

## Below is an Electronic Version of an Out-of-Print Publication

You can scroll to view or print this publication here, or you can borrow a paper copy from the Texas State Library, 512-463-5455. You can also view a copy at the TCEQ Library, 512-239-0020, or borrow one through your branch library using interlibrary loan.

The TCEQ's current print publications are listed in our catalog at [www.tceq.texas.gov/publications/](http://www.tceq.texas.gov/publications/)

This document is out of print, and should be used for historical reference only.



October 2013  
SFR-055/13

# Annual Report on Performance Measures

## Fiscal Year 2013



---

# **Annual Report on Performance Measures**

**Fiscal Year 2013**

Prepared by  
Chief Financial Officer Division

SFR-55/13  
October 2013

---



**Bryan W. Shaw, Ph.D., P.E.,** *Chairman*  
**Toby Baker,** *Commissioner*

**Zak Covar,** *Executive Director*

We authorize you to use or reproduce any original material contained in this publication—that is, any material we did not obtain from other sources. Please acknowledge the TCEQ as your source.

Copies of this publication are available for public use through the Texas State Library, other state depository libraries, and the TCEQ Library, in compliance with state depository law. For more information on TCEQ publications call 512-239-0028 or visit our website at:

**[tceq.texas.gov/publications](http://tceq.texas.gov/publications)**

Published and distributed  
by the  
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality  
PO Box 13087  
Austin TX 78711-3087

The TCEQ is an equal opportunity employer. The agency does not allow discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, disability, age, sexual orientation or veteran status. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, this document may be requested in alternate formats by contacting the TCEQ at 512-239-0028, Fax 512-239-4488, or 1-800-RELAY-TX (TDD), or by writing PO Box 13087, Austin, TX 78711-3087.

How is our customer service? [tceq.texas.gov/customersurvey](http://tceq.texas.gov/customersurvey)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Strategic Planning Structure Fiscal Year 2012</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Goal 01—Assessment, Planning, and Permitting.....	1
Goal 02—Drinking Water and Water Utilities .....	1
Goal 03—Enforcement and Compliance Assistance.....	2
Goal 04—Pollution Cleanup .....	2
Goal 05—River Compact Commissions.....	2
Goal—Historically Underutilized Business Program.....	2
<b>Goal 01-01: Assessment, Planning and Permitting</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Strategy 01-01-01: Air Quality Assessment and Planning.....	9
Strategy 01-01-02: Water Resource Assessment and Planning .....	16
Strategy 01-01-03: Waste Management Assessment Planning .....	19
<b>Goal 01-02: Assessment, Planning, and Permitting</b> .....	<b>21</b>
Strategy 01-02-01: Air Quality Permitting.....	23
Strategy 01-02-02: Water Resource Permitting.....	26
Strategy 01-02-03: Waste Management and Permitting.....	29
Strategy 01-02-04: Occupational Licensing.....	32
Strategy 01-03-01: Radioactive Materials Management.....	35
<b>Goal 02-01: Drinking Water and Water Utilities</b> .....	<b>37</b>
Strategy 02-01-01: Safe Drinking Water.....	38
Strategy 02-01-02: Water Utilities Oversight .....	39
<b>Goal 03-01: Enforcement and Compliance Assistance</b> .....	<b>41</b>
Strategy 03-01-01: Field Inspections and Complaint Response.....	46
Strategy 03-01-02: Enforcement and Compliance Support .....	51
Strategy 03-01-03: Pollution Prevention and Recycling .....	54
<b>Goal 04-01: Pollution Cleanup</b> .....	<b>58</b>
Strategy 04-01-01: Storage Tank Administration and Cleanup .....	60
Strategy 04-01-02: Hazardous Materials Cleanup .....	64
<b>Goal 05-01: River Compact Commissions</b> .....	<b>70</b>
<b>Historically Underutilized Businesses</b> .....	<b>73</b>



# Strategic Planning Structure

## Fiscal Year 2012

### **GOAL 01—ASSESSMENT, PLANNING, AND PERMITTING**

To protect public health and the environment by accurately assessing environmental conditions; by preventing or minimizing the level of contaminants released to the environment through regulation and permitting of facilities, individuals, or activities with potential to contribute to pollution levels.

Objective 01: To decrease the amount of toxics released and disposed of in Texas by 52 percent by the 2011 Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) reporting year from the 1992 reporting year levels and reduce air, water, and waste pollutants through assessing the environment.

**Strategy 01—Air Quality Assessment and Planning:** Reduce and prevent air pollution by monitoring and assessing air quality, developing and/or revising plans to address identified air quality problems, and assist in the implementation of approaches to reduce motor vehicle emissions.

**Strategy 02—Water Resource Assessment and Planning:** Develop plans to ensure an adequate, affordable supply of clean water by monitoring and assessing water quality and availability.

**Strategy 03—Waste Assessment and Planning:** Ensure the proper and safe disposal of pollutants by monitoring the generation, treatment, and storage of solid waste and assessing the capacity of waste disposal facilities; and by providing financial and technical assistance to municipal solid waste planning regions for the development and implementation of waste reduction plans.

Objective 02: To review and process 90% of air, water, and waste authorization applications within established time frames.

**Strategy 01—Air Quality Permitting:** Perform complete and timely reviews of applications to release pollutants into the air.

**Strategy 02—Water Resource Permitting:** Perform complete and timely reviews of applications to utilize the state's water resources or to discharge to the state's waterways.

**Strategy 03—Waste Management and Permitting:** Perform complete and timely reviews of applications relating to the management and disposal of municipal and industrial solid and hazardous waste.

**Strategy 04—Occupational Licensing:** Establish and maintain occupational certification programs to ensure compliance with statutes and regulations that protect public health and the environment.

Objective 03: To ensure the proper and safe disposal of low-level radioactive waste.

**Strategy 01—Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management:** To ensure the proper and safe recovery of source material and disposal of low-level radioactive waste.

### **GOAL 02—DRINKING WATER AND WATER UTILITIES**

To protect public health and the environment by assuring the delivery of safe drinking water to the citizens of Texas consistent with requirements in the Safe Drinking Water Act; by providing regulatory oversight of water and sewer utilities; and by promoting regional water strategies.

Objective 01: To supply 95% of Texans served by public drinking water systems with drinking water consistent with requirements in the Safe Drinking Water Act. To provide regulatory oversight of water and sewer utilities and to promote regional water strategies.

**Strategy 01—Safe Drinking Water:** Ensure the delivery of safe drinking water to all citizens through monitoring and oversight of drinking water sources consistent with the requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act.

**Strategy 02—Water Utilities Oversight:** Provide regulatory oversight of water and sewer utilities to ensure that charges to customers are necessary and cost-based; and to promote and ensure adequate customer service.



## **GOAL 03—ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE**

To protect public health and the environment by administering enforcement and environmental assistance programs that promote compliance with environmental laws and regulations, voluntary efforts to prevent pollution, and offer incentives for demonstrated environmental performance while providing strict, sure, and just enforcement when environmental laws are violated.

Objective 01: Through fiscal year 2011, to maintain at least 95 percent of all regulated facilities in compliance with state environmental laws and regulations, and to respond appropriately to citizen inquiries and complaints and to achieve pollution prevention, resource conservation, and enhanced compliance.

**Strategy 01—Field Inspections and Complaints:** Promote compliance with environmental laws and regulations by conducting field inspections and responding to citizen complaints.

**Strategy 02—Enforcement and Compliance Support:** Maximize voluntary compliance with environmental laws and regulations by providing educational outreach and assistance to businesses and units of local governments; and assure compliance with environmental laws and regulations by taking swift, sure and just enforcement actions to address violation situations.

**Strategy 03—Pollution Prevention and Recycling:** Enhance environmental performance, pollution prevention, recycling, and innovative programs through technical assistance, public education, and innovative programs implementation.

## **GOAL 04—POLLUTION CLEANUP**

To protect public health and the environment by identifying, assessing, and prioritizing contaminated sites, and by assuring timely and cost-effective cleanup based on good science and current risk factors.

Objective 01: By fiscal year 2011, identify, assess and remediate up to 56 percent of the known Superfund sites and/or other sites contaminated by hazardous materials. To identify, assess and remediate up to 91% of the leaking petroleum storage tank sites.

**Strategy 01—Storage Tank Administration and Cleanup:** Regulate the installation and operation of underground storage tanks and administer a program to identify and remediate sites contaminated by leaking storage tanks. Provide prompt and appropriate reimbursement to contractors and owners for the cost of remediating sites contaminated by leaking storage tanks.

**Strategy 02—Hazardous Materials Cleanup:** Aggressively pursue the investigation, design and cleanup of federal and state Superfund sites; and facilitate voluntary cleanup activities at other sites and respond immediately to spills which threaten human health and environment.

## **GOAL 05—RIVER COMPACT COMMISSIONS**

Ensure the delivery of Texas' equitable share of water.

Objective 01: Ensure the delivery of 100% of Texas' equitable share of water as apportioned by the River Compacts.

## **GOAL—HISTORICALLY UNDERUTILIZED BUSINESS PROGRAM**

To establish and carry out policies and practices governing purchasing and public works contracts that foster meaningful and substantive inclusion of historically underutilized businesses (HUBs). The agency strives to conduct a good faith effort program that will encourage inclusion of HUBs in all purchasing and procurement opportunities as set forth by Texas Government Code 2161 and 1 Texas Administrative Code 20.10 – 20.28, as adopted by the TCEQ. The HUB program will develop and implement a plan for increasing the use of HUBs in purchasing and public works contracts and subcontracts.

## Goal 01-01: Assessment, Planning and Permitting

---

**Outcome Measure 01:  
Annual Percent of Stationary and Mobile Source  
Pollution Reductions in Non-Attainment Areas  
(Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	3.00%	21.02%	700.67%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Annual Percent of Stationary and Mobile Source Pollution Reductions in Non-Attainment areas is above projections for FY 2013. 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. On-road mobile source emissions decreased because of more stringent emissions standards for newer fleet vehicles and the simultaneous attrition of older, higher emitting vehicles. Area source emissions also decreased during FY 2013 because of increased awareness, new rule requirements, technological advancements, and other factors. The desired performance for this measure is to be above the projected target.

**Outcome Measure 02:  
Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) Emissions Reduced  
Through the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan  
(TERP) (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	68.40	43.50	63.60%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Nitrogen Oxide Emissions Reduced through the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan (TERP) was below projections for FY 2013. This measure reports the actual tons per day (TPD) of emissions reductions as reported by grantees for projects in effect during the fiscal year. Reductions in NOx are lower than anticipated due to a number of factors including lower final commitments for reductions on some projects than were projected, needed adjustments to projections for realistic usage factors, and underperformance by some grantees. 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.

## Goal 01-01: Assessment, Planning and Permitting

---

**Outcome Measure 03:  
Percent of Texans Living Where the Air Meets  
Federal Air Quality Standards**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	35.00%	46%	131.43%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Percent of Texans Living Where the Air Meets Federal Air Quality Standards was higher than projected for FY 2013. This measure compares the percentage of the Texas population living in metropolitan areas that meet federal air quality standards. Fewer counties than expected were designated in nonattainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for ozone. Performance above the projected level is desirable for this measure.

**Outcome Measure 04:  
Annual Percent Reduction in Pollution from  
Permitted Wastewater Facilities Discharging to the  
Waters of the State (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	0.10%	.053%	53.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Annual Percent Reduction in Pollution from Permitted Wastewater Facilities Discharging to the Waters of the State was below projections for FY 2013. This measure compares this fiscal year's ratio of organic loading and permitted total flow of wastewater discharges to the previous fiscal year. During FY 2013, there were fewer plant expansions, fewer requests for new permits, and less of a reduction in pollution than originally anticipated.

## Goal 01-01: Assessment, Planning and Permitting

---

**Outcome Measure 05:  
Percent of Texas Surface Waters Meeting or  
Exceeding Water Quality Standards (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	59.00%	62.90%	106.61%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Percent of Texas Surface Waters Meeting or Exceeding Water Quality Standards is above projections at the end of FY 2013. 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 2012. One reason performance was higher is due to the approval of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs), which removed a number of waterbodies from the 303(d) list of impaired waterbodies. Also, assessment methods (which consider data variability) have been implemented to avoid the inappropriate listing of waterbodies on the impaired list.

**Outcome Measure 06:  
Annual Percent of Solid Waste Diverted from  
Municipal Solid Waste Facilities**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	8.00%	2.7%	33.75%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Annual Percent of Solid Waste Diverted from Municipal Solid Waste Facilities was below projections for FY 2013. This measure provides a general indicator of the effectiveness of statewide solid waste diversion and planning efforts. This measure only captures data for solid waste that arrives at a landfill and is then diverted. It does not capture diversion activities (such as local recycling programs) that divert waste before it arrives at a landfill. As local diversion programs have grown, waste diversion by landfills has decreased at a greater rate than originally estimated by the agency.

## Goal 01-01: Assessment, Planning and Permitting

---

**Outcome Measure 07:  
Annual Percent Decrease in the Toxic Releases in  
Texas (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	2.00%	-2.70%	-135.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Annual Percent Decrease in the Toxic Releases in Texas was below projections for FY 2013. Performance reflects an increase in toxic releases instead of the projected decrease. Two major stationary sources increased their air emissions releases by 1.5 million pounds due to unplanned plant upsets and plant processing changes. This measure is subject to a variety of factors like economic conditions and business decisions that are beyond the agency's control.

**Outcome Measure 08:  
Annual Percent Decrease in the Amount of  
Municipal Solid Waste Going into Texas landfills**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	-2.00%	-5.18%	-259.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Annual Percent Decrease in the Amount of Municipal Solid Waste Going into Texas Landfills was below projections for FY 2013. This measure reflects conservation efforts to reduce the amount of solid waste going into Texas landfills. During FY 2013, the amount of solid waste going to landfills increased despite conservation efforts. Some factors that impact solid waste going to landfills include statewide economic conditions, population growth, and natural disaster events. The state population increased 1.5% during FY 2013.

## Goal 01-01: Assessment, Planning and Permitting

---

**Outcome Measure 09:  
Percent of TERP Grants Derived From New  
Technology Research and Development (NTRD)  
Technologies**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	3.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Percent of TERP Grants Derived from NTRD Technologies was below projections for FY 2013. This measure shows the percent of the total dollar amount of TERP grants derived from grants of the NTRD program. To date, no TERP grants have been derived from NTRD funded technologies. The 82nd Regular Texas Legislature eliminated funding and authority for the NTRD program after FY 2011. Eight grant funded technologies have been certified/verified by the EPA or the California Air Resources Board (CARB). The NTRD funded technologies certified/verified to date have specialized markets and are moving toward acceptance in those markets. The NTRD funded railroad and marine certification projects that were most likely to be commercially implemented expired prior to completion. The agency will no longer report on this measure after this fiscal year.

**Outcome Measure 10:  
Percent of High and Significant Hazard Dams  
Inspected within the Last Five Years**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	100.00%	92.10%	92.10%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Percent of High and Significant Hazard Dams Inspected within the Last Five Years is below projections for FY 2013. This measure reflects the percent of high and significant hazard dams that have had safety inspections performed within the last five years. A number of factors have affected performance. The number of dams categorized in the inventory as high and significant hazard increased during the fiscal year. Staff was also reviewing a large number of Emergency Action Plans, and there were a large number of repeat inspections for certain dams. There has also been a high turnover rate among staff due to the improved job market for engineers.

## Goal 01-01: Assessment, Planning and Permitting

---

**Outcome Measure 11:  
Number of acres of Habitats Created, Restored,  
and Protected through Implementation of Estuary  
Action Plans**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	2,000	1,728	86.40%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Acres of Habitat Created, Restored, and Protected was below projections for FY 2013. This measure reports the number of acres of habitat created, restored, and/or protected through implementation of Galveston Bay Estuary Program (GBEP) and Coastal Bend Bay Estuaries Program (CBBEP) estuary action plans. A number of projects were delayed and could not be counted for this year's performance.

## Strategy 01-01-01: Air Quality Assessment and Planning

---

**Output Measure 01:**  
**Number of Point Source Air Quality Assessments**  
**(Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	491.75	471	23.95%
2nd Quarter	491.75	121	6.15%
3rd Quarter	491.75	516	26.23%
4th Quarter	491.75	906	46.06%
<b>Total Performance</b>	1,967.00	2,014.00	102.39%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Output Measure 02:**  
**Number of Area Source Air Quality Assessments**  
**(Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	562.50	1,776	78.93%
2nd Quarter	562.50	772	34.31%
3rd Quarter	562.50	2,094	93.07%
4th Quarter	562.50	0	0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	2,250.00	4,642.00	206.31%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Area Source Air Quality Assessments was above projections for FY 2013. This measure counts the number of area source air emissions inventories that have been developed, reviewed, and loaded into the TexAER database. The agency completed more inventories than anticipated in order to meet the EPA's triennial submission requirement for the area source emissions inventory. FY 2013 performance is atypical.



## Strategy 01-01-01: Air Quality Assessment and Planning

---

**Output Measure 03:  
Number of Mobile Source On-Road Air Quality  
Assessments (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	253.25	480	47.38%
2nd Quarter	253.25	187	18.46%
3rd Quarter	253.25	339	33.46%
4th Quarter	253.25	56	5.53%
<b>Total Performance</b>	<b>1,013.00</b>	<b>1,062</b>	<b>104.84%</b>

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Output Measure 04:  
Number of Non-Road Mobile Source Air Quality  
Assessments**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	516.50	514	24.88%
2nd Quarter	516.50	508	24.59%
3rd Quarter	516.50	600	29.04%
4th Quarter	516.50	542	26.23%
<b>Total Performance</b>	<b>2,066.00</b>	<b>2,164.00</b>	<b>104.74%</b>

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation is required.

## Strategy 01-01-01: Air Quality Assessment and Planning

---

**Output Measure 05:  
Number of Air Monitors Operated**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	610	620	101.64%
2nd Quarter	610	620	101.64%
3rd Quarter	610	614	100.66%
4th Quarter	610	614	100.66%
<b>Total Performance</b>	610	614	100.66%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Output Measure 06:  
Tons of Nitrogen Oxide (NOx) Reduced through the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	1,698.50	0.00	0.00%
2nd Quarter	1,698.50	0.	0.00%
3rd Quarter	1,698.50	3,175.00	46.73%
4th Quarter	1,698.50	8,400.00	123.64%
<b>Total Performance</b>	6,794.00	11,575.00	170.37%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Tons of NOx Reduced through the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan (TERP) was above projections for FY 2013. This measure shows the amount of NOx emissions projected to be reduced through projects funded by TERP incentive grants. The agency was able to award \$89 million in grants during FY 2013 instead of the \$51 million projected due to carryover of unused funds from FY 2012 appropriations, an additional \$16 million in contingency appropriations, and the return of unused grant funds. Desired performance is to be above projections.

Performance in third quarter is corrected to reflect the return of \$3 million from the RRC that were projected to reduce 400 tons of emissions.

## Strategy 01-01-01: Air Quality Assessment and Planning

---

**Output Measure 07:  
Number of Vehicles Repaired or Replaced through  
LIRAP Assistance (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	547.25	1,324	60.48%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	547.25	1,162	53.08%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	547.25	1,909	87.21%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	547.25	2,125	97.08%
<b>Total Performance</b>	2,189.00	6,520	297.85%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Vehicles Repaired or Replaced through LIRAP is above projections at the end of FY 2013 based on preliminary data from participating counties. This measure determines the number of vehicle repairs and replacements that have taken place in the five county Houston-Galveston-Brazoria (HGB) area, nine county Dallas-Fort Worth (DFW) area, and the two county Austin-Round Rock (ARR) area. For FY 2013, the HGB area repaired and replaced 2,981 vehicles; the DFW area repaired and replaced 2,889 vehicles; and the ARR area repaired and replaced 650 vehicles. The high number of repairs and replacements reported through fourth quarter of FY 2013 are due to outstanding replacement vouchers from FY 2012 being used during the early part of the fiscal year and program areas' use of unspent funds from FY 2012. All local programs continue issuing repair assistance vouchers, but only the ARR area continues to issue replacement vouchers.

**Output Measure 08:  
Number of New Technology Grants Approved to  
Fund Technologies to be Submitted for  
Verification or Certification by the EPA or CARB**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	1.25	0	0.00%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	1.25	0	0.00%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	1.25	0	0.00%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	1.25	0	0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	5.00	0.00	0.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of New Technology Grant Proposals Reviewed is below projections for FY 2013. The 82<sup>nd</sup> Legislature eliminated funding and authority for the NTRD program after FY 2011. TCEQ does not have the funding or authority to issue further NTRD grants and performance is zero. This measure will no longer be reported after this fiscal year.

## Strategy 01-01-01: Air Quality Assessment and Planning

---

**Efficiency Measure 01:  
Percent of Data Collected by TCEQ Continuous  
and Non-Continuous Air Monitoring Networks**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	94%	93%	98.94%
2nd Quarter	94%	94%	100.00%
3rd Quarter	94%	93%	98.94%
4th Quarter	94%	94%	100.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	94%	94%	100.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Efficiency Measure 02:  
Average Cost per Air Quality Assessment**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	\$ 286	\$ 156.560	54.74%
2nd Quarter	\$ 286	\$ 323.00	112.94%
3rd Quarter	\$ 286	\$ 148.00	51.75%
4th Quarter	\$ 286	\$ 362.00	126.57%
<b>Total Performance</b>	\$ 286	\$ 247.39	86.50%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for Average Cost per Air Quality Assessment was below projections for FY 2013. This measure accounts for the funds expended on salaries and other operating expenses related to staff who count the number of air emissions inventories that have been reviewed and loaded into a database. The agency performed a higher number of area source emissions assessments than expected which resulted in a lower cost per assessment. Desired performance for this measure is to be below projections.

## Strategy 01-01-01: Air Quality Assessment and Planning

---

**Efficiency Measure 03:  
Average Cost of LIRAP Vehicle Emissions  
Repairs/Retrofits (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	\$ 525	\$ 548.20	104.42%
2nd Quarter	\$ 525	\$ 545.64	103.93%
3rd Quarter	\$ 525	\$ 544.38	103.69%
4th Quarter	\$ 525	\$ 540.49	102.95%
<b>Total Performance</b>	\$ 525	\$ 544.69	103.75%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Efficiency Measure 04:  
Average Cost Per Ton of NOx Reduced through  
the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	\$ 7,500	\$ 0	0.00%
2nd Quarter	\$ 7,500	\$ 0	0.00%
3rd Quarter	\$ 7,500	\$ 5,321	70.95%
4th Quarter	\$ 7,500	\$ 8,132	108.43%
<b>Total Performance</b>	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,462	99.49%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation is required.

## Strategy 01-01-01: Air Quality Assessment and Planning

---

**Explanatory Measure 01:  
Number of Days Ozone Exceedances are Recorded  
in Texas**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	68	41	60.29%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Days Ozone Exceedances are Recorded in Texas was lower than projected for FY 2013. Ozone levels across the state were lower than projected and resulted in fewer days exceeding the federal ozone standard. A number of factors contributed to fewer days with elevated ozone including reduced emissions of ozone precursors and meteorology not conducive to ozone formation. Performance below projected levels is desirable for this measure.

## Strategy 01-01-02: Water Resource Assessment and Planning

---

**Output Measure 01:  
Number of Surface Water Assessments (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	16.75	1	1.49%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	16.75	9	13.43%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	16.75	14	20.90%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	16.75	37	55.22%
<b>Total Performance</b>	67.00	61.00	91.04%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Surface Water Assessments was below projections for FY 2013. This measure quantifies the surface water assessment activities of the agency. A variety of activities are reflected by this measure. Assessment of water quality is essential to the identification of impaired water bodies, development of water quality standards, development of effluent standards for discharges, and development of watershed restoration and implementation strategies. Water quality assessment activities were scheduled for completion late in the fiscal year after they were planned and coordinated. One project for 13 TMDLs was delayed to allow for stakeholder and community input. These TMDLs were adopted by the Commission on September 24, 2013.

**Output Measure 02:  
Number of Groundwater Assessments (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	13.50	7	12.96%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	13.50	13	24.07%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	13.50	9	16.67%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	13.50	26	48.15%
<b>Total Performance</b>	54.00	55.00	101.85%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

## Strategy 01-01-02: Water Resource Assessment and Planning

---

**Output Measure 03:  
Number of Dam Safety Assessments (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	257.50	321	31.17%
2nd Quarter	257.50	177	17.18%
3rd Quarter	257.50	172	16.70%
4th Quarter	257.50	266	25.83%
<b>Total Performance</b>	1,030.00	936	90.87%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Dam Safety Assessments was below projections as of the fourth quarter of FY 2013. This measure reflects the total number of dam safety assessments completed. There has been a high turnover and a large number of vacancies in the Dam Safety Program due to an improved job market for engineers, and the number of assessments completed is not as high as anticipated. Desired performance for this measure is to be above projections.

**Efficiency Measure 01:  
Average Cost per Dam Safety Assessment**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	\$ 3,000	\$ 1,905.69	63.52%
2nd Quarter	\$ 3,000	\$ 2,430.22	81.01%
3rd Quarter	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,772.78	125.76%
4th Quarter	\$ 3,000	\$ 1,651.73	55.06%
<b>Total Performance</b>	\$ 3,000	\$ 2,275.81	75.86%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Average Cost per Dam Safety Assessment is below projections at the end of FY 2013. This measure reports the average cost for each dam safety assessment conducted. The agency uses actual expenditures to calculate this measure. Since the agency has not been billed for some contracted professional service costs, total costs do not include costs that are billed and paid after year end. It is desirable for this measure to be below projections.



## Strategy 01-01-02: Water Resource Assessment and Planning

---

**Explanatory Measure 01:  
Percent of Texas' Rivers, Streams, Wetlands and  
Bays Protected by Site-Specific Water Quality  
Standards**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	36%	35.73%	99.25%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Explanatory Measure 03:  
Number of Dams in the Texas Dam Inventory**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	7,250	7,271	100.29%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

## Strategy 01-01-03: Waste Management Assessment Planning

---

**Output Measure 01:  
Number of Municipal Solid Waste Facility  
Capacity Assessments (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	56.25	0	0.00%
2nd Quarter	56.25	20	8.89%
3rd Quarter	56.25	122	54.22%
4th Quarter	56.25	114	50.67%
<b>Total Performance</b>	225.00	256.00	113.78%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Municipal Solid Waste Facility Capacity Assessments was above projections for FY 2013. This measure quantifies the number of MSW Annual Facility Capacity Assessment Reports reviewed by staff. The agency processed more reports than expected from facilities that are now inactive or in post closure care. Desired performance is to meet or be above projected targets.

**Efficiency Measure 01:  
Average Number of Hours Spent Per Municipal  
Solid Waste Facility Capacity Assessment**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	2.3	10.34	449.57%
2nd Quarter	2.3	.57	24.78%
3rd Quarter	2.3	1.24	53.91%
4th Quarter	2.3	2.30	100.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	2.3	2.30	100.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

## Strategy 01-01-03: Waste Management Assessment Planning

---

### Explanatory Measure 01:

**Number of Council of Government Regions in the State with Ten Years or More Years of Disposal Capacity**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	24.0	24.0	100.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

## Goal 01-02: Assessment, Planning, and Permitting

---

**Outcome Measure 01:  
Percent of Air Quality Permit Applications  
Reviewed within Established Time Frames**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	90.00%	54.00%	60.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for The Percent of Air Quality Permit Applications Reviewed within Established Time Frames was below the projected level at the end of FY 2013. This measure indicates the extent to which the Air Permits Division reviews air quality permit applications within established time frames. During FY 2012 and 2013, there was a 41% increase in the air applications received. The increased workload prevented permit applications from being completed in a timely manner.

**Outcome Measure 02:  
Percent of Water Quality Permit Applications  
Reviewed Within Established Time Frames**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	90.00%	90.90%	101.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

## Goal 01-02: Assessment, Planning, and Permitting

---

**Outcome Measure 03:  
Percent of Water Rights Permit Applications  
Reviewed Within Established Time Frames**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	75.00%	68%	90.67%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Percent of Water Rights Permit Applications Reviewed within Established Timeframes was below projections for FY 2013. This measure tracks the percent of water rights permits that were reviewed within the established time frames. Performance for this measure was below projections for the year due to the increasingly complex nature of water rights permitting applications. In addition, numerous staff normally assigned to permitting activities were involved in the coordination of agency drought responses and in complex rulemaking and stakeholder processes.

**Outcome Measure 04:  
Percent of Waste Management Permit  
Applications Reviewed Within Established Time  
Frames**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	90.00%	81.19%	90.21%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Percent of Waste Management Permit Applications Reviewed Within Established Time Frames is below projections for FY 2013. This measure reflects the percentage of waste permit applications reviewed by staff within established time frames. Performance is below projections because of increased demands on existing staff due to a high volume of complex waste permit applications and program related inquiries.

## Strategy 01-02-01: Air Quality Permitting

---

**Output Measure 01:**  
**Number of State and Federal New Source Review**  
**Air Quality Permit Applications Reviewed (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	1,400	1,911	34.13%
2nd Quarter	1,400	2,923	52.20%
3rd Quarter	1,400	2,469	44.09%
4th Quarter	1,400	2,179	38.91%
<b>Total Performance</b>	5,600	9,482	169.32%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of State and Federal New Source Air Quality Permit Applications Reviewed was above projections for FY 2013. This measure quantifies the permitting workload of the Air Permits Division (APD) staff assigned to review State and Federal New Source Review permit applications. The increased output for FY 2013 is due to a significant increase in applications received and reviewed during the year.

**Output Measure 02:**  
**Number of Federal Air Quality Operating Permits**  
**Reviewed (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	200	276	34.50%
2nd Quarter	200	284	35.50%
3rd Quarter	200	244	30.50%
4th Quarter	200	257	32.13%
<b>Total Performance</b>	800	1,061	132.63%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Federal Air Quality Operating Permits Reviewed was above projections for FY 2013. This measure quantifies the permitting workload of the Air Permits Division staff assigned to review federal operating permit applications. There has been an increase in the number of Title V projects reviewed due to the resolution of certain EPA objections that had been causing significant delays for Title V permit applications. There was also an increase in operating permit notifications due to the implementation of new rules for the oil and gas sector. While these notifications do not require a permit to be issued, staff is still required to process them.

## Strategy 01-02-01: Air Quality Permitting

---

**Output Measure 03:  
Number of Emissions Banking and Trading  
Transaction (EBT) Applications Reviewed**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	250	211	21.10%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	250	721	72.10%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	250	401	40.10%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	250	336	33.60%
<b>Total Performance</b>	1,000	1,669	166.90%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Emissions Banking and Trading (EBT) Applications Reviewed is above projections for FY 2013. This measure quantifies the workload of the Air Quality Division staff assigned to review EBT applications. Performance is above projections due to increased market activity resulting from increased rule applicability, program awareness, and the costs of alternatives.

**Explanatory Measure 01:  
Number of State and Federal New Source Review  
Air Quality Permits Issued**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	4,850	8,986	185.28%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of State and Federal New Source Review Air Quality Permit Applications Reviewed was above projections for FY 2013. This measure reports the number of state and federal new source review permits issued under the Texas Clean Air Act and Title I of the Federal Clean Air Act. The increased output for FY 2013 is due to significant increase in air applications received and issued during the year.

## Strategy 01-02-01: Air Quality Permitting

---

### Explanatory Measure 02: Number of Federal Air Quality Permits Issued

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	650	574	88.31%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Federal Air Quality Permits Issued is below projections for FY 2013. This measure reports the number of federal air quality operating permits issued under Title V of the Federal Clean Air Act. Performance is below projections because the number of incoming Title V applications has been decreasing three of the last four years. Additionally, permitting staff are addressing multiple time-intensive issues with EPA related to Site Operating Permits.



## Strategy 01-02-02: Water Resource Permitting

---

**Output Measure 01:**  
**Number of Applications to Address Water Quality**  
**Impacts Applications Reviewed (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	4,187.50	2,675	15.97%
2nd Quarter	4,187.50	2,475	14.78%
3rd Quarter	4,187.50	6,948	41.48%
4th Quarter	4,187.50	4,065	24.27%
<b>Total Performance</b>	16,750.00	16,163	96.50%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Output Measure 02:**  
**Number of Applications to Address Water Rights**  
**Impacts Reviewed**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	148.75	148	24.87%
2nd Quarter	148.75	112	18.82%
3rd Quarter	148.75	143	24.03%
4th Quarter	148.75	146	24.54%
<b>Total Performance</b>	595.00	549	92.27%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Applications to Address Water Rights Impacts Reviewed was below projections as of the fourth quarter of FY 2013. This measure reflects agency workload with regard to the review of water rights permit applications. Performance was below the target because persistent drought conditions have led to a decline in requests for temporary water right permits.

## Strategy 01-02-02: Water Resource Permitting

---

**Output Measure 03:  
Number of Concentrated Animal Feeding  
Operation (CAFO) Authorizations Reviewed (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	13.75	7	12.73%
2nd Quarter	13.75	12	21.82%
3rd Quarter	13.75	6	10.91%
4th Quarter	13.75	12	21.82%
<b>Total Performance</b>	55.00	37	67.27%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO) Authorizations Reviewed was below projections for FY 2013. This measure counts the number of CAFO individual permits filed with the Chief Clerk following technical review as well as the number of CAFO general permit authorizations that have been issued. The EPA is currently delaying approval of individual permits until the CAFO rule is revised; therefore no new renewal, or major amendment of individual CAFO permits have been filed with the Chief Clerk. The total number of issued permits reflects only CAFO general permit authorizations.

**Explanatory Measure 01:  
Number of Water Quality Permits Issued**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	825	624	75.64%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Water Quality Permits Issued was below projections for FY 2013. This measure reports the total number of water quality permits approved by the Executive Director or the Commissioners. EPA objections to pH, temperature, and whole effluent toxicity limits accepted by the agency prevented the issuance of over 100 Texas Pollution Discharge Elimination System permits. Also, the number of new applications received during FY 2013 was below historical levels.

## Strategy 01-02-02: Water Resource Permitting

---

### Explanatory Measure 02: Number of Water Rights Permits Issued

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	75	79	105.33%

#### **Variance Explanation: ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Water Rights Permits Issued was above the target for FY 2013. This measure tracks the number of water rights permit applications that were recommended for issuance and granted. Performance for this measure was above projections for the year due an unusually high number of abandonments received this year. These types of applications do not require technical review or notice and can be processed more quickly than other types of water rights permits.

## Strategy 01-02-03: Waste Management and Permitting

---

**Output Measure 01:  
Number of New System Waste Evaluations  
Conducted**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	142.50	138	24.21%
2nd Quarter	142.50	125	21.93%
3rd Quarter	142.50	122	21.40%
4th Quarter	142.50	178	31.23%
<b>Total Performance</b>	570.00	563	98.77%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Output Measure 02:  
Number of Non-Hazardous Waste Permit  
Applications Reviewed (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	59	48	20.34%
2nd Quarter	59	43	18.22%
3rd Quarter	59	35	14.83%
4th Quarter	59	34	14.41%
<b>Total Performance</b>	236	160	67.80%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Non-Hazardous Waste Permit Applications Reviewed is below projections for FY 2013. This measure quantifies the number of municipal solid waste permit and registration applications reviewed by TCEQ staff. The number of applications received has decreased. The number and type of authorization requests is shifting due to an increase in recycling activity. The majority of recycling activities are conducted via a Notice of Intent (NOI). Although NOI applications are reviewed and acknowledged by the program area, they are not included in the calculation of this performance measure.

## Strategy 01-02-03: Waste Management and Permitting

---

**Output Measure 03:  
Number of Hazardous Waste Permit Applications  
Reviewed (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	40	66	41.25%
2nd Quarter	40	50	31.25%
3rd Quarter	40	62	38.75%
4th Quarter	40	66	41.25%
<b>Total Performance</b>	160	244	152.50%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Hazardous Waste Permit Applications Reviewed was above projections for FY 2013. This measure quantifies the number of hazardous waste and underground injection control permits and registration applications reviewed. These reviews reflect requests for authorization made by the regulated community in response to changing business needs (updated contingency plans, addresses, contact information, etc.). These requests are difficult to anticipate and project.

**Explanatory Measure 01:  
Number of Non-Hazardous Waste Permits Issued**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	236	186	78.81%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Non-Hazardous Waste Permits Issued is below projected levels for FY 2013. This measure reflects requests for authorization by the regulated community in response to changing business needs. Recycling activity is increasing, and there has been a decrease in the number of permit applications received. Notice of Intent applications for recycling activities are currently not counted as an activity for this measure, but will be beginning next fiscal year.

## Strategy 01-02-03: Waste Management and Permitting

---

**Explanatory Measure 02:  
Number of Hazardous Waste Permits Issued**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	160	229	143.13%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Hazardous Waste Permits Issued was above projections for FY 2013. This measure quantifies the number of hazardous waste and underground injection control (UIC) permits and registration applications reviewed. Increased performance is attributed to requests for authorization made by the regulated community in response to changing business needs (for example updating contingency plans, addresses, contact information, etc.). These requests are difficult to anticipate and project

**Explanatory Measure 03:  
Number of Corrective Actions Implemented by Responsible Parties for Solid Waste Sites**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	3	2	66.67%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Corrective Actions Implemented by Responsible Parties for Solid Waste Sites is below projections for FY 2013. This measure quantifies the number of corrective actions implemented by responsible parties for solid waste sites. Decreased performance is attributed to the lower number of landfill gas remediation plans received and processed. Corrective action plans are required by rule to be submitted by the regulated community in response to landfill gas exceedance events and are difficult to anticipate and project. Desired performance is to be below projections.

## Strategy 01-02-04: Occupational Licensing

---

**Output Measure 01:  
Number of Applications for Occupational  
Licensing**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	6,000.00	4,077	16.99%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	6,000.00	4,135	17.23%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	6,000.00	5,541	23.09%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	6,000.00	5,340	22.25%
<b>Total Performance</b>	24,000.00	19,093	79.55%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Applications for Occupational Licensing was below projections for FY 2013. Fewer individuals have been applying for or renewing licenses. The agency cannot control the number of individuals that apply for or renew licenses and registrations. The lower number of applications reflect a lower demand for licensed occupations.

**Output Measure 02:  
Number of Examinations Processed (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	3,075.00	2,742.00	22.29%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	3,075.00	2,395.00	19.47%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	3,075.00	2,962.00	24.08%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	3,075.00	2,807.00	22.82%
<b>Total Performance</b>	12,300.00	10,906.00	88.67%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Examinations Processed was below projections as of the fourth quarter of FY 2013. Fewer individuals have been taking the required examinations reflecting a lower demand for licensed occupations. The agency cannot control the number of individuals taking examinations.

## Strategy 01-02-04: Occupational Licensing

---

**Output Measure 03:  
Number of Licenses and Registrations Issued**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	5,625	3,277	14.56%
2nd Quarter	5,625	3,484	15.48%
3rd Quarter	5,625	4,171	18.54%
4th Quarter	5,625	4,042	17.96%
<b>Total Performance</b>	22,500	14,974	66.55%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Licenses and Registrations Issued was below projections as of the fourth quarter of FY 2013. This measure reports the number of Occupational Licenses and Registrations issued by the Occupational Licensing Section. Fewer individuals are applying for new licenses/registrations or renewing existing licenses/registrations.

**Efficiency Measure 01:  
Average Annualized Cost Per License and Registration**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	\$ 18	\$18.27	101.50%
2nd Quarter	\$ 18	\$18.38	102.11%
3rd Quarter	\$ 18	\$18.33	101.83%
4th Quarter	\$ 18	\$19.07	105.94%
<b>Total Performance</b>	\$ 18	\$18.51	102.83%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.



## Strategy 01-02-04: Occupational Licensing

---

**Explanatory Measure 01:  
Number of TCEQ Licensed Environmental  
Professionals and Registered Companies**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	56,100	54,945	97.94%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation is required.

## Strategy 01-03-01: Radioactive Materials Management

---

**Output Measure 01:  
Number of Radiological Monitoring and  
Verification Samples Collected**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	25	33	33.00%
2nd Quarter	25	22	22.00%
3rd Quarter	25	50	50.00%
4th Quarter	25	24	24.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	100	129	129.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Radiological Monitoring and Verification Samples Collected was above projections as of the fourth quarter of FY 2013. This measure reports the number of samples taken at the Low Level Radioactive Waste Disposal facility in Andrews County and four additional radioactive materials sites. More sampling was done due to confirmatory surveys at the Mt. Lucas, South Texas Mining Ventures decommissioning project and quality assurance sampling in Andrews County.

**Explanatory Measure 01:  
Revenue Deposited in GR from 5% Gross Receipts  
Fee on Disposal of Waste**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	0	\$1,500,968.86	N/A

**Variance Explanation:**

No performance target is set for this measure. The number is provided for informational purposes only.

## Strategy 01-03-01: Radioactive Materials Management

---

**Explanatory Measure 02:  
Volume of LLRW Accepted by the State of Texas  
for Disposal at Texas Compact Waste Facility.**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	0	15,856.63 cubic feet	N/A

**Variance Explanation:**

No performance target is set for this measure. The number is provided for informational purposes only.

**Goal 02-01: Drinking Water and Water Utilities**

---

**Outcome Measure 01:  
Percent of Texas Population Served by Public  
Water Systems which Meet Drinking Water  
Standards (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	93.00%	96%	103.23%

<p><b>Variance Explanation:</b> <b>MEETS PROJECTIONS</b></p> <p>Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.</p>
--

**Outcome Measure 02:  
Percent of Texas Population Served by Public  
Water Systems Protected by a Program Which  
Prevents Connection between Potable and Non-  
Potable Water Sources**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	95.00%	95%	100.00%

<p><b>Variance Explanation:</b> <b>MEETS PROJECTIONS</b></p> <p>Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.</p>
--

## Strategy 02-01-01: Safe Drinking Water

---

**Output Measure 01:  
Number of Public Drinking Water Systems Which  
Meet Primary Drinking Water Standards (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	6,310	6,777	107.40%
2nd Quarter	6,310	6,683	105.91%
3rd Quarter	6,310	6,691	106.04%
4th Quarter	6,310	6,729	106.64%
<b>Total Performance</b>	6,310	6,729	106.64%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Public Drinking Water Systems Which Meet Primary Drinking Water Standards is above projections for FY 2013. This measure reports the total number of all public water systems which have not had maximum contaminant level (MCL), microbiological violations, or lead action level exceedances. More systems have come on line than projected. The desired performance for this measure is to be above projections.

**Output Measure 02:  
Number of Drinking Water Samples Collected  
(Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	10,397.75	12,248	29.45%
2nd Quarter	10,397.75	11,212	26.96%
3rd Quarter	10,397.75	15,863	38.14%
4th Quarter	10,397.75	8,640	20.77%
<b>Total Performance</b>	41,591.00	47,963	115.32%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for The Number of Drinking Water Samples Collected was above the projected level for FY 2013. This measure reflects the collection of public drinking water chemical compliance samples by an agency contractor and samples collected by TCEQ regional investigators. The Public Drinking Water Section has seen a steady increase in the number of public water systems coming on line. As these water systems come on line, they become subject to drinking water sampling requirements. Therefore, the number of samples taken has also been increasing and has led to performance above anticipated levels.

## Strategy 02-01-02: Water Utilities Oversight

---

**Output Measure 01:  
Number of Utility Rate Reviews Performed (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	20	32	40.00%
2nd Quarter	20	17	21.25%
3rd Quarter	20	29	36.25%
4th Quarter	20	20	25.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	80	98	122.50%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Utility Rate Reviews Performed is higher than expected for FY 2013. This measure reflects the number of applications received and processed by agency staff and either approved, dismissed, withdrawn, or referred to legal staff as a contested matter during the reporting period. The number of rate and tariff change applications filed has been increasing over the last three years. TCEQ believes this is a reflection of the current economy, aging infrastructure, and water and sewer utilities attempting to set rates that reflect the true cost of service. As the cost of service for water and/or sewer utilities increases, the need for utilities to increase their rates also increases. Therefore, the number of rate reviews also increases.

**Output Measure 02:  
Number of District Applications Processed**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	137.50	129	23.45%
2nd Quarter	137.50	91	16.55%
3rd Quarter	137.50	98	17.82%
4th Quarter	137.50	99	18.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	550.00	417	75.82%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of District Applications Processed is below projections for FY 2013. This measure reflects the number of applications received and processed by agency staff and either approved, denied, withdrawn, or referred to the Commission as a contested matter. The number of district applications has declined over the last three years, and as a result, the number of applications received by the TCEQ has been less than projected targets. Although developers have planned for new growth and continue construction of new infrastructure, applications submitted to the TCEQ have not significantly increased. The financing of new infrastructure by water districts typically occurs between one and 5 years after the construction of said infrastructure.

## Strategy 02-01-02: Water Utilities Oversight

---

**Output Measure 03:  
Number of Certificates of Convenience and  
Necessity Applications Processed**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	56.25	52	23.11%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	56.25	15	6.67%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	56.25	59	26.22%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	56.25	36	16.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	225.00	162	72.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Certificates of Convenience and Necessity Applications (CCN) Processed is below the projected level for FY 2013. This measure reflects the number of applications received and processed by agency staff and either approved, dismissed, withdrawn, or referred to SOAH staff as a contested matter during the reporting period. This number also includes the number of Sale, Transfer or Merger applications filed and processed. The number of CCN related applications is below historically experienced levels. Although development activity is increasing throughout the state, developers are not yet submitting new CCN applications for processing.

## Goal 03-01: Enforcement and Compliance Assistance

---

**Outcome Measure 01:  
Percent of Inspected or Investigated Air Sites in Compliance (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	98.00%	97.74%	99.73%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Outcome Measure 02:  
Percent of Inspected or Investigated Water Sites and Facilities in Compliance (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	97.00%	98.87%	101.93%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Outcome Measure 03:  
Percent of Inspected or Investigated Waste Sites in Compliance (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	97.00%	89.48%	92.25%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Percent of Inspected or Investigated Waste Sites in Compliance is below projections at the end of FY 2013. 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.



## Goal 03-01: Enforcement and Compliance Assistance

---

**Outcome Measure 04:  
Percent of Identified Non-Compliant Sites and  
Facilities for which Timely and Appropriate Action  
is Taken (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	85.00%	94.80%	111.53%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Percent of Identified Non-Compliant Sites and Facilities for which Timely and Appropriate Action is Taken is above projections for FY 2013. 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.

**Outcome Measure 05:  
Percent of Investigated Occupational Licensees in  
Compliance**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	82.00%	50.00%	60.98%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Percent of Investigated Occupational Licensees in Compliance was below projections for FY 2013. This measure determines the percentage of investigated licensees that were not found to have significant violations. There were a significant number of complaints investigated against occupational licensees and also individuals operating without occupational licenses this fiscal year which resulted in lower rates of compliance.

**Goal 03-01: Enforcement and Compliance Assistance**

---

**Outcome Measure 06:  
Percent of Administrative Orders Settled**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	85.00%	81.30%	95.65%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Outcome Measure 07:  
Percent of Administrative Penalties Collected  
(Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	88.00%	81.22%	92.30%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Percent of Administrative Penalties Collected is below performance at the end of FY 2013. 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.

**Goal 03-01: Enforcement and Compliance Assistance**

---

**Outcome Measure 08:  
Tons of Emissions and Waste Reduced and Minimized as Reported by the Regulated Community Implementing Pollution Prevention, Environmental Management Systems, and Other Innovative Programs.**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	0	0	0

**Variance Explanation:**

This program is no longer supported. Resources for this program were reallocated to other programs due to budget reductions from the 82nd Legislative Session. This measure will no longer be reported next fiscal year.

**Outcome Measure 09:  
Amount of Financial Savings Achieved as Reported by the Regulated Community Implementing Pollution Prevention, Environmental Management Systems, and Other Innovative Programs.**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	\$ 0	\$ 0	0

**Variance Explanation:**

This program is no longer supported. Resources for this program were reallocated to other programs due to budget reductions from the 82nd Legislative Session. This measure will no longer be reported next fiscal year.

---

**Goal 03-01: Enforcement and Compliance Assistance**

---

**Outcome Measure 10:  
Tons of Emissions and Waste Reduced and  
Minimized in the Texas Mexico Border Region as  
Reported by the Regulated Community  
Implementing Pollution Prevention,  
Environmental Management Systems, and Other  
Innovative Programs**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>Total Performance</b>	0	0	0

**Variance Explanation:**

This program is no longer supported. Resources for this program were reallocated to other programs due to budget reductions from the 82nd Legislative Session. This measure will no longer be reported next fiscal year.

## Strategy 03-01-01: Field Inspections and Complaint Response

---

**Output Measure 01:  
Number of Inspections and Investigations of Air  
Sites (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	2,794.25	2,748	24.59%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	2,794.25	2,915	26.08%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	2,794.25	3,062	27.40%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	2,794.25	3,873	34.65%
<b>Total Performance</b>	11,177.00	12,598	112.71%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Inspections and Investigations of Air Sites is above projections for FY 2013. Agency response to concerns regarding increased oil and gas production and an increase in permitting applications has led to a higher number of inspections and investigations than anticipated.

**Output Measure 02:  
Number of Inspections and Investigations of Water  
Rights Sites (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	7,150.00	7,253.00	25.36%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	7,150.00	8,970.00	31.36%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	7,150.00	6,086.00	21.28%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	7,150.00	6,983.00	24.42%
<b>Total Performance</b>	28,600.00	29,292.00	102.42%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

## Strategy 03-01-01: Field Inspections and Complaint Response

---

**Output Measure 03:  
Number of Inspections and Investigations of Water  
Sites and Facilities (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	2,883.75	3,333	28.89%
2nd Quarter	2,883.75	3,073	26.64%
3rd Quarter	2,883.75	3,310	28.70%
4th Quarter	2,883.75	4,511	39.11%
<b>Total Performance</b>	11,535.00	14,227	123.34%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Inspections and Investigations of Water Sites and Facilities is above projections for FY 2013. The agency has conducted more water rights inspections and responded to more priority calls than anticipated due to statewide drought conditions. In addition, the agency conducted a large number of surveys and inspections related to Aggregate Production Operations as required by new statutory requirements per HB 571, 82<sup>nd</sup> Legislature.

**Output Measure 04:  
Number of Inspections and Investigations of  
Livestock and Poultry Operation Sites (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	82.50	84	25.45%
2nd Quarter	82.50	87	26.36%
3rd Quarter	82.50	75	22.73%
4th Quarter	82.50	98	29.70%
<b>Total Performance</b>	330.00	344	104.24%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

## Strategy 03-01-01: Field Inspections and Complaint Response

---

**Output Measure 05:  
Number of Inspections and Investigations of Waste Sites (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	1,690.00	2,908	43.02%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	1,690.00	3,573	52.86%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	1,690.00	4,138	61.21%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	1,690.00	3,557	52.62%
<b>Total Performance</b>	6,760.00	14,176	209.70%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Inspections and Investigations of Waste Sites was above projections through the fourth quarter of FY 2013. This measure represents the number of inspections and investigations of waste sites and facilities and includes investigations at Petroleum Storage Tank (PST) sites subject to the Energy Policy Act (the Act). In order to meet the requirements of the Act, the agency received a grant from EPA. The grant was used to fund an intergovernmental contract to have these investigations completed. Investigations conducted by both the contractor and the agency have resulted in performance well above the projected target.

**Output Measure 06:  
Number of Spill Cleanup Inspections**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	162.50	85	13.08%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	162.50	99	15.23%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	162.50	151	23.23%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	162.50	85	13.08%
<b>Total Performance</b>	650.00	420	64.62%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Spill Cleanup Inspections is below projections at the end of FY 2013. Spill investigations are an on-demand activity and are based upon the number of spills of regulated materials reported by citizens, industry representatives, and state law enforcement officials. This number can vary widely from quarter to quarter. During this reporting period, fewer spills were reported to the agency that required investigations.

## Strategy 03-01-01: Field Inspections and Complaint Response

---

**Efficiency Measure 01:  
Average Inspection and Investigation Cost of  
Livestock and Poultry Operations**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	\$ 700	\$ 496.00	70.86%
2nd Quarter	\$ 700	\$ 586.14	83.73%
3rd Quarter	\$ 700	\$ 539.00	77.00%
4th Quarter	\$ 700	\$ 469.14	67.02%
<b>Total Performance</b>	\$ 700	\$ 519.44	74.21%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Average Inspection and Investigation Cost of Livestock and Poultry Operations was below projections through the fourth quarter of FY 2013. This measure represents total funds expended during the reporting period for monitoring of livestock and poultry operations, divided by the number of compliance inspections and complaint investigations for livestock and poultry operations completed during the fiscal year. Average cost figures for the inspection and investigation of livestock and poultry operations vary considerably due to the number and complexity of investigations performed in any given quarter. Desired performance for this measure is to be below projections.

**Efficiency Measure 02:  
Average Time (days) from Air, Water, and Waste  
Inspections to Report Completion**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	35	34	97.14%
2nd Quarter	35	35	100.00%
3rd Quarter	35	33	94.29%
4th Quarter	35	34	97.14%
<b>Total Performance</b>	35	34	97.14%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.



## Strategy 03-01-01: Field Inspections and Complaint Response

---

**Explanatory Measure 01:  
Number of Citizen Complaints Investigations  
Completed**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	5,300	3,480	65.66%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Citizen Complaints Investigations is below projections at the end of the fourth quarter for FY 2013. Citizen complaint investigations are an on-demand activity and are based upon the number of complaints received from citizens that result in investigations. This number can vary widely from quarter to quarter. During this reporting period, fewer complaints requiring investigation were received. Desired performance is to be below projections.

**Explanatory Measure 02:  
Number of Emissions Events Investigations**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	5,000	4,584	91.68%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Emission Events Investigations was below projections for FY 2013. These are on-demand, statutorily required activities. The number of emissions events, which are outside of the agency's control, drives the number of investigations. Fewer emissions events were reported during the fiscal year than projected.

## Strategy 03-01-02: Enforcement and Compliance Support

---

**Output Measure 01:  
Number of Environmental Laboratories  
Accredited (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	285	279	97.89%
2nd Quarter	285	284	99.65%
3rd Quarter	285	280	98.25%
4th Quarter	285	280	98.25%
<b>Total Performance</b>	285	280	98.25%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Output Measure 02:  
Number of Small Business and Local Governments  
Assisted (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	13,500.00	24,556	45.47%
2nd Quarter	13,500.00	17,693	32.76%
3rd Quarter	13,500.00	6,221	11.52%
4th Quarter	13,500.00	6,268	11.61%
<b>Total Performance</b>	54,000.00	54,738	101.37%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

## Strategy 03-01-02: Enforcement and Compliance Support

---

**Efficiency Measure 01:  
Average Number of Days to File an Initial  
Settlement Offer**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	70	51	72.86%
2nd Quarter	70	56	80.00%
3rd Quarter	70	57	81.43%
4th Quarter	70	55	78.57%
<b>Total Performance</b>	70	55	78.57%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Average Number of Days to File an Initial Settlement Offer was below projections for FY 2013. This measure represents the average number of days from the date the case was assigned, to the mailing date of the initial document that explains the violations and calculated penalty included in the enforcement action. The average number of days was lower than projected because the agency has procedures in place to ensure that all cases are processed below the average time frame. For this type of measure, performance below the target level is desirable.

**Explanatory Measure 01:  
Amount of Administrative Penalties Required to be  
Paid in Final Administrative Orders Issued**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	NA	\$12,400,409	NA

**Variance Explanation:**

No performance target is set for this measure. The number is provided for informational purposes only.

## Strategy 03-01-02: Enforcement and Compliance Support

---

**Explanatory Measure 02:  
Amount Required to be Paid for Supplemental  
Environmental Projects Issued in Final  
Administrative Orders**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	NA	\$2,463,988	NA

**Variance Explanation:**

No performance target is set for this measure. The number is provided for informational purposes only.

**Explanatory Measure 03:  
Number of Administrative Enforcement Orders  
Issued**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	1,000	2,182	218.20%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Administrative Enforcement Orders Issued was above projections for FY 2013. This measure reflects agency enforcement efforts. The total number of orders issued is largely a function of the rate of significant noncompliance documented during agency investigations. Performance exceeded projections due to an increase in the number of facilities that were documented to be in significant noncompliance.

## Strategy 03-01-03: Pollution Prevention and Recycling

---

**Output Measure 01:  
Number of On-Site Technical Assistance Visits,  
Audits, Presentations and Workshops on Pollution  
Prevention/Waste Minimization and Voluntary  
Program Participation (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	31.25	43	34.40%
2nd Quarter	31.25	15	12.00%
3rd Quarter	31.25	37	29.60%
4th Quarter	31.25	43	34.40%
<b>Total Performance</b>	125.00	138.00	110.40%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of On-Site Technical Assistance Visits, Presentations, and Workshops Conducted was above projected levels for FY 2013. There was increased interest in the Take Care of Texas program during the fiscal year. The desired performance for this measure is to be at or above projected targets.

**Output Measure 02:  
Number of Entities Participating in Voluntary  
Programs**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	150	49	32.67%
2nd Quarter	150	35	23.33%
3rd Quarter	150	35	23.33%
4th Quarter	150	33	22.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	150	33	22.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Entities Participating in Voluntary Programs was below projected levels for FY 2013. The decision to close out the Clean Texas program has resulted in no additional members. The number of participating entities is expected to continue to decline as memberships expire and are not renewed.

## Strategy 03-01-03: Pollution Prevention and Recycling

---

**Output Measure 03:  
Number of Quarts of Used Oil Diverted from  
Landfills and Processed (in millions)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	8.25	0.0	0.00%
2nd Quarter	8.25	35.72	108.24%
3rd Quarter	8.25	20.41	61.85%
4th Quarter	8.25	0.09	0.27%
<b>Total Performance</b>	33.0	56.22	170.36%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Quarts of Used Oil Diverted from Landfills and Processed is above projections as of the fourth quarter of FY 2013. This measure reports the amount of used oil diverted, via registered collection centers, from landfills. This information is reported annually, and reporting is voluntary. The actual number of quarts diverted varies from year to year due to the voluntary nature of reporting and changes in vehicle maintenance practices.

**Efficiency Measure 01:  
Average Cost Per On-Site Technical Assistance  
Visit**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	0	0	0

**Variance Explanation:**

This program is no longer supported. Resources for this program were reallocated to other programs due to budget reductions from the 82nd Legislative Session.

## Strategy 03-01-03: Pollution Prevention and Recycling

---

**Explanatory Measure 01:  
Tons of Hazardous Waste Reduced as a Result of  
Pollution Prevention Planning**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	500,000	278,935	55.79%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Tons of Hazardous Waste Reduced as a Result of Pollution Prevention Planning was below projections for FY 2013. This measure indicates the level of hazardous waste reduction by Texas facilities. This number is very volatile since reductions in hazardous waste are strongly dependent on a few large reporters. Additionally, projects can take years to implement and yield reductions. Continued efforts at outreach, education and marketing the benefits of pollution prevention planning will enhance future performance.

**Explanatory Measure 02:  
Tons of Waste Collected by Local and Regional  
Collection and Cleanup Events**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	4,000	6,634	165.85%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Tons of Waste Collected by Local and Regional Collection and Cleanup Events was above projections for FY 2013. The number of programs and collection events has increased in recent years, and interest in these cleanup and collection events is expected to continue into the future.

## Strategy 03-01-03: Pollution Prevention and Recycling

---

**Explanatory Measure 03:  
Tons of Agricultural Waste Chemicals Collected by  
TCEQ-Sponsored Entities**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	0	0	0

**Variance Explanation:**

This program is no longer supported. Resources for this program were reallocated to other programs due to budget reductions from the 82nd Legislature.

**Explanatory Measure 04:  
Number of Registered Waste Tire Facilities and  
Transporters**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	650	794	122.15%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJETED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Registered Waste Tire Facilities and Transporters was above projections for FY 2013. This measure reports the number of regulated facilities involved in scrap tire management. The number of registered waste tire facilities and transporters includes facilities registered from the previous year in addition to those newly registered in the reporting period. There has been an increase in the number of transporters and processors in the last year.



## Goal 04-01: Pollution Cleanup

---

**Outcome Measure 01:  
Percent of Leaking Petroleum Storage Tank Sites  
Cleaned Up (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	88.00%	93.78%	106.57%

Updated

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Percent of Leaking Petroleum Storage Tank Sites Cleaned Up was above projections for FY 2013. 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.

**New Outcome Measure 02:  
Total Number of Superfund Remedial Actions  
Completed (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	113	113	100.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

## Goal 04-01: Pollution Cleanup

---

**Outcome Measure 03:  
Percent of Voluntary and Brownfield Cleanup  
Properties made Available for  
Commercial/Industrial Redevelopment,  
Community, or other Economic Reuse (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	69.00%	75%	108.70%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

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 2013. 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 in a timely manner to facilitate property transactions and promote real estate reuse and development.

**Outcome Measure 04:  
Percent of Industrial Solid and Municipal  
Hazardous Waste Facilities Cleaned Up**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	62.00%	70.90%	114.35%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Percent of Industrial Solid and Municipal Hazardous Waste Facilities Cleaned Up was above projections for FY 2013. This outcome measure indicates the achievement of final cleanup goals of all closure and/or remediation projects at industrial solid waste and municipal hazardous waste facilities. An unexpectedly high level of unit closure reports were received in FY 2013. The agency has limited control over the number of corrective action cleanup and closure projects submitted for approval.

## Strategy 04-01-01: Storage Tank Administration and Cleanup

---

**Output Measure 01:  
Number of Petroleum Storage Tank Self-Certifications Processed**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	3,875.00	3,880	25.03%
2nd Quarter	3,875.00	4,447	28.69%
3rd Quarter	3,875.00	4,140	26.71%
4th Quarter	3,875.00	3,754	24.22%
<b>Total Performance</b>	15,500.00	16,221	104.65%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Output Measure 02:  
Number of Emergency Response Actions at Petroleum Storage Tank Sites**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	4	1	6.25%
2nd Quarter	4	0	0.00%
3rd Quarter	4	0	0.00%
4th Quarter	4	3	18.75%
<b>Total Performance</b>	16	4	25.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Emergency Response Actions at Petroleum Storage Tank Sites was below projections for FY 2013. This measure reports the number of sites to which a state lead contractor is dispatched to address an immediate threat to human health or safety or the environment. This is an on-demand activity. Fluctuations in performance are likely to occur due to the unpredictable number of sites requiring emergency responses. The desired performance for this measure is to be below projections.

## Strategy 04-01-01: Storage Tank Administration and Cleanup

**Output Measure 03:**  
**Number of Petroleum Storage Tank**  
**Reimbursement Fund Applications Processed**  
**(Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	0	0	0%
2nd Quarter	0	0	0%
3rd Quarter	0	0	0%
4th Quarter	0	0	0%
<b>Total Performance</b>	0	0	0%

**Petroleum Storage Tank Reimbursements have ended due to Sunset Provisions**  
 Measure is no longer applicable

**Output Measure 04:**  
**Number of Petroleum Storage Tank Cleanups Completed**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	50	80	40.00%
2nd Quarter	50	72	36.00%
3rd Quarter	50	93	46.50%
4th Quarter	50	80	40.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	200	325	162.50%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Petroleum Storage Tank Cleanups Completed was above projections for FY 2013. Most cleanups are finalized after responsible parties complete all field work and formally request closure review. The TCEQ has limited control over the number of requests for closure that are submitted within a given period of time.

## Strategy 04-01-01: Storage Tank Administration and Cleanup

**Efficiency Measure 01:  
Average Time (days) to Review and Respond to  
Remedial Action Plans**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	30	23.67	78.90%
2nd Quarter	30	24.00	80.00%
3rd Quarter	30	24.00	80.00%
4th Quarter	30	22.83	76.10%
<b>Total Performance</b>	30	21.64	72.13%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Average Time (days) to Review and Respond to Remedial Action Plans was below projections for FY 2013. This measure reports the average number of days for the agency to review and respond to remedial action plans over the reporting period. The agency has implemented procedures for reviewing remedial action plans to ensure average review times remain below the legislatively mandated time frame of 30 days. The desired performance for this measure is to be below projections.

**Efficiency Measure 02:  
Average Time (days) to Review and Respond to  
Risk-Based Site Assessments**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	30	22.51	75.03%
2nd Quarter	30	26.00	86.67%
3rd Quarter	30	23.00	76.67%
4th Quarter	30	20.00	66.67%
<b>Total Performance</b>	30	22.70	75.67%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Average Time (days) to Review and Respond to Risk-Based Site Assessments was below projections for FY 2013. This measure reports the average number of days for the agency to review and respond to risk-based site assessments over the reporting period. The agency has implemented procedures for reviewing these assessments to ensure average review times remain below the legislatively mandated time frame of 30 days. The desired performance for this measure is to be below projections.

## Strategy 04-01-01: Storage Tank Administration and Cleanup

---

**Efficiency Measure 03:  
Average Time (days) to Process Petroleum Storage  
Tank Remediation Fund Reimbursement Claims**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	0	0	0%
2nd Quarter	0	0	0%
3rd Quarter	0	0	0%
4th Quarter	0	0	0%
<b>Total Performance</b>	0	0	0%

**Variance Explanation:**

Petroleum Storage Tank Reimbursements have ended due to Sunset Provisions Measure is no longer applicable and will not be reported next fiscal year.

**Explanatory Measure 01:  
Average Cost per Petroleum Storage Tank  
Cleanup**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	\$ 0	\$0	0.00%

**Variance Explanation:** The program has ended and this measure is no longer applicable and will not be reported next fiscal year.

## Strategy 04-01-02: Hazardous Materials Cleanup

---

**Output Measure 01:  
Number of Immediate Response Actions  
Completed to Protect Human Health and the  
Environment**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	1	0	0.00%
2nd Quarter	1	1	25.00%
3rd Quarter	1	1	25.00%
4th Quarter	1	0	0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	4.00	2	50.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Immediate Response Actions Completed to Protect Human Health and the Environment was below projections for FY 2013. Response action completions are not expected to be evenly distributed over each reporting period. This measure is an on-demand activity, and the desired performance is to be below projections.

**Output Measure 02:  
Number of State Superfund Site Assessments**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	18	28	38.89%
2nd Quarter	18	3	4.17%
3rd Quarter	18	2	2.78%
4th Quarter	18	38	52.78%
<b>Total Performance</b>	72	71	98.61%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

## Strategy 04-01-02: Hazardous Materials Cleanup

---

**Output Measure 03:  
Number of Voluntary and Brownfield Cleanups  
Completed (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	15.00	16	26.67%
2nd Quarter	15.00	16	26.67%
3rd Quarter	15.00	22	36.67%
4th Quarter	15.00	30	50.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	60.00	84	140.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Voluntary and Brownfield Cleanups Completed is above projections as of the fourth quarter of FY 2013. This measure indicated the number of sites that have completed necessary response actions to either remove or control contamination levels at these sites. Performance is above projected levels due to the timely submittal of technical documents by applicants and expedited site closures.

**Output Measure 04:  
Number of Superfund sites in Texas Undergoing  
Evaluation and Cleanup (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	38	44	115.79%
2nd Quarter	38	45	118.42%
3rd Quarter	38	45	118.42%
4th Quarter	38	45	118.42%
<b>Total Performance</b>	38	45	118.42%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Superfund Sites Undergoing Evaluation and Cleanup was above projections for FY 2013. This measure reports the combined number of state and federal Superfund sites that are undergoing evaluation and/or cleanup. The progression of Superfund sites through the evaluation and cleanup phase is dependent on available funding. Current performance reflects the sites that may be progressing and/or awaiting available funding.



## Strategy 04-01-02: Hazardous Materials Cleanup

---

**Output Measure 05:  
Number of Superfund Remedial Actions  
Completed (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	0.25	1.00	100.00%
2nd Quarter	0.25	0.00	0.00%
3rd Quarter	0.25	0.00	0.00%
4th Quarter	0.25	0.00	0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	1.00	1.00	100.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Output Measure 06:  
Number of Dry Cleaner Remediation Program  
Site Assessments Initiated**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	3.00	0.00	0.00%
2nd Quarter	3.00	2.00	16.67%
3rd Quarter	3.00	4.00	33.33%
4th Quarter	3.00	0.00	0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	12.00	6.00	50.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Dry Cleaner Remediation Program Site Assessments Initiated is below projections for FY 2013. This measure indicates the number of work orders issued to initiate dry cleaner site cleanups during the reporting period. Entry into the program is voluntary, and the agency has no control over the number of applications for cleanup that it receives.

---

## Strategy 04-01-02: Hazardous Materials Cleanup

---

**Output Measure 07:  
Number of Dry Cleaner Remediation Program Site  
Cleanups Completed (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	0.50	1.00	50.00%
2nd Quarter	0.50	2.00	100.00%
3rd Quarter	0.50	2.00	100.00%
4th Quarter	0.50	0.00	0.00%
Total Performance	2.00	5.00	250.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Dry Cleaner Remediation Program Site Cleanups Completed was above projections for FY 2013. This measure reflects the agency's efforts to clean up known eligible dry cleaning sites contaminated by dry cleaner solvents. Performance can be attributed to some sites not requiring prolonged remediation.

## Strategy 04-01-02: Hazardous Materials Cleanup

---

**Efficiency Measure 01:  
Average time (days) to Process Dry Cleaner  
Remediation Program Applications**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	90	16.33	18.14%
2nd Quarter	90	64.00	71.11%
3rd Quarter	90	25.75	28.61%
4th Quarter	90	65.50	72.78%
<b>Total Performance</b>	90	43.50	48.33%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Average Time (days) to Process Dry Cleaner Remediation Program Applications was below projections for FY 2013. The measure reports the average number of days required by the agency staff to process the dry cleaner remediation program applications. The program has implemented procedures for screening and reviewing the applications to ensure that the average processing time is less than the legislatively mandated 90-day time frame. The desired performance for this measure is to be below projections.

**Explanatory Measure 01:  
Number of Potential Superfund Sites to be  
Assessed**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	800	721	90.13%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Potential Superfund Sites to be Assessed was below projections for FY 2013. This measure reports the number of potential Superfund sites that have not undergone an eligibility assessment for either the state or federal Superfund program. Fewer potential Superfund sites were referred for assessments than anticipated.

## Strategy 04-01-02: Hazardous Materials Cleanup

---

**Explanatory Measure 02:  
Number of Federal Superfund Sites**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	63	63	100.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation is needed.

**Explanatory Measure 03:  
Number of State Superfund Sites**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	102	98	96.08%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Explanatory Measure 04:  
Number of Dry Cleaner Remediation Program (DCRP) Eligible Sites**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	229	218	95.20%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

## Goal 05-01: River Compact Commissions

---

**Outcome 01:**

**The Percentage Received of Texas' Equitable Share of Quality Water Annually as Apportioned by the Canadian River Compact (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	100.00%	9%	9.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

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 2013. 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 severe drought conditions in the Canadian River watershed. New Mexico is in compliance with the Compact.

**Outcome 02:**

**The Percentage Received of Texas' Equitable Share of Quality Water Annually as Apportioned by the Pecos River Compact (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	100.00%	382%	382.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

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 2013. 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.

## Goal 05-01: River Compact Commissions

---

**Outcome 03:  
The Percentage Received of Texas' Equitable  
Share of Quality Water Annually as Apportioned  
by the Red River Compact (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	100.00%	100%	100.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Outcome 04:  
The Percentage Received of Texas' Equitable  
Share of Quality Water Annually as Apportioned  
by the Rio Grande River Compact (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	100.00%	0%	0%

**Variance Explanation:  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

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 2013. 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 of water deliveries and credit water calculations because of New Mexico's position on the Compact water deliveries and calculations regarding the use of Rio Grande Project waters. New Mexico's views will result in less water available to Texas. New Mexico has filed litigation in Federal District Court to attempt to verify their positions and reduce water available to Texas. The Rio Grande Compact Commission has hired outside legal counsel and technical experts and filed litigation in the U. S. Supreme Court (Texas v. New Mexico No. 141 Original) to protect the state's water supplies.

**Goal 05-01: River Compact Commissions**

---

**Outcome 05:  
The Percentage Received of Texas' Equitable  
Share of Quality Water Annually as Apportioned  
by the Sabine River Compact (Key)**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>Total Performance</b>	100.00%	106%	106.00%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for The Percentage Received of Texas' Equitable Share of Quality Water Annually as Apportioned by the Sabine River Compact was above projections for FY 2013. This measure is based on water usage compared to the last 5 year running average. The percentage of water received by Texas in FY 2013 was higher than projected compared to the average amount of diversions during the last 5 years due to increased industrial and mining uses. Louisiana was in compliance with the Compact.

## Historically Underutilized Businesses

---

**Output Measure 01:  
Percentage of Professional Services Going to  
Historically Underutilized Businesses**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	23.60%	25.62%	108.56%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	23.60%	6.80%	28.81%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	23.60%	33.89%	143.60%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	23.60%	27.07%	114.70%
<b>Total Performance</b>	23.60%	23.48%	99.49%

**Variance Explanation:  
MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Output Measure 02:  
Percentage of Other Services Awarded to  
Historically Underutilized Businesses**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	24.60%	31.23%	126.95%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	24.60%	30.88%	125.53%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	24.60%	38.77%	157.60%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	24.60%	34.15%	138.82%
<b>Total Performance</b>	24.60%	35.10%	142.68%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the percentage of Other Services awarded to Historically Underutilized Businesses (HUBs) was above projections for FY 2013. The agency exceeded this target because the Office of Administrative Services Information Resources Division was able to award a large portion of their contracts to HUBs. Direct and indirect (subcontracting) was especially strong in the Remediation Division.



## Historically Underutilized Businesses

---

**Output Measure 03:  
Percentage of Commodity Purchasing Awarded to  
Historically Underutilized Businesses**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	21.00%	21.29%	101.38%
2nd Quarter	21.00%	26.41%	125.76%
3rd Quarter	21.00%	28.20%	134.29%
4th Quarter	21.00%	33.91%	161.48%
Total Performance	21.00%	27.82%	132.48%

**Variance Explanation:  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL.**

The Percentage of Commodity Purchasing Awarded to Historically Underutilized Businesses (HUBs) was above projections for FY 2013. HUB contracting activity in this category is strong throughout the agency.