

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 <http://www.tceq.state.tx.us/publications/>.



October 2006
SFR-055/06-04

Fourth Quarter Report on Performance Measures

Fiscal Year 2006

Budget & Planning Division - Strategic Planning and Assessment

TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY



Kathleen Hartnett White, *Chairman*

Larry R. Soward, *Commissioner*

Martin A. Hubert, *Commissioner*

Glenn Shankle, *Executive Director*

Authorization for use or reproduction of any original material contained in this publication—that is, not obtained from other sources—is freely granted. The commission would appreciate acknowledgment.

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 Web site at:

<http://www.tceq.state.tx.us/publications>

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

The TCEQ is an equal opportunity/affirmative action 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 239-4488, or 1-800-RELAY-TX (TDD), or by writing P.O. Box 13087, Austin, TX 78711-3087.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Strategic Planning Structure	
Fiscal Year 2006	1
Goal 01 Assessment, Permitting, and Prevention	
Strategy 01-01-01 Air Quality Assessment and Planning	3
Strategy 01-01-02 Water Resource Assessment and Planning.....	10
Strategy 01-01-03 Waste Assessment and Planning	12
Strategy 01-02-01 Air Quality Permitting.....	13
Strategy 01-02-02 Water Resource Permitting	15
Strategy 01-02-03 Waste Management and Permitting	17
Strategy 01-02-04 Occupational Licensing	19
Goal 02 Drinking Water and Water Utilities	
Strategy 02-01-01 Safe Drinking Water	22
Strategy 02-01-02 Water Utilities Oversight.....	23
Goal 03 Enforcement and Compliance Assistance	
Strategy 03-01-01 Field Inspections and Complaints	25
Strategy 03-01-02 Enforcement and Compliance Support	30
Strategy 03-01-03 Pollution Prevention and Recycling.....	33
Goal 04 Pollution Cleanup	
Strategy 04-01-01 Storage Tank Administration and Cleanup.....	35
Strategy 04-01-02 Hazardous Materials Cleanup	39
Goal 05 Texas River Compacts	44
Goal Historically Underutilized Businesses	
Historically Underutilized Businesses	45

Strategic Planning Structure

Fiscal Year 2006

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 40 percent by 2007 from the 1992 level 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 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 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: By fiscal year 2007, 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 2007, to 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 85% 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 – TEXAS RIVER COMPACTS

To ensure the delivery of Texas' equitable share of water.

Objective 01: To 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 1 TAC 111.11 - 111.23, 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
Total Performance	6.0%	9.1%	151.67%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the annual percent of stationary and mobile source pollution reductions in non-attainment areas was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reflects the amount of pollution reduction in non-attainment areas in the state. There were significant pollution reductions from major point sources (such as power plants) due to the recent implementation of rules requiring more stringent controls. Reductions for mobile sources were due to more stringent vehicle emission standards and the reformulation of fuels. This high level of pollution reduction is not expected to continue in the future as stationary sources have already implemented the most effective and stringent controls to date, thus reducing the potential for further significant reductions.

Outcome Measure 02:

Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) emissions (tons per day) reduced through the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	42	5.25	12.50%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the Nitrogen Oxide emissions reduced through the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan (TERP) was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reflects the amount of NOx emissions reduced through implementation of the TERP incentive grants for cleaner on- and off-road diesel engines. As of the end of the fiscal year, only 30% of the grants awarded have phased into the performance period to report usage data. The results reported for this measure are significantly less than the target due to the time it has taken some of the larger and more complex projects to complete the purchases and begin using the grant-funded vehicles and equipment.

*This measure is expressed as tons per day reduction in NOx emissions.

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
Total Performance	43%	44%	102.33%

Variance Explanation:
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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
Total Performance	0.8%	0.2%	25.00%

Variance Explanation:
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL
Performance for the percent reduction in pollution from permitted wastewater facilities discharging to the waters of the state was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reflects the reduction in the pollution load from all facilities discharging to the waters of the state. Performance was lower due to the fact that the amount of permitted discharge increased by approximately 39 million gallons per day. The increase in flow negated any further reductions in pollution. Even though statewide permit limits are becoming more stringent, the pollution reductions are getting smaller.

Outcome Measure 05:

Percent of Texas surface waters meeting or exceeding water quality standards (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	84%	80.6%	95.95%

Variance Explanation:
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Goal 01-01: Assessment, Planning, and Permitting

Outcome Measure 06:

Annual percent reduction in disposal of municipal solid waste per capita (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	1.5%	1.39%	92.67%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the annual percent reduction in disposal of municipal solid waste per capita was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reflects the effectiveness of statewide solid waste reduction and planning efforts. Performance for FY 2006 was slightly below projected levels. This measure is calculated using data from FY 2005. The reduction in waste disposed of per capita was not as high as projected due in part to a slight increase in the amount of construction and demolition debris. However, data indicates that the amount of waste disposed of per person did decrease, perhaps reflecting positively on statewide solid waste reduction and planning efforts.

Outcome Measure 07:

Annual percent decrease in the toxic releases in Texas (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	2%	(5.4)%	-270.00%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the annual percent decrease in the toxic releases in Texas was above projections for FY 2006. The agency had projected a decrease in toxic releases and the data indicates there was an increase. This measure reflects industry efforts to make reductions in their toxic releases. Air, water, and underground emissions marked notable growth in releases, although land releases did show a small downturn. With a rise of over 3.6 million pounds from 2003 to 2004, disposal via underground injection wells accounted for 61% of the increase in emissions. The elevation in underground injection is associated with disposal of waste methanol, formaldehyde, ammonia acrylic acid, and acrylamide while air emissions were lead by ammonia, formaldehyde, and xylenes. Discharges via underground injection wells increased due to faulty process controls, less process recycling, and increases in business volume.

Goal 01-01: Assessment, Planning, and Permitting

Outcome Measure 08:

Annual percent decrease in the amount of municipal solid waste going into Texas landfills

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	-2.0%	-1.75%	87.50%

*Note- Projected performance is expressed as a negative number to indicate that an increase is projected.

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 2006. This measure reflects conservation efforts to reduce the amount of solid waste going into Texas landfills. The agency had projected a slight increase in the amount of waste going to landfills and performance indicates that the amount of municipal solid waste did not increase as much as projected. Performance for this measure may reflect positively on pollution prevention assistance, recycling market development, and solid waste public education provided by the commission encourage all Texan's to "reduce, reuse, recycle, and rebuy". Other factors which impact the amount of solid waste going to landfills include statewide economic conditions, population growth, and natural disaster events.

Outcome Measure 09:

Percent of New Technology Research and Development (NTRD) technologies verified by the EPA (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	10%	4%	40.00%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the percent of New Technology Research and Development (NTRD) technologies verified by the EPA was below projections for FY 2006. This measure shows the percent of NTRD grants funded that are verified by the EPA. The verification/certification process for NTRD technologies can take from several months to several years to complete. To date, there have been three NTRD technologies verified/certified by the EPA with thirteen more in the process to complete verification/certification by the end of FY 2007.

Goal 01-01: Assessment, Planning, and Permitting

Outcome Measure 10:

Percent of TERP grants derived from New Technology Research and Development technologies

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	10%	0%	0.00%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the percent of TERP grants derived from New Technology Research and Development (NTRD) technologies was below projections for FY 2006. This measure shows the percent of TERP grants that use technologies derived from grants issued through the NTRD program. The verification/certification process for NTRD technologies can take from several months to several years to complete. Many projects have not completed the final stages of the verification/certification processes. None of the verified technologies have been used in a TERP request to date. Currently, three technologies have been verified/certified with NTRD funds with thirteen more in the process to complete verification/certification by the end of FY 2007.

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
1 st Quarter	500	248	12.40%
2 nd Quarter	500	154	7.70%
3 rd Quarter	500	223	11.15%
4 th Quarter	500	1,361	68.05%
Total Performance	2,000	1,986	99.30%

Variance Explanation:
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
1 st Quarter	625	642	25.68%
2 nd Quarter	625	654	26.16%
3 rd Quarter	625	655	26.20%
4 th Quarter	625	646	25.84%
Total Performance	2,500	2,597	103.88%

Variance Explanation:
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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

Output Measure 03:

Number of mobile source air quality assessments (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	312.50	150	12.00%
2 nd Quarter	312.50	95	7.60%
3 rd Quarter	312.50	873	69.84%
4 th Quarter	312.50	806	64.48%
Total Performance	1,250	1,924	153.92%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of mobile source air quality assessments was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of on-road mobile source/ transportation related scenarios evaluated by the agency. In order to calculate the impact of mobile source emissions under the new eight-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality standard, more assessments were conducted. The assessments were used for attainment demonstration planning for Texas' State Implementation Plans for non-attainment areas.

Output Measure 04:

Number of air monitors operated

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	610	574	94.10%
2 nd Quarter	610	576	94.43%
3 rd Quarter	610	578	94.75%
4 th Quarter	610	582	95.41%
Annual Target	610	582	95.41%

Variance Explanation:

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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

Output Measure 05:

Tons of NOx reduced through the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	6,541	0	0.00%
2 nd Quarter	6,541	1,811.07	6.92%
3 rd Quarter	6,541	2,682.43	10.25%
4 th Quarter	6,541	26,614.12	101.72%
Total Performance	26,164	31,107.62	118.89%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the tons of NOx reduced through the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the amount of NOx emissions projected to be reduced through projects funded by TERP incentive grants awarded each year. Performance has exceeded projections due to a reduction in the average cost per ton of NOx reduced. The maximum cost per ton for locomotive and commercial marine projects was \$2,500, while the maximum for other project sectors was limited to \$5,500. The lower threshold allowed for a greater amount of NOx reduced for each grant dollar awarded.

Output Measure 06:

Number of new technology grant proposals reviewed (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	20	0	0.00%
2 nd Quarter	20	0	0.00%
3 rd Quarter	20	48	60.00%
4 th Quarter	20	0	0.00%
Total Performance	80	48	60.00%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of new technology grant proposals reviewed was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of grant proposals reviewed that identify and evaluate new technologies to improve air quality and to facilitate the deployment of those technologies. During the 79th Legislative Session, the NTRD grant program was transferred to the Texas Environmental Research Consortium (TERC) in Houston. Three Request For Grant Applications (RFGAs) were issued during the third quarter. A fourth RFGA is currently open and is projected to result in several applications for review in the first quarter of FY 2007. The agency has limited control over performance for this measure.

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

Output Measure 07:

Number of technology verifications by the EPA

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	1.25	0	0.00%
2 nd Quarter	1.25	1	20.00%
3 rd Quarter	1.25	0	0.00%
4 th Quarter	1.25	0	0.00%
Total Performance	5	1	20.00%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of technology verifications by the EPA was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of technology grants that are verified by the EPA based on their commercialization potential after being recommended for verification by the TCEQ. There are currently 13 projects that are in the verification process. The process can take anywhere from nine months to several years to complete. Performance is projected to increase as more projects move through the process.

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
1 st Quarter	83%	94%	113.25%
2 nd Quarter	83%	92%	110.84%
3 rd Quarter	83%	94%	113.25%
4 th Quarter	83%	94%	113.25%
Annual Target	83%	94%	113.25%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the percent of data collected by TCEQ continuous and non-continuous air monitoring networks was above projected levels for FY 2006. This measure reports the percent of valid data collected by the TCEQ continuous and non-continuous monitoring networks. For this type of measure, performance above the target level reflects positively on agency efforts to improve data quality from the air monitoring networks. Performance was above projections because of improving data return for the PM 10, lead monitoring networks, and improved technology for monitor calibrations in the continuous monitoring networks. The agency has switched to an improved sampling system for the air toxics network, which replaced the old canister sampling system. We have also developed improved lab techniques for data analysis. These factors have all contributed to improving the data quality from the air monitoring networks.

Efficiency Measure 02:

Average cost per air quality assessment

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	\$350	\$426	121.71%
2 nd Quarter	\$350	\$488	139.43%
3 rd Quarter	\$350	\$248	70.86%
4 th Quarter	\$350	\$165	47.14%
Annual Target	\$350	\$331.75	94.79%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the average cost per air quality assessment was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the average cost for the salaries and other operating expenses that are expended to conduct Point Source, Mobile Source, and Area Source air quality assessments. Performance was below projections due to an increased number of mobile source assessments completed. Staff completed additional assessments in support of multiple state implementation plans for Texas non-attainment areas in response to the new eight-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard.

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
1 st Quarter	\$480	\$490.30	102.15%
2 nd Quarter	\$480	\$506.42	105.50%
3 rd Quarter	\$480	\$492.15	102.53%
4 th Quarter	\$480	\$490.33	102.15%
Annual Target	\$480	\$493.94	102.90%

*Note: Annual target attainment is calculated by taking year-to-date expenditures and dividing by the number of repairs and retrofits completed. As of the fourth quarter, \$3,968,298.85 has been expended for the program. There have been 8,034 vehicles repaired or retrofitted.

Variance Explanation:

Performance for the average cost of LIRAP vehicle emissions repairs/retrofits met projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the average cost of repairs/retrofits to cars participating in the LIRAP program. This measure includes costs for the five (5) county Houston/Galveston area, nine (9) county North Central Texas area, and two (2) county Austin area. The average cost for the 1,157 vehicles repaired in the Houston/Galveston area was \$520.94. The average cost for the 676 vehicles repaired in the North Central Texas area was \$450.84. The average cost for the 162 vehicles repaired in the Austin area was \$436.50. Overall, average LIRAP repair cost for all 1,995 vehicles was \$490.33 for the fourth quarter.

Efficiency Measure 04:

Average cost of LIRAP vehicle retirements

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	\$1,000	\$997.78	99.78%
2 nd Quarter	\$1,000	\$993.73	99.37%
3 rd Quarter	\$1,000	\$995.14	99.51%
4 th Quarter	\$1,000	\$991.27	99.13%
Annual Target	\$1,000	\$994.37	99.44%

*Note: Annual target attainment is calculated by taking year-to-date expenditures and dividing by the number of vehicle retirements completed. Year to date retirement costs have been \$228,705.84. There have been 230 vehicle retirements as of the fourth quarter.

Variance Explanation:

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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

Efficiency Measure 05:

Average cost per ton of NOx reduced through the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	\$5,000	\$0	0.00%
2nd Quarter	\$5,000	\$4,874.70	97.49%
3rd Quarter	\$5,000	\$5,274.37	105.49%
4th Quarter	\$5,000	\$3,348.97	66.98%
Annual Target	\$5,000	\$3,348.97	66.98%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the average cost per ton of NOx reduced through the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan (TERP) was below projections for FY 2006. This measure shows the average cost per ton of NOx reduced through projects funded by the TERP incentive grants. Average cost has declined below the projected performance due to the reduction of the maximum cost per ton for locomotive and commercial marine projects to \$2,500, while the maximum cost per ton for other project sectors was limited at \$5,500. The continued participation in the TERP program by locomotive and commercial marine sectors, in addition to the general reduction in the cost per ton of other projects, served to drive the overall average cost per ton down.

Efficiency Measure 06:

Average number of days to review a grant proposal (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	14	0	0.00%
2nd Quarter	14	0	0.00%
3rd Quarter	14	5	35.71%
4th Quarter	14	0	0.00%
Annual Target	14	5	35.71%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the average number of days to review a grant proposal was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of days required to review grant proposals. During the 79th Legislative Session, implementation of the NTRD program was transferred to the Texas Environmental Research Consortium (TERC). According to TERC, they have been able to process the grant applications well below the targeted level of 14 days. The agency has limited control over performance for this measure.

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
Total Performance	45	42	93.33%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of days of ozone exceedances recorded in Texas was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of days that ozone standards are exceeded by more than one National Air Monitoring Site in any urban area. The decline may be due to several factors including weather conditions as well as NOx and Volatile Organic Chemicals emission controls implemented in non-attainment areas.

Explanatory Measure 02:

Number of New Technology Grants approved for funding

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	15	14	93.33%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of New Technology grants approved for funding was below projections for FY 2006. This measure shows the number of grants that were approved for funding and provides an indication of the number of grantees that the agency must monitor and assist. During the 79th Legislative Session, the NTRD grant program was transferred to the Texas Environmental Research Consortium (TERC) in Houston. Three Request For Grant Applications (RFGAs) were issued during the third quarter with grant awards made in the fourth quarter. A fourth RFGA is currently open and is projected to result in 10-20 new awards in the first quarter of FY 2007. The agency has limited control over performance 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
1st Quarter	11.25	10	22.22%
2nd Quarter	11.25	3	6.67%
3rd Quarter	11.25	17	37.78%
4th Quarter	11.25	19	42.22%
Total Performance	45	49	108.89%

Variance Explanation:
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the number of surface water assessments was above projections for FY 2006. This measure quantifies a diverse array of assessment types performed and reported by multiple divisions within the agency. More assessments were completed including two additional Water Quality Management Plan Updates, one additional Clean River Assessment, and one estuary report.

Output Measure 02:
Number of groundwater assessments (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	12.5	1	2.00%
2nd Quarter	12.5	4	8.00%
3rd Quarter	12.5	7	14.00%
4th Quarter	12.5	40	80.00%
Total Performance	50	52	104.00%

Variance Explanation:
 Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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

Output Measure 03:
Number of dam safety assessments

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	107.50	165	38.37%
2 nd Quarter	107.50	61	14.19%
3 rd Quarter	107.50	96	22.33%
4 th Quarter	107.50	170	39.53%
Total Performance	430	492	114.42%

Variance Explanation:
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the number of dam safety assessments was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of dam safety assessments conducted to ensure the safety of dams in the state. The agency has increased the number of assessments performed in an effort to meet Federal Standards on Dam Safety. This standard requires all high and significant-risk dams to be inspected every 5 years.

Efficiency Measure 01:
Average cost per dam safety assessment

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	\$1,200	\$1,411.75	117.65%
2 nd Quarter	\$1,200	\$1,174.02	97.84%
3 rd Quarter	\$1,200	\$1,034.83	86.24%
4 th Quarter	\$1,200	\$1,140.38	95.03%
Annual Target	\$1,200	\$1,214.96	101.25%

Variance Explanation:
 Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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
Total Performance	36%	35.7%	99.17%

Variance Explanation:
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Explanatory Measure 02:

Number of regional action plans implemented

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	14	14	100.00%

Variance Explanation:
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
Total Performance	8,060	7,582	94.07%

Variance Explanation:
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL
Performance for the number of dams in the Texas dam inventory was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of dams in the state which are subject to dam safety assessments. Performance is below projections due to a revision to the database containing the dam inventory. Dams that do not meet the criteria to be regulated have been removed from the database. Performance will remain at this level for FY 2007.

Strategy 01-01-03: Waste Assessment and Planning

Output Measure 01:

Number of municipal solid waste facility capacity assessments (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	62.5	0	0.00%
2nd Quarter	62.5	34	13.60%
3rd Quarter	62.5	206	82.40%
4th Quarter	62.5	16	6.40%
Total Performance	250	256	102.40%

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

Efficiency Measure 01:

Average cost per municipal solid waste facility capacity assessment (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	\$35	\$0	0.00%
2nd Quarter	\$35	\$48.50	138.57%
3rd Quarter	\$35	\$23.69	67.69%
4th Quarter	\$35	\$34.72	99.20%
Annual Target	\$35	\$35.64	101.83%

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

Strategy 01-01-03: Waste Assessment and Planning

Explanatory Measure 01:

Number of council of government regions in the state with less than 10 years of disposal capacity

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	0	1	200%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of Council of Government (COG) regions in the state with less than 10 years of disposal capacity was above projected levels for FY 2006. This measure identifies those regions of the state with projected capacity shortfalls, which may require more detailed solid waste management planning. The COG with less than the minimum disposal capacity currently has municipal solid waste sites with either new or amended permit applications pending before TCEQ. Upon approval, this will raise their disposal capacity above the ten-year threshold.

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
Total Performance	90%	84.4%	93.78%

Variance Explanation:
 BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the percent of air quality permit applications reviewed within established time frames was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports whether the agency is in compliance with established time frames for reviewing permit applications. The agency processed fewer applications within established timeframes due to the fact that many applications had hearing requirements and compliance issues, the resolution of which adds to the processing time.

Outcome Measure 02:

Percent of water quality permit applications reviewed within established time frames

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	90.0%	82%	91.11%

Variance Explanation:
 BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the percent of water quality permit applications reviewed within established time frames was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports whether the agency is in compliance with established time frames for reviewing permit applications. Many of the applications exceeded the established time frames due to: 1) unresolved technical/administrative issues with the applicants; 2) EPA objections; and 3) the necessity to respond to public comments.

Outcome Measure 03:

Percent of water rights permit applications reviewed within established time frames

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	90%	89.4%	99.33%

Variance Explanation:
 Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Goal 01-02: Assessment, Planning, and Permitting

Outcome Measure 04:

Percent of waste management permit applications reviewed within established time frames

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	90%	78%	86.67%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the percent of waste management permit applications reviewed within established time frames was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports whether the agency is in compliance with established time frames for reviewing permit applications. Low performance can be attributed to delays in applicants providing required data/information, additional time needed to conduct public meetings and/or hearings, additional time needed to respond to public comment, and time extensions given to applicants whose operations were negatively impacted by Hurricane Katrina and/or Rita.

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
1 st Quarter	1,400	1,262	22.54%
2 nd Quarter	1,400	1,326	23.68%
3 rd Quarter	1,400	1,549	27.66%
4 th Quarter	1,400	1,452	25.93%
Total Performance	5,600	5,589	99.80%

Variance Explanation:

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Output Measure 02:

Number of federal air quality operating permits reviewed (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	200	328	41.00%
2 nd Quarter	200	269	33.63%
3 rd Quarter	200	218	27.25%
4 th Quarter	200	277	34.63%
Total Performance	800	1,092	136.50%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of federal air quality operating permits reviewed was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reflects the number of completed application reviews for federal air quality operating permits mandated by Title V of the Federal Clean Air Act. Performance for this measure has exceeded projections due to the fact that the agency slightly underestimated the number of permits that would be reviewed. Performance is projected to remain at this level for FY 2007.

Strategy 01-02-01: Air Quality Permitting

Output Measure 03:

Number of Emissions Banking and Trading transaction applications reviewed

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	250	103	10.30%
2 nd Quarter	250	24	2.40%
3 rd Quarter	250	516	51.60%
4 th Quarter	250	456	45.60%
Total Performance	1,000	1,099	109.90%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of Emissions Banking and Trading (EBT) transaction applications reviewed was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of EBT transaction applications reviewed by the Air Permits Division. The measure includes emission reduction credits, discrete emission reduction credits, mass emission cap and trade, emissions banking and trading of allowances, and System Cap Trading programs. Demand for this program is driven by the regulated community and is expected to grow as it allows businesses and industry flexibility in meeting air standards. The agency slightly underestimated the number of application that would be submitted for review for this program.

Strategy 01-02-01: Air Quality Permitting

Explanatory Measure 01: Number of state and federal air quality permits issued

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	4,850	5,099	105.13%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of state and federal air quality permits issued was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of state and federal New Source Review air quality permits which were issued or approved. More permits were issued due to efforts which were concentrated on the processing of certain project types (i.e., existing facility permits and voluntary emission reduction permits) to meet their mandated completion deadline.

Explanatory Measure 02: Number of federal air quality permits issued

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	650	715	110.00%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of federal air quality permits issued was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of federal air quality permits issued under Title V of the Federal Clean Air Act. Process changes have allowed program staff to process a greater than expected number of applications and as a result, issue a greater number of permits. Additionally, the program received a greater than anticipated number of revisions to Title V permits.

Strategy 01-02-02: Water Resource Permitting

Output Measure 01:

Number of applications to address water quality impacts reviewed (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	3,864.50	3,188	20.62%
2 nd Quarter	3,864.50	4,369	28.26%
3 rd Quarter	3,864.50	4,545	29.40%
4 th Quarter	3,864.50	5,471	35.39%
Total Performance	15,458	17,573	113.68%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of applications to address water quality impacts reviewed was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of water quality applications reviewed by the water quality and field operations divisions to address water quality impacts. Greater performance can be attributed to the resolution of pending general permit applications which were incomplete. Also, performance has increased as a result of a contract with Texas State University to process Notice of Intents under the general permits.

Output Measure 02:

Number of applications to address water rights impacts reviewed

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	125	165	33.00%
2 nd Quarter	125	130	26.00%
3 rd Quarter	125	179	35.80%
4 th Quarter	125	163	32.60%
Total Performance	500	637	127.40%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of applications to address water rights impacts reviewed was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of permitting action reviews completed. Performance is above projections due to a greater number of temporary permits issued by Field Operations staff. These temporary permits are issued to allow temporary use of surplus surface water in amounts of 10 acre-feet or less for up to one year or less.

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
1 st Quarter	21.25	33	38.82%
2 nd Quarter	21.25	14	16.47%
3 rd Quarter	21.25	31	36.47%
4 th Quarter	21.25	33	38.82%
Total Performance	85	111	130.59%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO) authorizations reviewed was above projections for FY 2006. This measure counts the number of CAFO authorizations the agency reviews. The previous rules and registration program which authorized CAFOs has expired and thus required the submittal of notices of intent for coverage under the new general permit for the majority of the CAFOs in Texas. Performance has also been impacted by an increase in the number of new dairies located in the Texas Panhandle.

Strategy 01-02-02: Water Resource Permitting

Explanatory Measure 01: Number of water quality permits issued

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	900	932	103.56%

Variance Explanation:
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Explanatory Measure 02: Number of water rights permits issued

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	100	87	87.00%

Variance Explanation:
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL
Performance for the number of water rights permits issued was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of water rights permits that are issued by the agency. Due to the increasingly complex and time consuming nature of the water rights permit applications, water rights staff spent more time than projected processing applications. This resulted in fewer applications approved and consequently, fewer permits issued than previously projected.

Strategy 01-02-03: Waste Management and Permitting

Output Measure 01:
Number of new system waste evaluation conducted

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	142.50	137	24.04%
2 nd Quarter	142.50	137	24.04%
3 rd Quarter	142.50	126	22.11%
4 th Quarter	142.50	166	29.12%
Total Performance	570	566	99.30%

Variance Explanation:
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
1 st Quarter	59	61	25.85%
2 nd Quarter	59	54	22.88%
3 rd Quarter	59	52	22.03%
4 th Quarter	59	62	26.27%
Total Performance	236	229	97.03%

Variance Explanation:
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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	54	33.75%
2nd Quarter	40	41	25.63%
3rd Quarter	40	27	16.88%
4th Quarter	40	60	37.50%
Total Performance	160	182	113.75%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of hazardous waste permit applications reviewed was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of permits and authorizations reviewed, denied, or withdrawn. The high level of performance can be attributed to the agency responding to the needs of the regulated community. For the fiscal year, there was a higher than anticipated number of applications for minor changes needed to address business needs.

Strategy 01-02-03: Waste Management and Permitting

**Explanatory Measure 01:
Number of nonhazardous waste permits issued**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	236	209	88.56%

Variance Explanation:
 BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the number of non-hazardous waste permits issued was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of permits issued for facilities that dispose of non-hazardous waste. Performance was below projections due to delays in the submission of permit modification applications pending the publication of new agency (Chapter 330) rules, effective March 27, 2006. It is anticipated that an increase in the submittal of applications will occur in the beginning of FY 2007 to capture the new rules in applications within 6 months of the effective date of Chapter 330.

**Explanatory Measure 02:
Number of hazardous waste permits issued**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	160	168	105.00%

Variance Explanation:
 Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Explanatory Measure 03:
Number of solid waste sites remediated by responsible parties**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	3	3	100.00%

Variance Explanation:
 Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Strategy 01-02-04: Occupational Licensing

Output Measure 01:
Number of applications for occupational licensing

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	6,000	5,056	21.07%
2nd Quarter	6,000	4,961	20.67%
3rd Quarter	6,000	5,973	24.89%
4th Quarter	6,000	5,346	22.28%
Total Performance	24,000	21,336	88.90%

Variance Explanation:
 BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the number of applications for occupational licensing was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of applications for professional licensure that are received and processed during the reporting period. The agency has no control over how many individuals seek certification. The lower number may be related to economic conditions with less demand for licensed occupations.

Output Measure 02:
Number of examinations administered (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	2,625	2,564	24.42%
2nd Quarter	2,625	2,686	25.58%
3rd Quarter	2,625	3,099	29.51%
4th Quarter	2,625	2,588	24.65%
Total Performance	10,500	10,937	104.16%

Variance Explanation:
 Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Strategy 01-02-04: Occupational Licensing

Output Measure 03:
Number of licenses and registrations issued

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	2,000	1,515	18.94%
2nd Quarter	2,000	1,533	19.16%
3rd Quarter	2,000	1,865	23.31%
4th Quarter	2,000	1,976	24.70%
Total Performance	8,000	6,889	86.11%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of licenses and registrations issued was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of new and upgraded licenses and registrations issued during the reporting period. The agency has no control over how many individuals seek certification. The lower number may be related to economic conditions with less demand for licensed occupations.

Output Measure 04:
Number of licenses and registrations renewed

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	3,000	2,821	23.51%
2nd Quarter	3,000	2,822	23.52%
3rd Quarter	3,000	3,410	28.42%
4th Quarter	3,000	2,957	24.64%
Total Performance	12,000	12,010	100.08%

Variance Explanation:

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Strategy 01-02-04: Occupational Licensing

Efficiency Measure 01:

Average annualized cost per license and registration

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	\$18	\$18.31	101.72%
2 nd Quarter	\$18	\$18.25	101.39%
3 rd Quarter	\$18	\$18.15	100.83%
4 th Quarter	\$18	\$18.01	100.06%
Annual Target	\$18	\$18.01	100.06%

Variance Explanation:

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
Total Performance	47,000	47,004	100.01%

Variance Explanation:

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Explanatory Measure 02:

Number of jurisdictional complaints received

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	225	182	80.89%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of jurisdictional complaints received was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of jurisdictional complaints against regulated entities that are received by the agency. For FY 2006, the agency received fewer complaints than projected. This is due to several factors: 1) the increased training and education which has enabled local government programs to handle a larger number of complaints in the On-Site Sewage Facility (OSSF) program; and 2) the owners of the OSSFs are becoming better educated regarding their systems and are filing fewer complaints. This is an on-demand activity that the agency has limited control over.

Goal 01-03: Assessment, Planning, and Permitting

**Outcome Measure 01:
Percent of scheduled licensing activities complete (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	82%	60%	73.17%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the percent of scheduled licensing activities complete was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the progress made toward licensing a low-level radioactive waste disposal facility. Performance was below projections due to the applicant of the license requesting an extension until May 2007 to address the remaining technical deficiencies noted in the Second Technical Notice of Deficiency. Completion of the technical review is now scheduled for October 2007.

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
Total Performance	93%	97.46%	104.80%

Variance Explanation:
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Outcome Measure 02:

Percent of Texas public water systems protected by a source water protection program

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	95%	99%	104.21%

Variance Explanation:
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Outcome Measure 03:

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
Total Performance	94%	91.7%	97.55%

Variance Explanation:
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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
1 st Quarter	6,200	6,212	100.19%
2 nd Quarter	6,200	6,308	101.74%
3 rd Quarter	6,200	6,356	102.52%
4 th Quarter	6,200	6,317	101.89%
Total Performance	6,200	6,317	101.89%

Variance Explanation:
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Output Measure 02:

Number of drinking water samples collected (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	8,500	10,159	28.22%
2 nd Quarter	8,500	7,543	20.95%
3 rd Quarter	8,500	8,165	22.68%
4 th Quarter	8,500	9,432	26.20%
Total Performance	36,000	35,299	98.05%

Variance Explanation:
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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	25	9	9.00%
2nd Quarter	25	13	13.00%
3rd Quarter	25	8	8.00%
4th Quarter	25	40	40.00%
Total Performance	100	70	70.00%

Variance Explanation:
 BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the number of utility rate reviews performed was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of utility rate change requests which are reviewed and processed by agency staff. One reason for the lower number of application filings is that many small systems have been acquired or transferred to cities or larger multi-system investor owned utilities. The agency has no control over the number of rate review applications filed. The number of applications filed is dependent upon the needs of the utility companies.

Output Measure 02:
Number of district applications processed

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	137.5	228	41.45%
2nd Quarter	137.5	206	37.45%
3rd Quarter	137.5	156	28.36%
4th Quarter	137.5	122	22.18%
Total Performance	550	712	129.45%

Variance Explanation:
 ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the number of district applications processed was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of major and minor district applications reviewed, and includes: applications for district creation, bond issues, and other approvals required under the Texas Water Code. Performance is directly tied to the needs of the regulated community. With the rapid expansion of the housing markets in the state, the needs of water districts have expanded as well. This has resulted in a greater number of applications being filed and processed. This performance is expected to continue as long as economic activity remains high.

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
1st Quarter	56.25	70	31.11%
2nd Quarter	56.25	57	25.33%
3rd Quarter	56.25	66	29.33%
4th Quarter	56.25	41	18.22%
Total Performance	225	234	104.00%

Variance Explanation:

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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
Total Performance	98%	97.1%	99.08%

Variance Explanation:

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
Total Performance	97%	99%	102.06%

Variance Explanation:

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
Total Performance	97%	89.6%	92.37%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the percent of inspected or investigated waste sites in compliance was below projections for FY 2006. This measure evaluates the industrial and hazardous waste, petroleum storage tank (PST), municipal solid waste, radioactive waste, and underground injection control sites that were investigated and determines a percentage of sites that were not found to have significant violations. The percentage was lower due to the agency undertaking a temporary project to address dry cleaning facilities that generate hazardous wastes and failed to register with the agency. This resulted in a temporary increase in non-compliance rates. This project has concluded and performance is expected to return to projected levels in FY 2007.

Goal 03-01: Enforcement and Compliance Assistance

Outcome Measure 04:

Percent of identified non-compliant sites and facilities for which appropriate action is taken (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	85%	85.8%	100.94%

Variance Explanation:

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Outcome Measure 05:

Percent of investigated occupational licensees in compliance

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	86%	87.1%	101.28%

Variance Explanation:

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Outcome Measure 06:

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
Total Performance	100,000	111,807.5	111.81%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the tons of emissions and waste reduced by the regulated community implementing pollution prevention programs was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reflects the Pollution Prevention and Environmental Management staff's ability to encourage the regulated community to implement pollution prevention and waste minimization practices and technologies. During FY 2006, the agency was very successful in encouraging participation.

Goal 03-01: Enforcement and Compliance Assistance

Outcome Measure 07:

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
Total Performance	\$30,000,000	\$25,686,962	85.62%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the amount of financial savings achieved by the regulated community was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the dollar amount of savings voluntarily reported by the regulated community achieved through Pollution Prevention and Environmental Management technical assistance activities. The reported financial savings by the regulated community were slightly less than expected.

Outcome Measure 08:

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	10,000	7,650	76.50%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the tons of emissions and waste reduced and minimized in the Texas-Mexico border region was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of tons of emissions reduced as reported by the regulated community through their participation in pollution prevention, environmental management, or other innovative programs. Agency staff will continue to work with regulated industry along the Texas-Mexico border to provide technical assistance activities in order to increase waste and emissions reductions.

Strategy 03-01-01: Field Inspections and Complaints

Output Measure 01:

Number of inspections and investigations of air sites (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	4,000	2,473	15.46%
2 nd Quarter	4,000	4,111	25.69%
3 rd Quarter	4,000	4,670	29.19%
4 th Quarter	4,000	4,673	29.21%
Total Performance	16,000	15,927	99.54%

Variance Explanation:

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Output Measure 02:

Number of inspections and investigations of water rights sites (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	8,500	7,090	20.85%
2 nd Quarter	8,500	9,198	27.05%
3 rd Quarter	8,500	8,861	26.06%
4 th Quarter	8,500	8,982	26.42%
Total Performance	34,000	34,131	100.39%

Variance Explanation:

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Strategy 03-01-01: Field Inspections and Complaints

Output Measure 03:

Number of inspections and investigations of water sites and facilities (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	2,125	1,715	20.18%
2 nd Quarter	2,125	2,207	25.96%
3 rd Quarter	2,125	2,335	27.47%
4 th Quarter	2,125	2,168	25.51%
Total Performance	8,500	8,425	99.12%

Variance Explanation:

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Output Measure 04:

Number of inspections and investigations of livestock and poultry operation sites (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	175	89	12.71%
2 nd Quarter	175	160	22.86%
3 rd Quarter	175	247	35.29%
4 th Quarter	175	193	27.57%
Total Performance	700	689	98.43%

Variance Explanation:

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Strategy 03-01-01: Field Inspections and Complaints

Output Measure 05:

Number of inspections and investigations of waste sites (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	1,839.50	1,007	13.69%
2 nd Quarter	1,839.50	1,702	23.13%
3 rd Quarter	1,839.50	2,398	32.59%
4 th Quarter	1,839.50	3,518	47.81%
Total Performance	7,358	8,625	117.22%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of inspections and investigations was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of investigations of waste sites performed to assure compliance with rules, regulations, and statutes. The Dry Cleaner Investigation Initiative resulted in additional investigations over the projected level. This initiative was undertaken to ensure dry cleaning facilities were in compliance with registration requirements.

Output Measure 06:

Number of spill cleanup inspections

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	100	57	14.25%
2 nd Quarter	100	130	32.50%
3 rd Quarter	100	222	55.50%
4 th Quarter	100	221	55.25%
Total Performance	400	630	157.50%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of spill cleanup inspections was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of spill cleanup inspections that are conducted by the Field Operations Division. This measure is an on-demand activity. The agency has no control over the number of spills that occur. The Field Operations Division is required to inspect each spill that occurs to ensure that regulated entities comply with rules, regulations, and statutes designed to protect human health and the environment.

Strategy 03-01-01: Field Inspections and Complaints

Efficiency Measure 01:

Average inspection and investigation cost of livestock and poultry operations

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	\$430	\$1,256	292.09%
2 nd Quarter	\$430	\$764	177.67%
3 rd Quarter	\$430	\$501	116.51%
4 th Quarter	\$430	\$652	151.63%
Annual Target	\$430	\$529	123.02%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the average inspection and investigation cost of livestock and poultry operations was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the average cost per investigation and inspection of livestock and poultry operations in the state. This measure is directly tied to the number of inspections and investigations of livestock and poultry operations performed. Expenses tied to this measure such as rent, travel, and salaries have steadily increased in prior years and are expected to continue to rise.

Efficiency Measure 02:

Average time (days) from air inspection to report completion

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	21	22.7	108.10%
2 nd Quarter	21	23.1	110.00%
3 rd Quarter	21	21	100.00%
4 th Quarter	21	23.7	112.86%
Annual Target	21	22.6	107.62%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the average time in days from air inspection to report completion was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports how efficiently the agency completes investigations of air sites. An increased amount of time needed to complete reports can be attributed to the training and time needed for new staff to develop the expertise necessary to conduct inspections and complete reports within allotted timeframes.

Strategy 03-01-01: Field Inspections and Complaints

Efficiency Measure 03:

Average time (days) from water inspection to report completion

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	35	29.2	83.43%
2 nd Quarter	35	34.2	97.71%
3 rd Quarter	35	35.5	101.43%
4 th Quarter	35	26.7	76.29%
Annual Target	35	31.4	89.71%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the average time in days from water inspection to report completion was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports how efficiently the agency completes investigations of water sites. Performance below the targeted level reflects positive agency efforts to meet the needs of the public and regulated community.

Efficiency Measure 04:

Average time (days) from waste inspection to report completion

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	35	36.2	103.43%
2 nd Quarter	35	28	80.00%
3 rd Quarter	35	25	71.43%
4 th Quarter	35	29.9	85.43%
Annual Target	35	29.8	85.14%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the average time from waste inspection to report completion was below projection for FY 2006. This measure reports how efficiently the agency completes investigations of waste sites. Performance below the targeted level reflects positive agency efforts to meet the needs of the public and regulated community.

Strategy 03-01-01: Field Inspections and Complaints

**Explanatory Measure 01:
Number of air sites in non-compliance**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	340	465	136.76%

Variance Explanation:
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the number of air sites in non-compliance was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of air sites at which significant violations were discovered requiring formal enforcement. As part of the agency's Risk Based Investigation Strategy, the agency focused on investigation of sites that pose the greatest risk to the public and the environment. The actual performance was higher than projected because the agency has been focusing on compliance with the emissions events and scheduled maintenance, startup, and shutdown activities; Title V; and emissions inventory requirements that have resulted in a higher number of sites in non-compliance.

**Explanatory Measure 02:
Number of water sites and facilities in non-compliance**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	370	543	146.76%

Variance Explanation:
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the number of water sites and facilities in noncompliance was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of agriculture, public drinking water, water rights, and water quality (wastewater) sites and facilities at which significant violations were discovered requiring formal enforcement. As part of the agency's Risk Based Investigation Strategy, the agency focused on investigation of sites that pose the greatest risk to the public and the environment. This resulted in a higher number of sites in non-compliance.

Strategy 03-01-01: Field Inspections and Complaints

**Explanatory Measure 03:
Number of waste sites in non-compliance**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	520	971	186.73%

Variance Explanation:
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the number of waste sites and facilities in non-compliance was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of industrial and hazardous waste, municipal solid waste, radioactive waste, petroleum storage tank (PST), and underground injection control facilities at which significant violations were discovered requiring formal enforcement. The actual performance was higher than projected because the agency focused efforts on investigation of dry cleaning facilities that generate hazardous wastes and failed to register with the agency. This resulted in a higher number of sites in non-compliance.

**Explanatory Measure 04:
Number of citizen complaints investigations completed**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	6,500	4,701	72.32%

Variance Explanation:
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the number of citizen complaints investigations completed was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of citizen complaints that are investigated to assure compliance with rules, regulations, and statutes designed to protect human health and the environment. This measure is an on-demand activity. The agency has no control over the number of citizen complaints that are received. During FY 2006, fewer complaints were received than anticipated.

Strategy 03-01-01: Field Inspections and Complaints

**Explanatory Measure 05:
Number of occupational licensees in non-compliance**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	35	24	68.57%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of occupational licensees in noncompliance was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of licensees at which significant violations were discovered requiring formal enforcement. The TCEQ has been working with local programs so that they are able to handle more of their enforcement actions resulting in fewer complaints that the TCEQ is responsible for investigating and therefore fewer significant violations requiring enforcement.

Strategy 03-01-02: Enforcement and Compliance Support

Output Measure 01:
Number of commercial lab inspections

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	7.50	0	0.00%
2nd Quarter	7.50	0	0.00%
3rd Quarter	7.50	0	0.00%
4th Quarter	7.50	2	6.67%
Total Performance	30	2	6.67%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of commercial lab inspections was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of inspections conducted for purposes of awarding, maintaining, or renewing accreditation according to the Texas Water Code. Performance was below projections due to delays associated with the processing of accreditation applications and the scheduling of inspections. Many applications had missing or incomplete information which required a great deal more time than anticipated to identify and correct. Performance is expected to increase in FY 2007.

Output Measure 02:
Number of small business and local governments assisted (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	13,500	36,588	67.76%
2nd Quarter	13,500	1,442	2.67%
3rd Quarter	13,500	7,824	14.49%
4th Quarter	13,500	13,699	25.37%
Total Performance	54,000	59,553	110.28%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of small businesses and local governments assisted was above projections for FY 2006. This measure provides an indication of the responsiveness of Small Business and Local Government Assistance staff to small business and local government inquiries. The TCEQ sent a notification of TCEQ rule and policy changes to all small businesses and local governments included in the programs database during the first quarter. These notifications are provided to the state's small businesses and local governments to keep them informed of regulatory changes that might affect them. Increased performance can be attributed to the increase in calls associated with the reissuing of the storm water Multi-Sector General permit.

Strategy 03-01-02: Enforcement and Compliance Support

Output Measure 03:
Number of drinking water labs certified (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	117	118	100.85%
2nd Quarter	117	109	93.16%
3rd Quarter	117	104	88.89%
4th Quarter	117	102	87.18%
Total Performance	117	102	87.18%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of drinking water labs certified was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of labs certified to analyze public water supply samples. During the fiscal year, sixteen labs switched over from the drinking water certification program to the environmental laboratory accreditation program. Environmental laboratories are accredited according to standards adopted by the National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Conference. It is projected, as more laboratories switch their certification, performance will continue to fall. Migration to this accreditation should be complete within three years.

Output Measure 04:
Number of administrative enforcement orders issued

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	212.50	418	49.18%
2nd Quarter	212.50	350	41.18%
3rd Quarter	212.50	416	48.94%
4th Quarter	212.50	347	40.82%
Total Performance	850	1,531	180.12%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of administrative enforcement orders issued was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reflects agency enforcement efforts. Performance exceeded projections as a result of three federal and state initiatives: 1) EPA and TCEQ implemented new drinking water rules regarding regulation of disinfectant by-products resulting from water treatment chemicals; 2) TCEQ has increased compliance monitoring activities related to smaller wastewater treatment facilities; and 3) financial assurance initiatives in the waste programs have continued to increase the number of cases requiring enforcement.

Strategy 03-01-02: Enforcement and Compliance Support

Efficiency Measure 01:

Average number of days to file notices or formal violations

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	70	58	82.86%
2 nd Quarter	70	66	94.29%
3 rd Quarter	70	55	78.57%
4 th Quarter	70	37	52.86%
Annual Target	70	37	52.86%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the average number of days to file notices of formal violations was below projections for FY 2006. This measure represents the average number of days from the date the case was screened for appropriate evidence and a decision was made to take formal enforcement action, 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 revised enforcement processing procedures to process all new cases within a 60 day average time frame. This change in procedures is part of an overall review of the Agency's enforcement policies and procedures. In addition to changing procedures, the agency focused efforts on investigation and enforcement of dry cleaning facilities that failed to register with the agency. These cases are less complex and can be processed in a much quicker time frame. For this type of measure, performance below the target level reflects positively on agency efforts to expedite cases.

Strategy 03-01-02: Enforcement and Compliance Support

**Explanatory Measure 01:
Amount of administrative penalties paid in final orders issued**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	N/A	\$9,935,719	N/A

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

**Explanatory Measure 02:
Amount required to be paid for supplemental environmental projects issued in administrative orders**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	N/A	\$3,279,898	N/A

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

**Explanatory Measure 03:
Percent of administrative penalties collected**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	85%	82.21%	96.72%

Variance Explanation:
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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 environmental management systems conducted

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	50	44	22.00%
2 nd Quarter	50	50	25.00%
3 rd Quarter	50	84	42.00%
4 th Quarter	50	59	29.50%
Total Performance	200	237	118.50%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of on-site technical assistance visits, audits, presentations, and workshops was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of outreach activities conducted by the Pollution Prevention and Environmental Management staff.

Performance is dependent upon requests for technical assistance and training from the regulated community, and there were more requests than anticipated.

Output Measure 02:

Number of entities participating in performance-based regulatory programs

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	37.5	20	13.33%
2 nd Quarter	37.5	38	25.33%
3 rd Quarter	37.5	54	36.00%
4 th Quarter	37.5	37	24.67%
Total Performance	150	149	99.33%

Variance Explanation:

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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
1 st Quarter	5.75	0	0.00%
2 nd Quarter	5.75	32.5	141.30%
3 rd Quarter	5.75	0.1	0.43%
4 th Quarter	5.75	0	0.00%
Total Performance	23	32.6	141.73%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of quarts of used oil diverted from landfills and processed was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the amount of used oil which, if not received by the registered collection centers, would otherwise be delivered to landfills or improperly disposed of. This information is collected from the Annual Used Oil Report which is submitted by used oil collection centers. In the last year, 250 new facilities have registered with the agency bringing the total number of registered facilities to 2,160. Performance has also been affected by an increase in the amount of oil processed by facilities. The significant increase over the prior year can be attributed to more facilities registering and the agency's efforts to ensure that the registered facilities are reporting their numbers accurately.

Efficiency Measure 01:

Average cost per on-site technical assistance visit

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	\$600	\$522.30	87.05%
2 nd Quarter	\$600	\$662.00	110.33%
3 rd Quarter	\$600	\$784.41	130.74%
4 th Quarter	\$600	\$641.02	106.84%
Annual Target	\$600	\$668.36	111.39%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the average cost per on-site technical assistance visit was above projections for FY 2006. This measure provides an indication of staff's ability to provide pollution prevention assistance and training in a cost-effective, efficient manner. The higher cost is due to out-of-region travel costs to provide technical assistance in TCEQ Region 9 (Waco, TX) and Region 5 (Tyler). TCEQ does not have a regional staff person assigned to conduct pollution prevention technical assistance in either region. This requires staff to travel from other regions in the state.

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
Total Performance	1,000,000	700,104	70.01%

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 2006. This measure indicates the level of hazardous waste reduction by Texas facilities and provides information regarding the agency's efforts to reduce toxics released in Texas. Projects implemented by industry can take years to implement and yield reductions. During FY 2006, there were few pollution prevention projects undertaken by industry that resulted in large reductions at the source.

Explanatory Measure 02:

Tons of waste collected by local and regional collection and cleanup events

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	1,050	1,365	130.00%

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 2006. This measure reports the tons of waste collected through cleanup events sponsored by or assisted by TCEQ. The high level of performance indicates that program staff members were successful in promoting statewide events to minimize the amount of household hazardous waste and litter in the state. The proper disposal of these wastes reduces the impact on the environment.

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
Total Performance	125	184	147.20%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the tons of agricultural waste chemicals collected by TCEQ-sponsored entities was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the tons of agricultural waste chemicals collected by agency contractors. This level of participation in TCEQ-sponsored collection events is projected to continue in future years. Greater performance is indicative of the agency's successful promotion of collection events throughout the state.

Explanatory Measure 04:

Number of registered waste tire facilities and transporters

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	780	831	106.54%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of registered waste tire facilities and transporters was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of regulated facilities involved in scrap tire management. During FY 2006, the number of facilities grew at a greater than anticipated rate. The agency has no control over the number of applications for registration. Performance above the projected target is desirable and shows that there a greater number of facilities to properly dispose of scrap tires.

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
Total Performance	85%	86%	101.18%

Variance Explanation:

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Outcome Measure 02:

Percent of Superfund sites cleaned up (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	58%	61%	105.17%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the percent of Superfund sites cleaned up was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reflects long-term agency efforts to clean up Superfund sites. The program exceeded its target of five cleanup completions for Fiscal Year 2006. There were nine new sites added to the superfund listing during the fiscal year. The superfund program has cleaned up 87 of the 141 sites that have been listed. The percentage of cleanups completed is based on the number of sites cleaned up and the number of sites that are on the state and federal listings since program inception.

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
Total Performance	56%	64%	114.29%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the percent of brownfield properties made available for redevelopment was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the percentage of voluntary and brownfield properties/sites that are returned to a productive use within a community. The Voluntary Cleanup Program (VCP) has closed 1,162 of the 1,804 sites that have entered into the VCP program. The VCP program has experienced a downward trend during the past six years in the number of applications received. With a reduction in the number of new applications received and a greater than projected number of sites closed during the fiscal year, the percent of sites made available for reuse was greater than projected.

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
1 st Quarter	4,500	2,781	15.45%
2 nd Quarter	4,500	4,882	27.12%
3 rd Quarter	4,500	5,024	27.91%
4 th Quarter	4,500	5,328	29.60%
Total Performance	18,000	18,015	100.08%

Variance Explanation:

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
1 st Quarter	7.5	2	6.67%
2 nd Quarter	7.5	3	10.00%
3 rd Quarter	7.5	5	16.67%
4 th Quarter	7.5	1	3.33%
Total Performance	30	11	36.67%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of emergency response actions at petroleum storage tank sites was below projections for FY 2006. 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. This is an on-demand activity and the agency has no control over the number of emergency response actions. Fluctuations in performance are likely to occur due to the unpredictable number of sites requiring emergency responses.

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

Output Measure 03:

Number of Petroleum Storage Tank Reimbursement Fund applications processed

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	1,500	1,155	19.25%
2 nd Quarter	1,500	1,165	19.42%
3 rd Quarter	1,500	1,319	21.98%
4 th Quarter	1,500	1,455	24.25%
Total Performance	6,000	5,094	84.90%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of Petroleum Storage Tank Reimbursement Fund applications processed was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reflects agency workload in processing applications for reimbursements for petroleum storage tank remediation. Program performance is dependent upon the number of claims received. The reduced number of applications received and processed is a direct result of the reduction of sites undergoing remediation. At the close of 2006, 86% of the known LPST sites have been closed. With the fewer number of sites remaining open and the larger number of sites requiring annual groundwater monitoring, the corresponding number of reimbursement applications submitted has decreased. The program is scheduled to sunset at the end of FY 2008.

Output Measure 04:

Number of petroleum storage tank cleanups completed

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	225	476	52.89%
2 nd Quarter	225	156	17.33%
3 rd Quarter	225	145	16.11%
4 th Quarter	225	236	26.22%
Total Performance	900	1,013	112.56%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of petroleum storage tank cleanups completed was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports agency efforts to clean up leaking petroleum storage tank sites. Cleanup completions are not expected to be evenly distributed over each reporting period. Most cleanups are finalized after responsible parties complete all field work and formally request closure review. Applicants have increased their efforts to close sites since the program was to end in FY 2005 but was extended during the 79th Legislature. With the reimbursement program coming to an end, a renewed effort by the applicants to receive reimbursement for cleanup may have increased the closure numbers for the year.

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
1 st Quarter	30	27.7	92.33%
2 nd Quarter	30	28.2	94.00%
3 rd Quarter	30	26.6	88.67%
4 th Quarter	30	24.3	81.00%
Annual Target	30	26.7	89.00%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the average time to review and respond to remedial action plans was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the average number of days for the agency to review and respond to remedial action plans over the reporting period. The TCEQ has implemented procedures for reviewing remedial action plans to ensure average review times remain below the legislatively mandated time frame of 30 days.

Efficiency Measure 02:

Average time (days) to review and respond to risk-based site assessments

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	30	28.1	93.67%
2 nd Quarter	30	26.6	88.67%
3 rd Quarter	30	25	83.33%
4 th Quarter	30	24.7	82.33%
Annual Target	30	26.1	87.00%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the average time to review and respond to risk-based site assessments was below projections for FY 2006. 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 TCEQ has implemented procedures for reviewing these assessments to ensure average review times remain below the legislatively mandated time frame of 30 days.

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	90	55	61.11%
2nd Quarter	90	59	65.56%
3rd Quarter	90	53	58.89%
4th Quarter	90	52	57.78%
Annual Target	90	54.8	60.89%

Variance Explanation:
 BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the average time to process Petroleum Storage Tank Remediation Fund reimbursement claims was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reflects how efficiently the agency processes claims for reimbursements from the PST remediation fund. Turnaround time for claim processing has consistently been below the mandated level of 90 days. This is primarily due to staff efficiency and the improved quality of information provided in claims submitted.

Explanatory Measure 01:

Average cost per petroleum storage tank cleanup

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	\$75,000	\$76,210	101.61%

Variance Explanation:
 Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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	1.25	1	20.00%
2nd Quarter	1.25	1	20.00%
3rd Quarter	1.25	0	0.00%
4th Quarter	1.25	4	80.00%
Total Performance	5	6	120.00%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of immediate response actions completed to protect human health and the environment was above projections for FY 2006. During the fourth quarter, four immediate response actions were completed (Redi-Strip, Camtraco, E. 67th Street Groundwater Plum, and Bandera Road Groundwater Plume). This measure is an on-demand activity. The agency is required to respond to all sites which require immediate action to protect human health and the environment.

Output Measure 02:

Number of Superfund site assessments

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	18	18	25.00%
2nd Quarter	18	32	44.44%
3rd Quarter	18	27	37.50%
4th Quarter	18	12	16.67%
Total Performance	72	89	123.61%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of Superfund site assessments was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of potential Superfund sites that have undergone an eligibility assessment for either the state or federal Superfund programs. To meet the statutory requirement of notifying private well owners under TWC 26.408 (House Bill 3030, 78th Legislative Session), the program has increased the number of staff members conducting assessments. Also, a greater than projected number of the sites assessed required no further action.

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
1 st Quarter	17.50	102	145.71%
2 nd Quarter	17.50	22	31.43%
3 rd Quarter	17.50	20	28.57%
4 th Quarter	17.50	13	18.57%
Total Performance	70	157	224.29%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of voluntary and brownfield cleanups completed was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of voluntary cleanup and brownfield sites which have completed necessary response action through the removal or control of contamination levels which are protective of human health and the environment. Performance remains above projections due primarily to one individual applicant who requested 75 separate certificates of completion for contiguous residential lots that were originally designated as one site. As a result, performance has remained above projections throughout the fiscal year.

Output Measure 04:

Number of Superfund evaluations underway (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	25	28	112.00%
2 nd Quarter	25	31	124.00%
3 rd Quarter	25	33	132.00%
4 th Quarter	25	33	132.00%
Total Performance	25	33	132.00%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of Superfund evaluations underway was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of state and federal Superfund sites that are undergoing the evaluation phase of the Superfund process. Many of the sites in this category are groundwater sites and the investigation is requiring more time because tracking groundwater plume boundaries requires additional effort. Getting access agreements from surrounding property owners has slowed the site investigation process. Also, due to decreases in federal funding for cleanup starts, sites that are ready to begin cleanup will remain in the evaluation phase until the EPA can obtain the available funding to issue a Record of Decision for cleanup to start.

Strategy 04-01-02: Hazardous Materials Cleanup

Output Measure 05:
Number of Superfund cleanups underway (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	28	18	64.29%
2 nd Quarter	28	17	60.71%
3 rd Quarter	28	16	57.14%
4 th Quarter	28	15	53.57%
Total Performance	28	15	53.57%

Variance Explanation:
 BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the number of Superfund cleanups underway was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the total number of state and federal Superfund sites that are in the cleanup phase. Delays in federal funding continue to prevent several federal Superfund sites from moving from the cleanup investigation category into the cleanup underway category. Additionally, several state sites are progressing slower than projected due to ground water contamination issues that were discovered during the evaluation process of the sites. Currently, over 90% of the sites that have been added to the state and federal Superfund listing in the past two years have groundwater contamination and the investigation timelines will increase. The cost to perform the cleanup will also increase the burden on federal funding and will remain a key factor.

Output Measure 06:
Number of Superfund cleanups completed (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 st Quarter	1.25	0	0.00%
2 nd Quarter	1.25	1	20.00%
3 rd Quarter	1.25	1	20.00%
4 th Quarter	1.25	3	60.00%
Total Performance	5	5	100.00%

Variance Explanation:
 Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Strategy 04-01-02: Hazardous Materials Cleanup

Output Measure 07:

Number of corrective action documents approved for industrial solid and municipal hazardous waste sites

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	137.5	166	30.18%
2nd Quarter	137.5	111	20.18%
3rd Quarter	137.5	243	44.18%
4th Quarter	137.5	182	33.09%
Total Performance	550	702	127.64%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of corrective action documents approved for industrial solid and municipal hazardous waste sites was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of corrective action document approvals demonstrating progress towards final cleanup of sites contaminated by industrial solid or municipal hazardous waste. The number of documents reviewed is not evenly distributed throughout the fiscal year because most of the semiannual remediation progress reports are received during the second and fourth quarters and are due for review during the first and third quarters. The program has no control over the number of corrective action documents submitted by facilities.

Output Measure 08:

Number of Dry Cleaner Remediation program applications received (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	6.25	11	44.00%
2nd Quarter	6.25	14	56.00%
3rd Quarter	6.25	8	32.00%
4th Quarter	6.25	20	80.00%
Total Performance	25	53	212.00%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of Dry Cleaner Remediation program applications received was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of Dry Cleaner Remediation Program applications received, ranked, prioritized, and scheduled for, or undergoing, corrective action activity. The higher performance may be linked to new rule changes which were adopted late in FY 2005. It is believed that many applications were not submitted to the agency until the rules were finalized.

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	26.1	29.00%
2nd Quarter	90	36	40.00%
3rd Quarter	90	47	52.22%
4th Quarter	90	34	37.78%
Annual Target	90	35.8	39.78%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the average time to process Dry Cleaner Remediation program applications was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the average number of days required by agency staff to process the Dry Cleaner Remediation program applications. The program area has implemented procedures for screening and reviewing the applications to ensure the average processing time is less than the legislatively mandated time frame of 90 days.

Strategy 04-01-02: Hazardous Materials Cleanup

**Explanatory Measure 01:
Number of potential Superfund sites to be assessed**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	560	457	81.61%

Variance Explanation:
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL
Performance for the number of potential Superfund sites to be assessed was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of known sites that are to be prioritized and assessed for Superfund eligibility in the subsequent fiscal year(s). In FY 2006, the total number of sites to be assessed dropped to 457 from the FY 2005 total of 546. The majority of sites evaluated required no further action. The number of new site referrals will affect the number of sites to be evaluated in future years.

**Explanatory Measure 02:
Number of federal Superfund sites**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	54	52	96.30%

Variance Explanation:
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Strategy 04-01-02: Hazardous Materials Cleanup

**Explanatory Measure 03:
Number of state Superfund sites**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	96	89	92.71%

Variance Explanation:
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL
Performance for the number of state Superfund sites was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of state Superfund sites in Texas. The actual number of State Superfund sites at the beginning of FY 2006 was 80. As of the end of the fiscal year, nine (9) sites were added to the state Superfund registry. The total number of state Superfund sites was less than projected due to fewer referrals to the state Superfund program during the fiscal year.

**Explanatory Measure 04:
Number of approved industrial solid and municipal hazardous waste cleanups**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	300	293	97.67%

Variance Explanation:
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Goal 05-01: Texas River Compacts

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
Total Performance	100%	53.7%	53.70%

Variance Explanation:
 BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the percent of quality water received was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the extent to which Texas receives its share of water as apportioned by the compact. Performance was below projections due to below average precipitation in the Canadian River watershed of New Mexico.

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
Total Performance	100%	172.2%	172.20%

Variance Explanation:
 ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the percent of quality water received was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the extent to which Texas receives its share of water as apportioned by the compact. Performance was above projections due to New Mexico's credits accumulated under the compact.

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
Total Performance	100%	100%	100.00%

Variance Explanation:
 Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Goal 05-01: Texas River Compacts

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
Total Performance	100%	127.5%	127.50%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the percent of quality water received was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the extent to which Texas receives its share of water as apportioned by the compact. Performance was above projections due to lower than normal compact delivery requirements due to drought conditions in New Mexico and New Mexico's existing credits for past over-deliveries of water.

Outcome 05:

The percentage received of Texas' equitable share of quality water annually as apportioned by the Sabine River Compact (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	100%	99.2%	99.20%

Variance Explanation:

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Strategy 05-01-01: Canadian River Compact

Output Measure 01:
Number of accountings prepared and resolved annually

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	1	1	100.00%

Variance Explanation:
 Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Output Measure 02:
Acre feet of quality water impounded in Texas' reservoirs as apportioned by the Canadian River Compact

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	350,000	188,107	53.74%

Variance Explanation:
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the acre-feet of quality water received was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the extent to which Texas receives its share of water as apportioned by the compact. Performance was below projections due to below average precipitation in the Canadian River watershed of New Mexico. New Mexico was in compliance with the Compact.

Strategy 05-01-01: Canadian River Compact

Efficiency Measure 01:

Average cost per acre-foot of water impounded in Texas' reservoirs as apportioned by the Canadian River Compact

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	0.06	0.08	133.33%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the average cost per acre-foot of water received was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the average cost per acre-foot of water received by Texas. The average cost was impacted by the reduced amount of water received from New Mexico for the fiscal year.

Explanatory Measure 01:

Number of active interstate disputes regarding the Canadian River Compact which could result in litigation involving Texas, Oklahoma, and/or New Mexico

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	0	1	200%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of active interstate disputes was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of disputes that may result in litigation between the Compact states. The state of Oklahoma continues to assert that Texas' construction of Palo Duro Reservoir is in violation of the Compact. Texas does not believe this is the case. The Commissioner continues to work with Oklahoma to resolve this issue.

Strategy 05-01-02: Pecos River Compact

**Output Measure 01:
Number of accountings prepared and resolved annually**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	1	1	100.00%

Variance Explanation:
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Output Measure 02:
Acre feet of quality water received by Texas annually as apportioned by the Pecos River Compact**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	64,000	110,200	172.19%

Variance Explanation:
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL
Performance for the acre-feet of water received by Texas was above projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the extent to which Texas receives its share of water as apportioned by the compact. Performance was higher than projected due to New Mexico's credits accumulated under the Compact. New Mexico was in compliance with the Compact.

**Output Measure 03:
Number of projects implemented to maximize water quality and water resource**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	2	2	100.00%

Variance Explanation:
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Strategy 05-01-02: Pecos River Compact

Efficiency Measure 01:

Average cost per acre-foot of quality water received by Texas as apportioned by the Pecos River Compact

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	1.66	1.00	60.24%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the average cost per acre-foot of water received was below projections for FY 2006. This measure is directly tied to the number of acre-feet of water received by the state. The acre-feet received in FY 2006 was higher than projected due to New Mexico's credits accumulated under the Compact. As the number of acre-feet received increases, the average cost decreases. New Mexico was in compliance with the Compact.

Strategy 05-01-03: Red River Compact

Output Measure 01:

Rules developed and approved for compact defined by the Red River Compact

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	0.5	0	0.00%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the number of rules developed and approved was below projections for FY 2006. This measure reports the number of rules developed and approved for the Compact. No compact rules were approved during the fiscal year. The Texas and Oklahoma Commissioners were unable to reach an agreement on the draft rules for the Red River upstream of Lake Texoma or for the North Fork Red River/Sweetwater Creek area.

Output Measure 02:

Number of interstate compact meetings attended to administer the Red River Compact

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	6	6	100.00%

Variance Explanation:

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Strategy 05-01-03: Red River Compact

Efficiency Measure 01:

Average cost per compact meeting attended to administer the Red River Compact

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	4,618	4,746	102.77%

Variance Explanation:
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Strategy 05-01-04: Rio Grande River Compact

Output Measure 01:
Number of accountings prepared and resolved annually

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	1	1	100.00%

Variance Explanation:
 Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Output Measure 02:
Acres of quality water received by Texas annually as apportioned by the Rio Grande River Compact

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	750,500	957,100	127.53%

Variance Explanation:
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the acre-feet of water received by Texas was above projections for FY 2006. The number of acre-feet received by Texas was greater than projected due to lower than normal compact requirements due to drought conditions in New Mexico and existing credits for past over-deliveries of water.

Output Measure 03:
Number of projects implemented to maximize water quality and water resource

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	2	2	100.00%

Variance Explanation:
 Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Strategy 05-01-04: Rio Grande River Compact

Efficiency Measure 01:

Average cost per acre-foot of quality water received by Texas as apportioned by the Rio Grande River Compact

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	0.16	0.1	62.50%

Variance Explanation:

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the average cost per acre-foot of water received by Texas was below projections for FY 2006. This measure is directly tied to the number of acre-feet of water received by Texas. The number of acre-feet received was greater than projected due to lower than normal compact requirements due to drought conditions in New Mexico and existing credits for past over-deliveries of water.

Strategy 05-01-05: Sabine Grande River Compact

Output Measure 01:

Number of accountings prepared and resolved annually

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	1	1	100.00%

Variance Explanation:
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Output Measure 02:

Acre feet of quality water diversions by Texas annually as apportioned by the Sabine River Compact

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	57,017	56,550	99.18%

Variance Explanation:
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Strategy 05-01-05: Sabine Grande River Compact

Efficiency Measure 01:

Average cost per acre-foot of water diversions by Texas as apportioned by the Sabine River Compact

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
Total Performance	0.79	0.94	118.99%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the average cost per acre-foot of water was above projections for FY 2006. This measure is directly tied to the number of acre-feet of water diverted by Texas. The number of acre-feet diverted is divided by total funds spent during the fiscal year in furtherance of the River Compact. Performance is slightly higher due to additional funds allocated to the River Compacts per Rider 23 in the General Appropriations Act.

Historically Underutilized Business Program

Output Measure 01:
Percentage of professional services going to HUBs

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	18.1%	6.6%	36.46%
2nd Quarter	18.1%	27.5%	151.93%
3rd Quarter	18.1%	15.59%	86.13%
4th Quarter	18.1%	6.37%	35.19%
Total Performance	18.1%	13.3%	73.48%

Variance Explanation:
 BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL
 Performance for the percent of professional services going to HUBs was below projections for FY 2006. The agency currently has 21 contracts in this category none of which have been awarded to HUB vendors. The HUB program has reviewed the HUB subcontracting performance of the contracts and is working with the programs and contractors to improve HUB subcontracting.

Output Measure 02:
Percentage of other services going to HUBs

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	33%	35.4%	107.27%
2nd Quarter	33%	27.9%	84.55%
3rd Quarter	33%	37.33%	113.12%
4th Quarter	33%	34.05%	103.18%
Total Performance	33%	33.8%	102.42%

Variance Explanation:
 Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

Historically Underutilized Business Program

Output Measure 03:
Percentage of commodity purchasing awarded to HUBs

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	12.6%	53.3%	423.02%
2nd Quarter	12.6%	22.9%	181.75%
3rd Quarter	12.6%	33.9%	269.05%
4th Quarter	12.6%	34.82%	276.35%
Total Performance	12.6%	41.9%	332.54%

Variance Explanation:

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL.

Performance for the percentage of commodity purchases awarded to HUBs was above projections for FY 2006. The TCEQ has successfully focused efforts on identifying HUB vendors in this area. A large number of certified HUB vendors available in this category has aided TCEQ efforts to utilize their services.