

## 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/>.



January 2008  
SFR-055/08-01

# First Quarter Report on Performance Measures

## Fiscal Year 2008

Budget & Planning Division - Strategic Planning and Assessment

TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY



**Buddy Garcia, *Chairman***  
**Larry R. Soward, *Commissioner***  
**Bryan W. Shaw, Ph.D., *Commissioner***

**Glenn Shankle, *Executive Director***

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

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

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

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

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

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Strategic Planning Structure</b>	
Fiscal Year 2008 .....	1
<b>Goal 01      Assessment, Permitting, and Prevention</b>	
Strategy 01-01-01      Air Quality Assessment and Planning .....	3
Strategy 01-01-02      Water Resource Assessment and Planning.....	9
Strategy 01-01-03      Waste Assessment and Planning .....	11
Strategy 01-02-01      Air Quality Permitting.....	12
Strategy 01-02-02      Water Resource Permitting .....	14
Strategy 01-02-03      Waste Management and Permitting .....	16
Strategy 01-02-04      Occupational Licensing .....	18
<b>Goal 02      Drinking Water and Water Utilities</b>	
Strategy 02-01-01      Safe Drinking Water .....	20
Strategy 02-01-02      Water Utilities Oversight.....	21
<b>Goal 03      Enforcement and Compliance Assistance</b>	
Strategy 03-01-01      Field Inspections and Complaints .....	23
Strategy 03-01-02      Enforcement and Compliance Support .....	27
Strategy 03-01-03      Pollution Prevention and Recycling.....	29
<b>Goal 04      Pollution Cleanup</b>	
Strategy 04-01-01      Storage Tank Administration and Cleanup.....	31
Strategy 04-01-02      Hazardous Materials Cleanup .....	35
<b>Goal 05      Texas River Compacts .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Goal      Historically Underutilized Businesses</b>	
Historically Underutilized Businesses .....	40

---

## Strategic Planning Structure

### Fiscal Year 2008

#### 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 2008, 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 2008, 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.

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

---

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	500	809	40.45%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	500		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	500		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	500		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	2,000	809	40.45%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for the Number of Point Source Air Quality Assessments was above projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure counts the number of point source air emission inventories which have been reviewed and entered into the State of Texas Air Reporting System Database (STARS). During the first quarter, remaining point source air quality inventories from the previous reporting year were reviewed and entered into the STARS database. The division reallocated resources and added temporary staff in order to enter the remaining inventories to meet state implementation plan (SIP) requirements. Staff will distribute FY 08 inventories during the second quarter. These inventories will be entered in the third quarter bringing the performance to anticipated levels for the fiscal year per the air emissions inventory Chapter 30 rule.

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	625	641	25.64%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	625		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	625		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	625		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	2,500	641	25.64%

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

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

---

### Output Measure 03:

#### Number of Mobile Source Air Quality Assessments (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	312.50	321	25.68%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	312.50		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	312.50		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	312.50		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	1,250	321	25.68%

**Variance Explanation:**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

### Output Measure 04:

#### Number of Air Monitors Operated

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	590	589	99.83%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	590		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	590		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	590		0.00%
<b>Annual Target</b>	590	589	99.83%

**Variance Explanation:**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.



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

---

### Output Measure 05:

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	7,152.75	909	3.18%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	7,152.75		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	7,152.75		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	7,152.75		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	28,611	909	3.18%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Tons of NOx Reduced through the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan (TERP) was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure reports the amount of NOx emissions projected to be reduced through projects funded by TERP incentive grants awarded each year. The 909 tons of NOx reported are a result of a \$5,000,000 third party grant to the Texas General Land Office (GLO). Performance for the first quarter is comparable to first quarter performance from the previous year. The main grant application period for the TERP grant will open in January of FY 2008. These funds will bring a significant increase in the number of tons of NOx reduced that will be reported in the third quarter of this fiscal year.

### Output Measure 06:

#### Number of New Technology Grant Proposals Reviewed (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	15.5	11	17.74%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	15.5		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	15.5		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	15.5		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	62	11	17.74%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of New Technology Grant Proposals Reviewed was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. 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. Eleven grant applications were received by the close of the first quarter with an additional Request for Grant Approval (RFGA) period ending on December 5<sup>th</sup>. With these two RFGAs, the program is on track to meet the yearly performance goal.

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

---

### Output Measure 07:

#### Number of Vehicles Repaired or Replaced through LIRAP Assistance (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	3,750	1,565	10.43%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	3,750		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	3,750		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	3,750		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	15,000	1,565	10.43%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Vehicles Repaired or Replaced through LIRAP Assistance was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure determines the number of vehicle repairs and replacements that have taken place in the program. Total repairs and replacements for the five-county Houston/Galveston/Brazoria Area (HGB), nine county Dallas-Fort Worth (DFW) Area, and two-county Austin area, were used to determine the total LIRAP participation figures. The HGB area repaired 819 vehicles and replaced 31 vehicles for a YTD total of 850 vehicles. The DFW area repaired 598 vehicles and replaced 25 vehicles for a YTD of 623 vehicles. The Austin area repaired 90 vehicles and replaced 2 for YTD of 92 vehicles. The total YTD participation number for all 16 counties is 1,565. The first quarter number represents units that received funding prior to the implementation of the program enhancements resulting from the implementation of Senate Bill 12, 80<sup>th</sup> Legislature. Beginning December 12, 2007, the counties will begin implementing SB 12 enhanced activities. The program expects to see increases in the number of replacements for the next reporting period.

### Efficiency Measure 01:

#### Percent of Data Collected by TCEQ Continuous and Non-Continuous Air Monitoring Networks

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	90%	93%	103.33%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	90%		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	90%		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	90%		0.00%
<b>Annual Target</b>	90%	93%	103.33%

**Variance Explanation:**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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

---

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	\$370	\$332	89.73%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	\$370		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	\$370		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	\$370		0.00%
Annual Target	\$370	\$332	89.73%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 The Average Cost Per Air Quality Assessment was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure accounts for the funds expended by the Air Quality Planning and Implementation Division on salaries and other operating expenses related to staff work on air quality assessments. Performance is lower than projected for the first quarter due to the higher than expected number of point source emission inventories reviewed. It is desirable that the performance for this measure be below projections.

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	\$480	\$500.28	104.23%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	\$480		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	\$480		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	\$480		0.00%
Annual Target	\$480	\$500.28	104.23%

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

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

---

**Efficiency Measure 04:**

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

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	\$5,000	\$5,500	110.00%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	\$5,000		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	\$5,000		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	\$5,000		0.00%
<b>Annual Target</b>	\$5,000	\$5,500	110.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Average Cost Per Ton of NOx Reduced through the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan (TERP) exceeded projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure shows the average cost per ton of NOx reduced through projects funded by the TERP incentive grants. The \$5,500 cost per ton estimates shown for the first quarter represent the maximum cost per ton levels for pass-through grants to be awarded by the Texas General Land Office (GLO) under a third-party grant with the TCEQ awarded in the first quarter. The grant application period for the regular TERP grants will be open in early January 2008. Significant results are expected to be reported under this measure by the third quarter of FY 2008.

**Efficiency Measure 05:**

**Average Number of Days to Review a Grant Proposal (Key)**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	1	1	100.00%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	1		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	1		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	1		0.00%
<b>Annual Target</b>	1	1	100.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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

---

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	16.75	11	16.42%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	16.75		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	16.75		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	16.75		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	67	11	16.42%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Surface Water Assessments was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure quantifies a diverse assemblage of assessment types performed and reported by multiple divisions within the agency. Field sampling conducted to support surface water assessments is performed primarily during the warmer parts of the year when aquatic systems are most responsive to environmental conditions. The Water Body System and 303(d) Updates are scheduled for the third quarter. Clean Rivers Assessments are not due until later in the year. The Clean Water Act (CWA) 319 Annual Report is scheduled for completion in the second quarter.

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	15	4	6.67%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	15		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	15		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	15		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	60	4	6.67%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Groundwater Assessments was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure counts the number of reports completed which evaluate environmental or programmatic data related to groundwater quality or quantity issues. This level of performance is to be expected as most of the assessments are either regional studies or ongoing tasks. Regional studies require four months or longer of preparation. Ongoing tasks use data that is compiled at the end of the year. Projected performance is anticipated to be met in the fourth quarter.

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

---

**Output Measure 03:  
Number of Dam Safety Assessments**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	107.5	153	35.58%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	107.5		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	107.5		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	107.5		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	430	153	35.58%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for the Number of Dam Safety Assessments was above projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure includes on-site investigations as well as in-house review of plans, engineering reports, and water use permit applications involving dams. The Dam Safety program received more final reports from the two contractors than expected, emergency action plans, engineering inspection reports from consultants and Water District creation documents to review and approve. The Dam Safety Program anticipates performance to be above projections for the second quarter as well.

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

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	\$1,200	\$622	51.83%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	\$1,200		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	\$1,200		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	\$1,200		0.00%
<b>Annual Target</b>	\$1,200	\$622	51.83%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for the Average Cost Per Dam Safety Assessment was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure reports the average cost for each dam safety assessment performed by TCEQ staff and contractors. Average cost figures vary considerably due to the number and complexity of assessments performed. The average cost for the first quarter was lower than projected due to the higher than projected number of assessments completed. The desired performance for this measure is to be below projections. The TCEQ anticipates being below projections for the second quarter.

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

---

**Output Measure 01:**

**Number of Municipal Solid Waste Facility Capacity Assessments (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	62.50	65	26.00%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	62.50		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	62.50		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	62.50		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	250	65	26.00%

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

**Efficiency Measure 01:**

**Average Cost Per Municipal Solid Waste Facility Capacity Assessment (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	\$35	\$28.84	82.40%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	\$35		77.97%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	\$35		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	\$35		0.00%
<b>Annual Target</b>	\$35	\$28.84	67.13%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for the Average Cost Per Municipal Solid Waste Facility Capacity Assessment was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure reflects agency efforts to conduct municipal solid waste facility capacity assessments in an efficient manner. Improved efficiency resulting from process automation decreases the amount of time required to conduct each assessment, thereby reducing the cost per assessment.

## 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 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	1,450	1,013	17.47%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	1,450		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	1,450		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	1,450		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	5,800	1,013	17.47%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of State and Federal New Source Review Air Quality Permit Applications Reviewed was below projections for the first quarter FY 2008. This measure quantifies the permitting workload of the Air Permits Division (APD) staff assigned to review state and federal new source review permit applications. The reported performance may be attributable to deficiencies in applications submitted to authorize planned maintenance, startup, and shutdown (MSS) emissions. Changes to the General Air Quality Rules (30 TAC 101, Subchapter F in January 2006) required an owner or operator to apply to authorize planned MSS emissions. These emissions did not need air quality authorizations before the change. The annual target is expected to be met by fiscal year end.

### Output Measure 02:

#### Number of Federal Air Quality Operating Permits Reviewed (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	275	215	19.55%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	275		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	275		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	275		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	1,100	215	19.55%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Federal Air Quality Operating Permits Reviewed was below projections for the first quarter FY 2008. This measure quantifies the permitting workload of the Air Permits Division staff assigned to review federal operating permit applications. The reported variance may be attributable to the complexity of projects received during this quarter and the greater amount of time needed to complete the associated technical review. The division is working diligently with applicants to determine all applicable requirements and ensure all rule changes and site modifications are accounted for.



---

## 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 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	250	142	14.20%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	250		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	250		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	250		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	1,000	142	14.20%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Emissions Banking and Trading (EBT) Transaction Applications Reviewed was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure reports the number of EBT transaction applications reviewed by the Air Quality 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. The reported variance is primarily attributable to an irregular workload stream. The annual target is expected to exceed projections for FY 08.

## 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 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	4,539.50	4,064	22.38%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	4,539.50		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	4,539.50		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	4,539.50		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	18,158	4,064	22.38%

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

### Output Measure 02:

#### Number of Applications to Address Water Rights Impacts Reviewed

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	148.75	159	26.72%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	148.75		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	148.75		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	148.75		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	595	159	26.72%

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

---

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

---

**Output Measure 03:**

**Number of Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO) Authorizations Reviewed (Key)**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	22.5	28	31.11%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	22.5		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	22.5		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	22.5		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	90	28	31.11%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO) Authorizations Reviewed was above projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure counts the number of CAFO Individual Permits filed with the Chief Clerk's Office and General Permit (GP) Notice of Intents (NOIs) acknowledged for new and existing facilities. The number for the quarter is over projections due to the larger number of NOIs received this quarter. Projections for this measure are anticipated to be met in FY 2008.

## 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 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	142.50	138	24.21%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	142.50		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	142.50		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	142.50		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	570	138	24.21%

**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 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	59	75	31.78%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	59		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	59		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	59		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	236	75	31.78%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Non-Hazardous Waste Permit Applications Reviewed was above projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure quantifies the number of reviews conducted to ensure proposed facilities meet design and operational requirements and are protective of human health and the environment. The increase is attributed to the number of municipal solid waste permit modifications submitted for facilities that need to comply with the new Chapter 330 rules.

---

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

---

**Output Measure 03:**

**Number of Hazardous Waste Permit Applications Reviewed (Key)**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	40	46	28.75%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	40		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	40		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	40		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	160	46	28.75%

**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
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	6,000	5,198	21.66%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	6,000		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	6,000		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	6,000		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	24,000	5,198	21.66%

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

### Output Measure 02: Number of Examinations Administered (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	2,625	2,865	27.29%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	2,625		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	2,625		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	2,625		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	10,500	2,865	27.29%

**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
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	5,750	4,651	20.22%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	5,750		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	5,750		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	5,750		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	23,000	4,651	20.22%

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

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	\$18	\$18.67	103.72%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	\$18		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	\$18		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	\$18		0.00%
<b>Annual Target</b>	\$18	\$18.67	103.72%

**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 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	6,200	6,260	100.97%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	6,200		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	6,200		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	6,200		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	6,200	6,260	100.97%

**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 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	9,012.75	11,973	33.21%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	9,012.75		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	9,012.75		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	9,012.75		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	36,051	11,973	33.21%

**Variance Explanation:**  
 ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL  
 Performance for the Number of Drinking Water Samples Collected was above projections for the first quarter FY 2008. The variance in the number of samples collected resulted from normal fluctuations in the seasonality of required sampling at public water systems and from an increase in the number of chemical samples that will be required in FY 2008 due to rule changes. In FY 2008, this effect is projected to be more pronounced due to an overall increase in sampling because of the adoption of the stage 2 Disinfection Byproducts Rule (DBP2).



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

---

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	25	29	29.00%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	25		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	25		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	25		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	100	29	29.00%

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

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	137.5	158	28.73%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	137.5		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	137.5		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	137.5		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	550	158	28.73%

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

---

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

---

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

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	56.25	65	28.89%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	56.25		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	56.25		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	56.25		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	225	65	28.89%

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

---

## 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 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	3,250	2,724	20.95%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	3,250		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	3,250		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	3,250		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	13,000	2,724	20.95%

**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 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	8,500	8,381	24.65%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	8,500		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	8,500		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	8,500		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	34,000	8,381	24.65%

**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 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	2,125	2,037	23.96%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	2,125		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	2,125		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	2,125		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	8,500	2,037	23.96%

**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 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	175	120	17.14%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	175		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	175		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	175		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	700	120	17.14%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Inspections and Investigations of Livestock and Poultry Operations Sites was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure reports the regulated entities that are investigated to assure compliance with rules, regulations, and statutes designed to protect human health and the environment. The TCEQ uses a risk-based investigation strategy (RBIS) to determine a scheduled investigation strategy that focuses resources on facilities that pose the greatest risk to the public and the environment. During the FY08 ranking process, fewer livestock and poultry operation sites ranked high enough to be selected for a scheduled investigation. Additionally, some of the investigation activities are on-demand type activities such as during and after significant rain events in the Dairy Outreach Program areas. There have not been many rain events this quarter, thus some of these investigations did not occur. The TCEQ anticipates being below projections for the second quarter.

**Strategy 03-01-01: Field Inspections and Complaints**

---

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

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	1,839.50	1,911	25.97%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	1,839.50		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	1,839.50		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	1,839.50		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	7,358	1,911	25.97%

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

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

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	100	169	42.25%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	100		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	100		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	100		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	400	169	42.25%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**  
The Number of Spill Cleanup Inspections was above projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure is the total number of initial, on-site spill incident inspections/investigations conducted. Spill investigations are an on-demand activity and are based upon the number of spills of regulated materials reported by citizens, industry representatives, and state law enforcement officials. This number can vary widely from quarter to quarter. During this reporting period, more spills were reported to the agency that required investigations. The TCEQ anticipates being above projections for the second quarter.

## 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 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	\$770	\$550	71.43%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	\$770		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	\$770		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	\$770		0.00%
Annual Target	\$770	\$550	71.43%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Average Inspection and Investigation Cost of Livestock and Poultry Operations was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure is the total funds expended during the reporting period for TCEQ monitoring of livestock and poultry operations, divided by the number of inspections/investigations, and other compliance inspections and complaint investigations for livestock and poultry operations completed during the reporting period. The lower cost is the result of a refined accounting of time spent on investigations. Many costs used to calculate this measure increase on an annual basis, but the more accurate time accounting resulted in a lower cost per inspection. The desired performance for this measure is to be below projections.

### Efficiency Measure 02:

#### Average Time (days) from Air, Water, and Waste Inspections to Report Completion

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	35	29	82.86%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	35		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	35		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	35		0.00%
Annual Target	35	29	82.86%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Average Time (days) from Air, Water, and Waste Inspections to Report Completion was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure reports the total number of calendar days between date of investigation and date of completion divided by the total number of completed investigations reported during the reporting period. Field Operations Support Division (FOSD) had increased number of investigations that do not take as much time to complete. For example, FOSD had an increase in the number of on-site follow up investigation and record reviews associated with the implementation of last year's Energy Bill inspections. The desired performance for this measure is to be below projections.

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

---

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	75	80	26.67%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	75		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	75		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	75		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	300	80	26.67%

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

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	13,500	24,370	45.13%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	13,500		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	13,500		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	13,500		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	54,000	24,370	45.13%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for the Number of Small Businesses and Local Governments Assisted was above projections for the first quarter FY 2008. This measure provides an indication of the number of notifications provided to the state's small businesses and local governments to keep them informed of regulatory changes that might affect them. Performance exceeded projections for the quarter due to two special mailouts, one concerning a National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP), the other concerning the AirCheck Texas program. Performance is expected to be at projections for the remainder of the fiscal year.

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

---

**Output Measure 03:  
Number of Drinking Water Laboratories Certified**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	0	92	9200%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	0		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	0		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	0		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	0	92	9200%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for the Number of Drinking Water Laboratories Certified was above projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure reports the number of labs certified to analyze public water supply samples. The number of labs is projected to be 0 as laboratories are switching from the Drinking Water Certification Program to the Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program. The drinking water certification program will end June 30, 2008.

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	70	59	84.29%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	70		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	70		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	70		0.00%
<b>Annual Target</b>	70	59	84.29%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for the Average Number of Days to File an Initial Settlement Offer was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure represents the average number of days from the date the case was assigned, to the mailing date of the initial document that explains the violations and calculated penalty included in the enforcement action. The average number of days was lower than projected because the agency has revised enforcement processing procedures to process all new cases within a 60 day or less average time frame. For this type of measure, performance below the target level reflects positively on agency efforts to expedite cases. The agency anticipates performing below projections for the second quarter.



## 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 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	60	89	37.08%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	60		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	60		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	60		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	240	89	37.08%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of On-Site Technical Assistance Visits, Audits, Presentations and Workshops on Pollution Prevention/Waste Minimization and Environmental Management Systems Conducted was above projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure reports the number of outreach activities conducted by the Pollution Prevention and Environmental Management Staff. The increase in the number for the first quarter is due to new programs that offered additional opportunities for outreach events.

### Output Measure 02:

#### Number of Entities Participating in Performance-Based Regulatory Programs

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	370	148	40.00%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	370		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	370		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	370		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	370	148	40.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Entities Participating in Performance-Based Regulatory Programs was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure reflects the number of entities participating in voluntary programs. Changes made to Clean Texas Program in the middle of FY 2007 increased the requirements for participants. Members are now expected to continually enhance their pollution prevention efforts and members unwilling to actively participate are no longer included. This change in strategy makes the projected performance value difficult to achieve. Increased marketing and public outreach will continue in an effort to increase participation in these programs.

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

---

**Output Measure 03:**

**Number of Quarts of Used Oil Diverted from Landfills and Processed (in millions)**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	8.25	0.18	0.55%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	8.25		0.0%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	8.25		0.0%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	8.25		0.0%
<b>Total Performance</b>	33	0.18	0.55%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Quarts of Used Oil Diverted from Landfills and Processed (in millions) was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure reports the amount of used oil diverted, via registered collection centers, from landfills and processed. In the first quarter .18 million quarts was reported as diverted. A performance of less than 1 million quarts for the first quarter is consistent with past fiscal years. It is below the projection as used oil collection centers report this information annually. The annual used oil collection reports are due January 25<sup>th</sup>, which is in the second quarter. The used oil program anticipates higher performance for the second through fourth quarters.

**Efficiency Measure 01:**

**Average Cost Per On-Site Technical Assistance Visit**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	\$600	\$276.00	46.00%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	\$600		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	\$600		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	\$600		0.00%
<b>Annual Target</b>	\$600	\$276.00	46.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Average Cost Per On-Site Technical Assistance Visit was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure reports the average cost of each technical site assistance visit performed by Pollution Prevention Staff. The performance is a result of modifications made to the calculation method. Changes were made to track the actual time spent onsite instead of using an average that is no longer correct. Additionally, due to the local nature of these visits few travel costs were incurred. Future performance is expected to remain below \$600.00.

## 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
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	4,500	2,392	13.29%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	4,500		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	4,500		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	4,500		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	18,000	2,392	13.29%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for the Number of Petroleum Storage Tank Self-Certifications Processed was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure reflects agency workload for the processing of petroleum storage tank self-certifications. Self-certification is an annual requirement of owners or operators to certify that facilities are in compliance with certain technical and administrative requirements. Performance for the first quarter is consistent with past fiscal years. Self-certifications are renewed January through October. None are required to renew in November. A new requirement to file proof of financial assurance with the annual Self-Certifications has resulted in many submittals being returned and a delay in processing forms. We anticipate future performance for the second through fourth quarters should be consistent with past fiscal years.

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	4	7	43.75%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	4		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	4		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	4		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	16	7	43.75%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for the Number of Emergency Response Actions at Petroleum Storage Tank Sites was above projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. 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. 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 (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	875	785	22.43%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	875		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	875		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	875		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	3,500	785	22.43%

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

**Output Measure 04:**

**Number of Petroleum Storage Tank Cleanups Completed**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	100	115	28.75%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	100		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	100		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	100		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	400	115	28.75%

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

## 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 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	30	24.3	81.00%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	30		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	30		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	30		0.00%
Annual Target	30	24.3	81.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Average Time (days) to Review and Respond to Remedial Action Plans was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. 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. Performance is expected to be at this level for future reporting periods.

### Efficiency Measure 02:

#### Average Time (days) to Review and Respond to Risk-Based Site Assessments

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	30	24	80.00%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	30		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	30		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	30		0.00%
Annual Target	30	24	80.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Average Time (days) to Review and Respond to Risk-Based Site Assessments was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. 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. Projections for this measure are expected to remain at this level for future reporting periods.

---

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

---

**Efficiency Measure 03:**

**Average Time (days) to Process Petroleum Storage Tank Remediation Fund Reimbursement Claims**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	90	46	51.11%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	90		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	90		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	90		0.00%
<b>Annual Target</b>	90	46	51.11%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Average Time (Days) to Process Petroleum Storage Tank (PST) Remediation Fund Reimbursement Claims was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure reflects how efficiently the agency processes claims for reimbursements from the PST remediation fund. The program is required by rule to process new claims from the date of receipt to date that a payment is mailed out to be no more than 90 days. Due to efficiencies in processing new claims, the program has consistently operated within established timelines.

## 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
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	1.25	1	20.00%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	1.25		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	1.25		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	1.25		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	5	1	20.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

### Output Measure 02:

#### Number of Superfund Site Assessments

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	18	18	25.00%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	18		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	18		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	18		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	72	18	25.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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

---

**Output Measure 03:**

**Number of Voluntary and Brownfield Cleanups Completed (Key)**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	20	23	28.75%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	20		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	20		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	20		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	80	23	28.75%

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

**Output Measure 04:**

**Number of Superfund sites in Texas Undergoing Evaluation and Cleanup (Key)**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	67	47	70.15%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	67		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	67		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	67		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	67	47	70.15%

**Variance Explanation:**  
 BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL  
 Performance for the Number of Superfund Sites Undergoing Evaluation and Cleanup was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. This measure reports the number of state and federal Superfund sites that are undergoing the evaluation or cleanup phase of the superfund process. At the end of the 2007 fiscal year, 48 sites were in the evaluation and cleanup phase. Three new sites were added to the superfund registry during the first quarter of FY 2008. These new sites can only be counted in this phase after a work order is issued. No work orders were issued on these new sites during the first quarter of FY 2008. Three additional sites are scheduled to be listed during the second or early third quarter. One site moved from the evaluation and cleanup phase to the cleanup completed phase during this quarter.



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

---

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

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

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

**Output Measure 06:  
Number of Corrective Action Documents Approved for Industrial Solid and Municipal Hazardous Waste Sites**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	137.5	209	38.00%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	137.5		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	137.5		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	137.5		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	550	209	38.00%

**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 the first quarter of FY 2008. 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 in the first and third quarters are generally greater 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. It is projected the annual target will be reached.

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

---

### Output Measure 07:

#### Number of Dry Cleaner Remediation Program Applications Received (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	7.5	5	16.67%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	7.5		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	7.5		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	7.5		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	30	5	16.67%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Dry Cleaner Remediation Program Applications Received was below projections for the first quarter FY 2008.

This measure reports the number of dry cleaner remediation program applications received. The program is still new and potential applicants are learning about the program and are evaluating their qualifications for entering the program.

However, the agency has limited control over number of applications submitted. The number of applications received is expected to meet projected goals by end of fiscal year.

### Efficiency Measure 01:

#### Average time (days) to Process Dry Cleaner Remediation Program Applications

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	90	41.7	46.33%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	90		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	90		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	90		0.00%
<b>Annual Target</b>	90	41.7	46.33%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Average Time (days) to Process Dry Cleaner Remediation Program Applications was below projections for the second quarter of FY 2007. 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.

## **Goal 05-01: Texas River Compacts**

---

Pursuant to Rider 38 for the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality as specified in the General Appropriations Act of the 79<sup>th</sup> Legislature, the five River Compact Commissions have been incorporated into the budget structure of the TCEQ. Because the River Compact Commissions hold their official meetings in the third and fourth quarters of each fiscal year, there is no performance measure data available until the fourth quarter. Reporting for all performance measures for the River Compacts will be included in the fourth quarter performance measure report.

## Historically Underutilized Business Program

---

**Output Measure 01:**

**Percentage of Professional Services Going to Historically Underutilized Businesses**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	18.1%	34.87%	192.65%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	18.1%		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	18.1%		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	18.1%		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	18.1%	34.87%	192.65%

**Variance Explanation:**

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the Percent of Professional Services Going to Historically Underutilized Businesses (HUBs) was above projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. The agency has ensured that prime contractors fully comply with their HUB subcontracting goals.

**Output Measure 02:**

**Percentage of Other Services Awarded to Historically Underutilized Businesses**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	33%	25.10%	76.06%
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	33%		0.00%
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	33%		0.00%
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>	33%		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	33%	25.10%	76.06%

**Variance Explanation:**

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the Percentage of Other Services Awarded to Historically Underutilized Businesses (HUBs) was below projections for the first quarter of FY 2008. The agency has concentrated on ensuring that HUB vendors can compete as prime contractors by encouraging participation, dividing solicitations into smaller contracts and assessing bond and insurance requirements. The TCEQ also notifies HUB vendors who can potentially perform the work for the subcontracting opportunities identified in its solicitations. The TCEQ continues to provide training opportunities to improve HUB contract monitoring.

---

## Historically Underutilized Business Program

---

### Output Measure 03:

#### Percentage of Commodity Purchasing Awarded to Historically Underutilized Businesses

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter	12.6%	37.30%	296.03%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	12.6%		0.00%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	12.6%		0.00%
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	12.6%		0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	12.6%	37.30%	296.03%

**Variance Explanation:**

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL.

Performance for the Percentage of Commodity Purchasing Awarded to Historically Underutilized Businesses (HUBs) was above projections for the second quarter of FY 2007. The TCEQ has successfully focused efforts on identifying HUB vendors in this area.