

## 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 2010  
SFR-055/10-04

# Fourth Quarter Report on Performance Measures

## Fiscal Year 2010



---

# **Fourth Quarter Report on Performance Measures Fiscal Year 2010**

Prepared by  
Chief Financial Officer Division

SFR-055/10-04  
October 2010

---



**Bryan W. Shaw, Ph.D.,** *Chairman*  
**Buddy Garcia,** *Commissioner*  
**Carlos Rubinstein,** *Commissioner*

**Mark R. Vickery, P.G.,** *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:*

***[www.tceq.state.tx.us/goto/publications](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 2010 .....	1
<b>Goal 01      Assessment, Permitting, and Prevention</b>	
Strategy 01-01-01    Air Quality Assessment and Planning.....	8
Strategy 01-01-02    Water Resource Assessment and Planning .....	15
Strategy 01-01-03    Waste Management Assessment and Planning .....	18
Strategy 01-02-01    Air Quality Permitting .....	22
Strategy 01-02-02    Water Resource Permitting .....	25
Strategy 01-02-03    Waste Management and Permitting .....	28
Strategy 01-02-04    Occupational Licensing .....	31
<b>Goal 02      Drinking Water and Water Utilities</b>	
Strategy 02-01-01    Safe Drinking Water .....	37
Strategy 02-01-02    Water Utilities Oversight.....	38
<b>Goal 03      Enforcement and Compliance Assistance</b>	
Strategy 03-01-01    Field Inspections and Complaint Response.....	44
Strategy 03-01-02    Enforcement and Compliance Support.....	49
Strategy 03-01-03    Pollution Prevention and Recycling .....	52
<b>Goal 04      Pollution Cleanup</b>	
Strategy 04-01-01    Storage Tank Administration and Cleanup .....	58
Strategy 04-01-02    Hazardous Materials Cleanup .....	62
<b>Goal 05      River Compact Commissions .....</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>Goal          Historically Underutilized Businesses</b>	
Historically Underutilized Businesses .....	70



---

# Strategic Planning Structure

## Fiscal Year 2010

### Goal 01 — ASSESSMENT, PLANNING, AND PERMITTING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Goal 02 — DRINKING WATER AND WATER UTILITIES

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

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

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

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

---

## Goal 03 — ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE

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

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

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

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

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

## Goal 04 — POLLUTION CLEANUP

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

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

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

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

## Goal 05 — TEXAS RIVER COMPACTS

Ensure the delivery of Texas' equitable share of water.

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

## Goal — HISTORICALLY UNDERUTILIZED BUSINESS PROGRAM

To establish and carry out policies and practices governing purchasing and public works contracts that foster meaningful and substantive inclusion of historically underutilized businesses (HUBs). The agency strives to conduct a good faith effort program that will encourage inclusion of HUBs in all purchasing and procurement opportunities as set forth by 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
<b>Total Performance</b>	6.00%	9.48%	158.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Annual Percent of Stationary and Mobile Source Pollution Reductions in Non-Attainment areas is above projections for FY 2010. This measure compares the percent change in volatile organic compounds and nitrogen oxides emitted in ozone nonattainment areas from point, area, on-road mobile, and non-road mobile sources. Factors contributing to reductions in emissions are: fleet turnover; scheduled implementation of rules; and a downturn in the types of economic activity that produces emissions. From an air quality perspective, the desired performance for this measure is to be above the projected target. The performance for FY 2010 is atypical, and performance in FY 2011 is expected to meet the projected target.

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	64.80	38.07	58.75%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Nitrogen Oxide Emissions Reduced through the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan (TERP) was below projections for FY 2010. This measure reports the actual tons per day (TPD) of emissions reductions as reported by grantees for projects in effect in FY 2010. Approximately 65 percent of active grants have phased into the performance period and are reporting usage data. The results reported for this measure are less than the projected performance 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. Of the projects reporting usage data, the projects achieved over 94 percent of the usage and emissions reduction targets for those projects. It is also noted that this longer period for implementing the projects will help the program in the long term because the period over which the program can claim the TPD reductions will extend further into the future to meet the new State Implementation Plan (SIP) emission reduction targets under EPA's new 8-hr monitoring standards for ground-level ozone.

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

---

### Outcome Measure 03:

#### Percent of Texans Living Where the Air Meets Federal Air Quality Standards

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	37.00%	74.47%	201.27%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Percent of Texans Living Where the Air Meets Federal Air Quality Standards was higher than projected for FY 2010. This measure compares the percentage of the Texas population living in metropolitan areas that meet versus exceed federal air quality standards. Actual performance exceeded projections due to air quality improving faster than expected in some areas. During FY 2010, the ozone design value in the Houston-Galveston-Brazoria area met federal standards, leaving only the Dallas-Fort Worth area not measuring attainment of the federal ozone standard. Performance above the projected level is desirable for this measure.

### Outcome Measure 04:

#### Annual Percent Reduction in Pollution from Permitted Wastewater Facilities Discharging to the Waters of the State (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	0.10%	0.52%	520.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Annual Percent Reduction in Pollution from Permitted Wastewater Facilities Discharging to the Waters of the State was above projections for FY 2010. This measure reflects the reduction in the pollution load from all facilities discharging to the waters of the state. Performance was better due to a 30%-50% reduction in organic loading from multiple municipal wastewater treatment plants in the Houston ship channel. Additionally, revised dissolved oxygen modeling protocols have been established for discharges to sensitive water bodies that have resulted in more stringent water quality effluent limitations. As TCEQ continues to issue permits in FY 2011 for this region of the state and utilize revised modeling protocols, similar types of reductions are anticipated. However, over the long term lower reductions which are more in line with the projected target are anticipated.

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

---

### Outcome Measure 05:

#### Percent of Texas Surface Waters Meeting or Exceeding Water Quality Standards (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	65.00%	63.20%	97.23%

**Variance Explanation:**

MEETS PROJECTIONS

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

### Outcome Measure 06:

#### Annual Percent of Solid Waste Diverted from Municipal Solid Waste Facilities

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	8.00%	4.09%	51.13%

**Variance Explanation:**

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the Annual Percent of Solid Waste Diverted from Municipal Solid Waste Facilities was below projections for FY 2010. This measure provides a general indicator of the effectiveness of statewide solid waste diversion and planning efforts. Cities have established more aggressive programs to divert waste, such as yard waste, before it reaches a landfill. Data for this measure is taken from landfill reports. These reports do not include waste diverted prior to reaching a landfill.

### Outcome Measure 07:

#### Annual Percent Decrease in the Toxic Releases in Texas (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	2.00%	9.45%	472.50%

**Variance Explanation:**

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the Annual Percent Decrease in the Toxic Releases in Texas was above projections for FY 2010. This measure compares the most current year reported and the previous year reported for the total on-site releases of the core 1988 chemicals released from all industries located in Texas subject to the Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) reporting requirements. In comparison to the previous TRI reporting year, there was a significant reduction in air emission releases which caused performance to be above the projected target. In FY 2011 the target projected for this measure is expected to be met.

**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
<b>Total Performance</b>	-2.00%	2.46%	-123.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Annual Percent Decrease in the Amount of Municipal Solid Waste Going into Texas Landfills was above projections for FY 2010. This measure reflects conservation efforts to reduce the amount of solid waste going into Texas landfills. The projection anticipated a 2% increase in the amount of waste, but the data indicates a 2.46% decrease in the amount of waste. The reduction in the amount of waste is a result of the economic downturn, the positive impact of waste reduction/recycling campaigns, and the effect of ongoing public education efforts. Continuing population increases dictate that the amount of municipal solid waste will continue to increase, but it should continue to increase at a lower rate due to the downturn in the economy. A reasonable projected performance for this measure in FY 2011 is -2%.

**Outcome Measure 09:**

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	15%	0%	0.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Percent of TERP Grants Derived from NTRD Technologies was below projections for FY 2010. This measure shows the percent of the total dollar amount of TERP grants derived from grants of the NTRD program. To date, no TERP grants have been derived from NTRD funded technologies. The implementation of the NTRD program was transferred by HB 1796, 81st Legislature, Regular Session, back to the TCEQ after being managed by the Texas Environmental Research Consortium (TERC) for the last four years. Six TCEQ grant funded technologies and two TERC technologies have been certified/verified by the EPA or the California Air Resources Board (CARB). The NTRD funded technologies certified/verified to date have specialized markets and are moving toward acceptance in those markets. The TCEQ anticipates that the NTRD funded railroad technologies that have been certified/verified are the most likely to be commercially implemented in the near future.

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

---

**Outcome Measure 10:**

**Percent of High and Significant Hazard Dams Inspected within Established Timeframes**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>Total Performance</b>	85.00%	81.00%	95.29%

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

**Outcome Measure 11:**

**Number of acres of Habitats Created, Restored, and Protected through Implementation of Estuary Action Plans**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>Total Performance</b>	2,000	1,332	66.60%

**Variance Explanation:**  
 BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL  
 Performance for the Number of Acres of Habitat Created, Restored, and Protected was below projections for FY 2010. This measure reports the number of acres of habitat created, restored, and/or protected through implementation of Galveston Estuary Bay Program (GBEP) and Coastal Bend Bay Estuary Program (CBBEP) estuary action plans. Many of the projects scheduled for FY2010 were to be funded through grant funds provided by entities other than TCEQ. While these funds have been awarded they have either not been received or disbursed to the projects. As a result several projects have been delayed which were due to be executed and completed in FY2010.

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

---

### Output Measure 01:

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	575	603	26.22%
2nd Quarter	575	26	1.13%
3rd Quarter	575	731	31.78%
4th Quarter	575	906	39.39%
<b>Total Performance</b>	2,300	2,266	98.52%

**Variance Explanation:**

MEETS PROJECTIONS  
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

### Output Measure 02:

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	625	680	27.20%
2nd Quarter	625	627	25.08%
3rd Quarter	625	674	26.96%
4th Quarter	625	616	24.64%
<b>Total Performance</b>	2,500	2,597	103.88%

**Variance Explanation:**

MEETS PROJECTIONS  
Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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

---

### Output Measure 03:

#### Number of Mobile Source On-Road Air Quality Assessments (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	375.00	168	11.20%
2nd Quarter	375.00	156	10.40%
3rd Quarter	375.00	1,767	117.80%
4th Quarter	375.00	846	56.40%
<b>Total Performance</b>	1,500	2,937	195.80%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Mobile Source On-Road Air Quality Assessments is above projections for FY 2010. This measure depicts the number of on-road mobile source/transportation related scenarios evaluated by the Air Quality Division. During both the third and fourth quarters, the on-road mobile source staff performed both routine tasks and work tasks related to the possible designation of new ozone nonattainment counties based on proposed revisions to the eight-hour ozone standard. The number of scenarios required to provide planning information for the possible new nonattainment areas was not anticipated for this measure, and the quarterly variance is atypical.

### Output Measure 04:

#### Number of Non-Road Mobile Source Air Quality Assessments

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	516.50	1,108	53.63%
2nd Quarter	516.50	770	37.27%
3rd Quarter	516.50	183	8.86%
4th Quarter	516.50	849	41.09%
<b>Total Performance</b>	2,066	2,910	140.85%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Non-Road Mobile Source Air Quality Assessments is above projected levels for FY 2010. This measure reflects the number of non-road mobile source emissions inventories developed at the county level for SIP development and other analyses. The annual performance exceeded projected levels due to additional emissions inventories developed during the first quarter for the upcoming Dallas-Fort Worth Rate of Further Progress SIP and the Houston-Galveston-Brazoria Attainment Demonstration SIP. In the fourth quarter, the non-road mobile source staff did additional assessments regarding the possible designation of new ozone nonattainment counties because of proposed revisions to the eight-hour ozone standard. The number of scenarios required to provide planning information for the possible new nonattainment areas was not anticipated, and FY 2010 performance is atypical for this measure. For FY 2011, the projected target is expected to be met.

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

---

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	630	604	95.87%
2nd Quarter	630	600	95.24%
3rd Quarter	630	607	96.35%
4th Quarter	630	610	96.83%
<b>Total Performance</b>	630	610	96.83%

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

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	3,700.75	4,775	32.26%
2nd Quarter	3,700.75	904	6.11%
3rd Quarter	3,700.75	974	6.58%
4th Quarter	3,700.75	87	0.59%
<b>Total Performance</b>	14,803	6,740	45.53%

**Variance Explanation:**  
BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL  
The Tons of NOx Reduced through the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan (TERP) was below projections for FY 2010. This measure shows the amount of NOx emissions projected to be reduced through projects funded by TERP incentive grants. Grant application periods do not conform to a quarterly schedule and the amount of funding awarded each quarter and the resulting NOx reductions do not always coincide with quarterly or yearly projections. For FY 2010, the agency was appropriated \$111 million for these grants, but the TERP budget was reduced by \$21.5 million as part of the agency's 5 percent budget reduction. The agency also received a federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) grant totaling an additional \$13 million. Grants awarded in FY 2010 totaled \$65 million, which was approximately 63 percent of the budgeted grant funds. The TERP Incentive Grants Program application period closed in the fourth quarter, and grants from that solicitation will be awarded in FY 2011. The unobligated FY 2010 funds will be carried forward to FY 2011, which will result in a higher than projected performance in FY 2011.

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

---

### Output Measure 07:

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	4,250	6,131	36.06%
2nd Quarter	4,250	4,133	24.31%
3rd Quarter	4,250	4,887	28.75%
4th Quarter	4,250	4,830	27.41%
<b>Total Performance</b>	17,000	19,981	117.54%

#### **Variance Explanation:**

##### ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the Number of Vehicles Repaired or Replaced through LIRAP is above projections at the end of FY 2010. This measure determines the number of vehicle repairs and replacements that have taken place in the five county Houston/Galveston/Brazoria HGB) area, nine county Dallas-Fort Worth (DFW) area, and the two county Austin area. In FY 2010, the Dallas-Fort Worth area repaired or retired 10,112 vehicles. The Houston-Galveston-Brazoria area repaired or retired 8,542 vehicles. The Central Texas area repaired or retired 1,327 vehicles. Annual performance exceeded projections primarily because of first quarter activity where a large number of valid vouchers from FY 2009 were redeemed in FY 2010.

### Output Measure 08:

#### Number of New Technology Grants Approved to Fund Technologies to be Submitted for Verification or Certification by the EPA or CARB

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	2	0	0.00%
2nd Quarter	2	0	0.00%
3rd Quarter	2	0	0.00%
4th Quarter	2	2	25.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	8	2	25.00%

#### **Variance Explanation:**

##### BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the Number of New Technology Grant Proposals Reviewed is below projections for FY 2010. The implementation of the NTRD program was transferred by HB 1796, 81st Legislature, Regular Session, back to the TCEQ after being managed by the Texas Environmental Research Consortium (TERC) for the last four years. The TCEQ opened and closed a grant solicitation during the third quarter of FY 2010 with grant awards made during the fourth quarter. During this solicitation, only two eligible applications were submitted for certification/verification and both received awards.

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

---

### Efficiency Measure 01:

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	94%	95%	101.06%
2nd Quarter	94%	94%	100.00%
3rd Quarter	94%	94%	100.00%
4th Quarter	94%	94%	100.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	94%	94%	100.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

**MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

### Efficiency Measure 02:

#### Average Cost per Air Quality Assessment

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	\$ 286	\$ 208	72.73%
2nd Quarter	\$ 286	\$ 365	127.62%
3rd Quarter	\$ 286	\$ 178	62.24%
4th Quarter	\$ 286	\$ 184	64.34%
<b>Total Performance</b>	\$ 286	\$ 233.75	81.73%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Average Cost Per Air Quality Assessment was below projections on an annual basis at the end of the fourth quarter for FY 2010. This measure accounts for the funds expended on salaries and other operating expenses related to staff work on air quality assessments. The number of air quality assessments completed year to date is higher than projected resulting in a lower cost per assessment for the year.

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

---

**Efficiency Measure 03:**

**Average Cost of LIRAP Vehicle Emissions Repairs/Retrofits (Key)**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1st Quarter</b>	\$ 525	\$ 511.48	97.42%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	\$ 525	\$ 529.90	100.93%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	\$ 525	\$ 526.29	100.25%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	\$ 525	\$ 526.05	100.20%
<b>Total Performance</b>	\$ 525	\$ 523.64	99.74%

**Variance Explanation:**

**MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Efficiency Measure 04:**

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

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1st Quarter</b>	\$ 7,500	\$ 9,089	121.19%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	\$ 7,500	\$ 9,435	125.80%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	\$ 7,500	\$ 9,611	128.15%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	\$ 7,500	\$ 9,916	132.21%
<b>Total Performance</b>	\$ 7,500	\$ 9,222.01	122.96%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Average Cost Per Ton of NOx Reduced through the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan (TERP) is above projections at the end of FY 2010. The majority of grant awards in FY 2010 have been under the TERP Rebate Grants Program. These grants are not competitive and usually have a higher average cost per ton than the other TERP grants. TERP Emissions Reduction Incentive Grant (ERIG) applications were accepted in the fourth quarter of FY 2010, but awards for these grants will be made in FY 2011. These grants are awarded on a competitive basis, and the average cost per ton of NOx reduction is lower than in TERP rebate grants. Therefore, FY 2011 performance is expected to be at or below projected average cost.

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

---

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	32	14	43.75%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Days Ozone Exceedances are Recorded in Texas was lower than projected. During FY 2010, ozone levels across the state were substantially lower than in previous years, resulting in fewer days exceeding the Federal ozone standard. Favorable factors contributing to fewer days of ozone exceedance in FY 2010 are reduced emissions of ozone precursors in nonattainment areas and meteorological conditions. Performance below projected levels is desirable for this measure.

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

---

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	17.50	2	2.86%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	17.50	2	2.86%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	17.50	14	20.00%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	17.50	31	44.29%
<b>Total Performance</b>	70	49	70.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Surface Water Assessments was below projections for FY 2010. This measure quantifies a number of surface water quality assessment activities of the agency. Assessment of water quality is essential to the identification of impaired water bodies, development of water quality standards, development of effluent standards for discharges, and development of watershed restoration and implementation strategies. In general, water quality assessment activities are scheduled for completion late in the fiscal year after they have been planned and coordinated and/or field sampling has been completed. Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) projects have required more coordination with other state agencies and stakeholder groups than anticipated. This has led to delays in completion of some TMDL projects.

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	15	6	10.00%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	15	11	18.33%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	15	10	16.67%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	15	33	55.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	60	60	100.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

**MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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

---

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	182.5	159	21.78%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	182.5	183	25.07%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	182.5	343	46.99%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	182.5	570	78.08%
<b>Total Performance</b>	730	1,255	171.92%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Dam Safety Assessments was above projections as of the fourth quarter of FY 2010. This measure includes on-site inspections as well as in-house review of plans and specifications for dams, spillway adequacies, breach analyses, emergency action plans, engineering reports and water use permit applications involving dams. In the third and fourth quarters of FY 2010, the Dam Safety Program conducted a large number of reviews of emergency action plans due to new rule requirements and had a large number of contractor reports completed. The Dam Safety Program also completed a large number of inspections in the fourth quarter, and annual performance exceeded projections.

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	\$ 1,200	\$2,492	207.69%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	\$ 1,200	\$2,382	198.54%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	\$ 1,200	\$1,354	112.83%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	\$ 1,200	\$1,576	131.30%
<b>Total Performance</b>	\$ 1,200	\$1,763	146.95%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Average Cost Per Dam Safety Assessment was above projections for FY 2010. This measure reports the average cost for each dam safety assessment performed by TCEQ staff. New staff continued to be added to the program during FY 2010. The increased salary expenditures, combined with the time needed for staff to be trained and become proficient has resulted in a higher cost per assessment.

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

---

### Explanatory Measure 01:

#### Percent of Texas' Rivers, Streams, Wetlands and Bays Protected by Site-Specific Water Quality Standards

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	36%	35.70%	99.17%

**Variance Explanation:**

MEETS PROJECTIONS

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

### Explanatory Measure 02:

#### Percentage of Surface Water Impairments that are Addressed Within 13 Years of Impairment Listing

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	93%	68.00%	73.12%

**Variance Explanation:**

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the Percentage of Surface Water Impairments that are Addressed Within 13 Years of Impairment Listing was below projected levels for FY 2010. This measure reports the percentage of surface water impairments that are addressed within 13 years of impairment listing, which is the Environmental Protection Agency's benchmark for completion. The number of surface water impairments is re-evaluated every two years. Reporting for FY 2010 is based on the 1997 impairment listing. Additional impairments have been identified as a result of the re-evaluation, and staff resources were allocated to address the most severe surface water impairments. The re-evaluation and prioritization of impairments has resulted in the performance for this measure, which uses the 1997 listing, being below target.

### Explanatory Measure 03:

#### Number of Dams in the Texas Dam Inventory

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	7,626	7,298	95.70%

**Variance Explanation:**

MEETS PROJECTIONS

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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

---

### Output Measure 01:

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	62.50	0	0.00%
2nd Quarter	62.50	0	0.00%
3rd Quarter	62.50	212	84.80%
4th Quarter	62.50	5	2.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	250	217	86.80%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Municipal Solid Waste Facility Capacity Assessments was below projections for FY 2010. This measure quantifies the number of MSW Annual Facility Capacity Assessment Reports reviewed by staff. All 217 reports received have been scanned, entered, and reviewed. As anticipated in the third quarter, the number of reports received fell below the projected target for the year due to the fact that this year post-active or closed landfills were not required to send reports.

### Efficiency Measure 01:

#### Average Number of Hours Spent Per Municipal Solid Waste Facility Capacity Assessment

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	2.3	0	0.00%
2nd Quarter	2.3	0.4	17.39%
3rd Quarter	2.3	0.6	26.09%
4th Quarter	2.3	0.7	30.43%
<b>Total Performance</b>	2.3	0.7	30.43%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Average Number of Hours Spent per Municipal Solid Waste Facility Capacity Assessment is below the projection for FY 2010. This measure quantifies the time spent reviewing annual reports from landfills. The responsibility for reviewing and processing the Facility Capacity Assessment reports were assigned to new staff that developed a new system to streamline the process. Reviews of all Facility Capacity Assessment reports were completed in the fourth quarter. The desired performance for this measure is to be below the projected target.

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

---

### Explanatory Measure 01:

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	22.0	23.0	104.55%

**Variance Explanation:**

MEETS PROJECTIONS

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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

---

**Outcome Measure 01:**

**Percent of Air Quality Permit Applications Reviewed within Established Time Frames**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	90.00%	85.40%	94.89%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for The Percent of Air Quality Permit Applications Reviewed within Established Time Frames was below the projected level at the end of FY 2010. This measure indicates the extent to which the Air Permits Division reviews air quality permit applications within established time frames. The reported variance is attributable to changes to state air quality rules, changes to federal air permitting rules, new federal standards, and uncertainty of Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) decisions regarding air permitting activities. These factors increased the complexity of projects and the amount of time needed to complete the associated technical reviews.

**Outcome Measure 02:**

**Percent of Water Quality Permit Applications Reviewed within Established Time Frames**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	90.00%	85.70%	95.22%

**Variance Explanation:**

**MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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

---

**Outcome Measure 03:**

**Percent of Water Rights Permit Applications Reviewed within Established Time Frames**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>Total Performance</b>	86.00%	69.00%	80.23%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Percent of Water Rights Permit Applications Reviewed within Established Timeframes was below target for FY 2010. This measure tracks the percent of water rights permits that were reviewed within the established 300-day time frame. Performance for this measure was below projections for the year due to the increasingly complex nature of water rights permitting applications. More applications require complex accounting plans which must be reviewed and approved by staff. A Supreme Court decision on the application for the City of Marshall resulted in extended review times and required the development and implementation of a new process to determine notice requirements for water rights applications. Permitting staff have also been involved in complex rulemaking and stakeholder processes during FY 2010.

**Outcome Measure 04:**

**Percent of Waste Management Permit Applications Reviewed within Established Time Frames**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>Total Performance</b>	90.00%	90.10%	100.11%

**Variance Explanation:**

**MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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

---

### Output Measure 01:

#### Number of State and Federal New Source Review Air Quality Permit Applications Reviewed (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	1,400	1,053	18.80%
2nd Quarter	1,400	964	17.21%
3rd Quarter	1,400	1,183	21.13%
4th Quarter	1,400	1,363	24.34%
<b>Total Performance</b>	<b>5,600</b>	<b>4,563</b>	<b>81.48%</b>

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of State and Federal New Source Air Quality Permit Applications Reviewed was below projections for FY 2010. 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 majority of New Source Review applications require complex analysis and more time to perform necessary technical reviews than in the past to ensure no adverse impacts to public health and/or the environment and related permitting and compliance issues. The economic environment and uncertainty of Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) decisions regarding air permitting activities may influence performance for this measure in FY 2011.

### Output Measure 02:

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	200	258	32.25%
2nd Quarter	200	212	26.50%
3rd Quarter	200	162	20.25%
4th Quarter	200	215	26.88%
<b>Total Performance</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>847</b>	<b>105.88%</b>

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Federal Air Quality Operating Permits Reviewed was above projections for FY 2010. This measure quantifies the permitting workload of the Air Permits Division staff assigned to review federal operating permit applications. The reported variance is attributable to a high number of Site Operating Permit Renewals that were completed.

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

---

### Output Measure 03:

#### Number of Emissions Banking and Trading Transaction (EBT) Applications Reviewed

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	250	224	22.40%
2nd Quarter	250	320	32.00%
3rd Quarter	250	490	49.00%
4th Quarter	250	403	40.30%
<b>Total Performance</b>	1,000	1,437	143.70%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Emissions Banking and Trading (EBT) Applications Reviewed is above projections for FY 2010. This measure quantifies the workload of the Air Quality Division staff assigned to review EBT applications. Performance is above projections due to increased market activity resulting from new emission specifications, increased rule applicability and program awareness, and the costs of alternatives.

### Explanatory Measure 01:

#### Number of State and Federal New Source Review Air Quality Permits Issued

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	4,850	4,005	82.58%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of State and Federal New Source Review Air Quality Permit Applications Reviewed was below projections for FY 2010. This measure reports the number of state and federal new source review permits issued under the Texas Clean Air Act and Title I of the Federal Clean Air Act. The reported variance is attributable to changes to state air quality rules, changes to federal air permitting rules, new federal standards, and uncertainty of Environmental Protection Agency decisions regarding air permitting activities. These factors increased the complexity of projects received and the amount of time needed to complete associated technical reviews.

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

---

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	650	500	76.92%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Federal Air Quality Permits Issued was below projections for FY 2010. This measure reports the number of federal air quality permits issued under Title V of the Federal Clean Air Act. The reported variance is attributable to changes to state air quality rules, changes to federal air permitting rules, new federal standards, and uncertainty of Environmental Protection Agency decisions regarding air permitting activities. These factors increased the complexity of projects received and the amount of time needed to complete associated technical reviews.

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

---

### Output Measure 01:

#### Number of Applications to Address Water Quality Impacts Applications Reviewed (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	4,746.00	1,796	9.46%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	4,746.00	2,087	10.99%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	4,746.00	2,309	12.16%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	4,746.00	2,748	14.48%
<b>Total Performance</b>	18,984	8,940	47.09%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Applications to Address Water Quality Impacts Applications Reviewed was below projections for FY 2010. This measure reflects agency workload with regard to the review of water quality permit applications. The number of notice of intents (NOIs) for authorization under TCEQ's storm water construction general permit is below historically experienced levels. TCEQ believes this is a reflection of the current economic environment where new construction projects are being initiated at lower frequencies. Submittal rates for FY 2011 are anticipated to be below projections for the same reason.

### Output Measure 02:

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	148.75	133	22.35%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	148.75	189	31.76%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	148.75	248	41.68%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	148.75	184	30.92%
<b>Total Performance</b>	595	754	126.72%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Applications to Address Water Rights Impacts Reviewed was above projections as of the fourth quarter of FY 2010. This measure reflects agency workload with regard to the review of water rights permit applications. During the third and fourth quarters, the number of temporary water rights applications reviewed increased due to oil and gas related activities in the Dallas-Fort Worth and Tyler regions. Temporary water rights allow surface water to be used for hydraulic fracturing.

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

---

### Output Measure 03:

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	223.3	377	42.22%
2nd Quarter	223.3	188	21.05%
3rd Quarter	223.3	14	1.57%
4th Quarter	223.3	18	2.02%
<b>Total Performance</b>	893	597	66.85%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO) Authorizations Reviewed was below projections for FY 2010. This measure counts the number of concentrated animal feeding operation (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 TCEQ believes the current economic climate has impacted the CAFO industry, and fewer new CAFOs are seeking authorization. Existing CAFOs are seeking fewer authorizations for expansion or changes in ownership as well.

### Explanatory Measure 01:

#### Number of Water Quality Permits Issued

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	900	817	90.78%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Water Quality Permits Issued was below projections for FY 2010. This measure counts the number of TPDES and state authorizations issued for the fiscal year (FY) which are processed through the Chief Clerk's Office. Fewer concentrated animal feeding operation (CAFO) permits have been processed this year due to the impact of the current economic climate on the industry. There are fewer new and existing CAFOs seeking authorization.

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

---

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	100	78	78.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Water Rights Permits Issued was below target for FY 2010. This measure tracks the number of water rights permit applications that were recommended for issuance and granted. Performance for this measure was below projections for the year due to the increasingly complex nature of water rights applications. As permit holders seek authorization for reuse of water and as the provisions of SB 3, 81<sup>st</sup> Legislature, R.S. concerning environmental flows are implemented, the complexity of these applications may increase the difficulty of reaching the projected target in FY 2011.

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

---

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	142.50	135	23.68%
2nd Quarter	142.50	145	25.44%
3rd Quarter	142.50	153	26.84%
4th Quarter	142.50	138	24.21%
<b>Total Performance</b>	570	571	100.18%

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

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	59	<b>94</b>	39.83%
2nd Quarter	59	<b>76</b>	32.20%
3rd Quarter	59	<b>101</b>	42.80%
4th Quarter	59	78	33.05%
<b>Total Performance</b>	236	349	147.88%

**Variance Explanation:**  
ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL  
The Number of Non-Hazardous Waste Permit Applications Reviewed is above projections for FY 2010. This measure quantifies the number of permit and registration applications reviewed and recommended by TCEQ staff. Increased performance is attributed to the completion of a backlog of groundwater monitoring well spacing permit modifications received in FY 2009, as well as the completion of permit modifications received as a result of the final call-in of Site Operating Plan modifications for Arid Exempt landfills.

Note: Previously reported performance was as follows:  
1<sup>st</sup> Quarter = 82, 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter = 52, 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter = 89  
A year end data cleanup identified additional applications that were reviewed.  
Previously reported data is corrected as shown above.

**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>1st Quarter</b>	40	49	30.62%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	40	39	24.38%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	40	43	26.88%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	40	69	43.13%
<b>Total Performance</b>	160	200	125.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Hazardous Waste Permit Applications Reviewed was above projections for FY 2010. This measure quantifies the number of hazardous waste and underground injection control permits and registration applications reviewed. Performance is attributed to the large number of minor permit modifications received and processed. These modifications reflect requests for authorization made by the regulated community in response to changing business needs (updated contingency plans, addresses, contact information, etc.). These requests are difficult to anticipate and project.

**Explanatory Measure 01:**

**Number of Non-Hazardous Waste Permits issued**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>Total Performance</b>	236	334.0	141.53%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Non-Hazardous Waste Permits Issued is above projected levels for FY 2010. Increased performance is attributed to the completion of a backlog of groundwater monitoring well spacing permit modifications received in FY 2009, as well as the completion of permit modifications received as a result of the final call-in of Site Operating Plan modifications for Arid Exempt facilities.

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

---

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	160	227.0	141.88%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Hazardous Waste Permits Issued was above projections for FY 2010. This measure quantifies the number of hazardous waste and underground injection control permits and registration applications reviewed. Increased performance is attributed to the large number of minor permit modifications received and processed. These modifications reflect requests for authorization made by the regulated community in response to changing business needs (for example updating contingency plans, addresses, contact information, etc.). These requests are difficult to anticipate and project.

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	3	3	100.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

**MEETS PROJECTIONS**

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	5,875	5,458	23.23%
2nd Quarter	5,875	4,966	21.13%
3rd Quarter	5,875	5,572	23.71%
4th Quarter	5,875	5,470	23.28%
<b>Total Performance</b>	<b>23,500</b>	<b>21,466</b>	<b>91.34%</b>

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Applications for Occupational Licensing was below projections as of the fourth quarter of FY 2010. This measure reports the number of occupational license and registration applications received by the Occupational Licensing Section. The lower number of applications received can be attributed to several of the licenses which previously had a two year validity period being changed to a three validity period. This change was a part of the rule revisions adopted in August 2007. Because of this rule change there are very few renewal applications for the Irrigators and On-Site Sewage Facility Installer licenses for 2010.

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	3,050	2,826	23.16%
2nd Quarter	3,050	3,224	26.43%
3rd Quarter	3,050	3,137	25.71%
4th Quarter	3,050	3,306	27.10%
<b>Total Performance</b>	<b>12,200</b>	<b>12,493</b>	<b>102.40%</b>

**Variance Explanation:**

**MEETS PROJECTIONS**

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	5,625	5,073	22.55%
2nd Quarter	5,625	4,170	18.53%
3rd Quarter	5,625	4,497	19.99%
4th Quarter	5,625	4,313	19.17%
<b>Total Performance</b>	<b>22,500</b>	<b>18,053</b>	<b>80.24%</b>

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Licenses and Registrations Issued was below projections as of the fourth quarter of FY 2010. This measure reports the number of Occupational Licenses and Registrations issued by the Occupational Licensing Section. Recent rule revisions have changed several of the licenses from a two year validity period to a three year validity period. Because of this rule change, there are fewer license renewals for the Irrigators and On-Site Sewage Facility Installers in FY 2010.

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	\$ 18	\$ 21.23	117.94%
2nd Quarter	\$ 18	\$ 17.80	98.89%
3rd Quarter	\$ 18	\$ 17.77	98.72%
4th Quarter	\$ 18	\$ 17.47	97.06%
<b>Total Performance</b>	<b>\$ 18</b>	<b>\$ 17.47</b>	<b>97.06%</b>

**Variance Explanation:**

**MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

## Strategy 01-02-04: Occupational Licensing

---

### Explanatory Measure 01:

#### Number of TCEQ Licensed Environmental Professionals and Registered Companies

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	52,000	54,985	105.74%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of TCEQ Licensed Environmental Professionals and Registered Companies exceeded projections for FY 2010.

This measure reports the number of individuals and entities holding licenses and registrations issued by the Occupational Licensing Section.

Recent rule revisions created two new licenses in the landscape irrigation program (Irrigation Inspectors and Irrigation Technicians). The addition of these two license types caused the total number of licensed individuals to increase more than the projected target.

## Goal 01-03: Assessment, Planning, and Permitting

---

**Outcome Measure 01:  
Percent of Scheduled Licensing Activities Complete**

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

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

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

---

**Outcome Measure 01:**

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	91.00%	95.90%	105.38%

**Variance Explanation:**

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

The Percent of Texas Population Served by Public Water Systems Which Meet Drinking Water Standards was above the projected level for FY 2010. This measure reports the percent population served by all public water systems which have not had maximum contaminant level (MCL) or micro violations. Performance is above projections due to a higher compliance rate with the Disinfection By-Product Rule and the Total Coliform Rule.

**Outcome Measure 02:**

**Percent of Texas Public Water Systems Protected by a Source Water Protection Program**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	95.00%	98.27%	103.44%

**Variance Explanation:**

MEETS PROJECTIONS

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

---

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

---

**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**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>Total Performance</b>	95.00%	92.42%	97.28%

**Variance Explanation:**

MEETS PROJECTIONS

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
1st Quarter	6,300	6,520	103.49%
2nd Quarter	6,300	6,585	104.52%
3rd Quarter	6,300	6,573	104.33%
4th Quarter	6,300	6,524	103.56%
<b>Total Performance</b>	6,300	6,524	103.56%

**Variance Explanation:**

MEETS PROJECTIONS

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

### Output Measure 02:

#### Number of Drinking Water Samples Collected (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	9,800.00	9,251	23.60%
2nd Quarter	9,800.00	9,163	23.38%
3rd Quarter	9,800.00	10,113	25.80%
4th Quarter	9,800.00	14,051	35.84%
<b>Total Performance</b>	39,200	42,578	108.62%

**Variance Explanation:**

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for The Number of Drinking Water Samples Collected was above the projected level for FY 2010. The variance in the number of chemical samples collected resulted from increased sampling required by the federal Stage 2 Disinfections Byproduct Rule. This rule requires quarterly sampling for a 12 month period. These additional sampling requirements have been staggered over the last three years based on system size. The last group of water systems completed sampling in FY 2010, and the number of samples required for FY 2011 is expected to return to normal levels.

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

---

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	20	21	26.25%
2nd Quarter	20	43	53.75%
3rd Quarter	20	36	45.00%
4th Quarter	20	29	36.25%
<b>Total Performance</b>	80	129	161.25%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for the Number of Utility Rate Reviews Performed is higher than expected for FY 2010. This measure reflects the number of applications received and processed by agency staff and either approved, dismissed, withdrawn, or referred to legal staff as a contested matter during the reporting period. The number of rate and tariff change applications filed by water and/or sewer utilities increased in FY 2010. This may be partially attributed to economic factors involving increased costs of running a business. As the cost of service for water and/or sewer utilities increases, the need for utilities to increase their rates also increases, which in turn, increases the number of reviews staff must perform.

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	137.5	189	34.36%
2nd Quarter	137.5	119	21.64%
3rd Quarter	137.5	124	22.55%
4th Quarter	137.5	161	29.27%
<b>Total Performance</b>	550	593	107.82%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for The Number of District Applications Processed was above the projected level for FY 2010. This measure represents the number of Water District applications submitted for Commission approval. Performance is above projections due to the low interest rates available in the current economic climate. This has resulted in a push by developers and districts to fund infrastructure projects.

## 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	53	23.56%
2nd Quarter	56.25	57	25.33%
3rd Quarter	56.25	66	29.33%
4th Quarter	56.25	54	24.00%
Total Performance	225	230	102.22%

**Variance Explanation:**

MEETS PROJECTIONS

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
<b>Total Performance</b>	98.00%	96.93%	98.91%

**Variance Explanation:**

MEETS PROJECTIONS

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

### Outcome Measure 02:

#### Percent of Inspected or Investigated Water Sites and Facilities in Compliance (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	97.00%	98.88%	101.94%

**Variance Explanation:**

MEETS PROJECTIONS

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

### Outcome Measure 03:

#### Percent of Inspected or Investigated Waste Sites in Compliance (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	97.00%	92.48%	95.34%

**Variance Explanation:**

MEETS PROJECTIONS

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

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

---

**Outcome Measure 04:**

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	85.00%	88.40%	104.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

MEETS PROJECTIONS

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Outcome Measure 05:**

**Percent of Investigated Occupational Licensees in Compliance**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	82.00%	54.46%	66.41%

**Variance Explanation:**

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the Percent of Investigated Occupational Licensees in Compliance was below projections for FY 2010. This measure determines the percentage of investigated licenses that were not found to have significant violations. There were a significant number of complaints investigated against occupational licensees and also individuals operating without occupational licenses in this fiscal year which resulted in lower rates of compliance. This trend is expected to continue in the future.

## Goal 03-01: Enforcement and Compliance Assistance

---

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	85.00%	76.16%	89.60%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for the Percent of Administrative Orders Settled was below projections for FY2010. This measure reflects a percentage of the enforcement orders issued during a fiscal year that were settled by the Enforcement Division without litigation. In FY 2010, the agency continued to focus resources on reducing the number of backlog cases in litigation. This increase in the number of litigation cases resulted in a slightly lower number of orders settled by the Enforcement Division and issued by the commission. This trend is expected to continue in FY 2011.

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	88.00%	81.74%	92.89%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for the Percent of Administrative Penalties Collected improved from 79.15% collected in FY 2009 but continued to be below the target for FY 2010. This trend tracks closely with the beginning of the current economic recession. The majority of unpaid penalties are owed by small businesses and individuals with underground fuel tanks or unauthorized waste sites. The current recession has eroded small business revenues and profits, and access to credit has been severely curtailed. Consequently, small businesses have prioritized the payment of operating expenses and existing debt service over the payment of administrative penalties. Through the efforts of a collection agency or the Office of the Attorney General, some delinquent administrative penalties are collected after the close of a fiscal year.

## Goal 03-01: Enforcement and Compliance Assistance

---

### Outcome Measure 08:

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	100,000	126,959	126.96%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for the Tons of Emissions and Waste Reduced and Minimized as Reported by the Regulated Community Implementing Pollution Prevention Training, Environmental Management Systems, and Other Innovative Programs was above projected levels for FY 2010. In FY 2010, additional outreach and follow up were performed to increase reporting. Generally, emissions and material use reductions tend to be initially high with declining performance in following years. Past trends indicate that future performance is expected to remain near 100,000 tons.

### Outcome Measure 09:

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	\$30,000,000	\$29,550,905	98.50%

**Variance Explanation:**

**MEETS PROJECTIONS**  
 Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

### Outcome Measure 10:

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	1,000	4,111	411.10%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for the 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 was above projected levels for FY 2010. The majority of the reduction was from a single company. Emissions and material use reductions tend to be initially high with declining performance in following years. Future performance is expected to remain near 1,000 tons.

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

---

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

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1st Quarter</b>	2,869	2,939	25.61%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	2,869	2,949	25.70%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	2,869	3,030	26.41%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	2,869	3,637	31.69%
<b>Total Performance</b>	11,475	12,555	109.41%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for the Number of Inspections and Investigations of Air Sites was above projections for FY 2010. This measure reports the number of inspections and investigations completed at regulated air sites. The increased number of inspections is attributed to the increased interest in oil & gas facilities. The agency dedicated additional staff to investigate and monitor oil & gas facilities in response to legislative and citizen concerns in the 23-county Barnett Shale area.

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

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1st Quarter</b>	8,500	6,409	18.85%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	8,500	8,049	23.67%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	8,500	9,920	29.18%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	8,500	11,520	33.88%
<b>Total Performance</b>	34,000	35,898	105.58%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 The Number of Inspections and Investigations of Water Rights Sites was above projections through the fourth quarter of FY 2010. This measure reports the number of inspections and investigations completed at regulated water rights sites. The increased number of inspections can be attributed to the fact that the irrigation season is from May - August and there are more diversions and thus more inspections occurring in the Watermaster areas.

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

---

### Output Measure 03:

#### Number of Inspections and Investigations of Water Sites and Facilities (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	2,200	2,232	25.36%
2nd Quarter	2,200	2,189	24.88%
3rd Quarter	2,200	2,320	26.36%
4th Quarter	2,200	2,652	30.14%
<b>Total Performance</b>	<b>8,800</b>	<b>9,393</b>	<b>106.74%</b>

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Number of Inspections and Investigations of Water Sites and Facilities was above projections as of the fourth quarter of FY 2010. This measure reports the number of inspections and investigations completed at regulated water sites and facilities. Extensive flooding at wastewater treatment facilities and public water systems in the Rio Grande Valley as well as a drought initiative in the Brazos River basin required staff to do more inspections than projected.

### Output Measure 04:

#### Number of Inspections and Investigations of Livestock and Poultry Operation Sites (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	100	115	28.75%
2nd Quarter	100	113	28.25%
3rd Quarter	100	103	25.75%
4th Quarter	100	105	26.25%
<b>Total Performance</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>436</b>	<b>109.00%</b>

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Inspections and Investigations of Livestock and Poultry Operation Sites exceeded the projected levels through the end of the fourth quarter of FY 2010.

There were several unplanned compliance inspections at several Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO) sites related to enforcement cases and flood related discharges in the Amarillo Region as well as compliance inspections conducted at the request of the Texas State Soil & Water Conservation Board at facilities that are no longer in business.

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

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	1,839.50	2,028	27.56%
2nd Quarter	1,839.50	1,982	26.94%
3rd Quarter	1,839.50	2,425	32.96%
4th Quarter	1,839.50	2,088	28.38%
<b>Total Performance</b>	7,358	8,523	115.83%

**Variance Explanation:**

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL  
Performance for the Number of Inspections and Investigations of Waste Sites was above projections through the fourth quarter of FY 2010. This measure represents the number of inspections and investigations of waste sites and facilities. Required investigations of Petroleum Storage Tanks (PST) sites increased in the third and fourth quarter of the fiscal year.

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	162.50	109	16.77%
2nd Quarter	162.50	117	18.00%
3rd Quarter	162.50	128	19.69%
4th Quarter	162.50	217	33.38%
<b>Total Performance</b>	650	571	87.85%

**Variance Explanation:**

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL  
Performance for the Number of Spill Cleanup Inspections is below projections at the end of FY 2010. Spill investigations are an on-demand activity and are based upon the number of spills of regulated materials reported by citizens, industry representatives, and state law enforcement officials. This number can vary widely from quarter to quarter. During this reporting period, fewer spills were reported to the agency that required investigations.

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

---

**Efficiency Measure 01:**

**Average Inspection and Investigation Cost of Livestock and Poultry Operations**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1st Quarter</b>	\$ 600	\$ 671	111.83%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	\$ 600	\$ 600	100.00%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	\$ 600	\$ 745	124.17%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	\$ 600	\$ 647	107.83%
<b>Total Performance</b>	\$ 600	\$ 664	110.67%

**Variance Explanation:**

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the Average Inspection and Investigation Cost of Livestock and Poultry Operations was above projections through the fourth quarter of FY 2010. This measure represents total funds expended during the reporting period for monitoring of livestock and poultry operations, divided by the number of compliance inspections and complaint investigations for livestock and poultry operations completed during the fiscal year. Average cost figures for the inspection and investigation of livestock and poultry operations vary considerably due to the number and complexity of investigations performed in any given quarter.

**Efficiency Measure 02:**

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

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1st Quarter</b>	35	28.0	80.00%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	35	28.0	80.00%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	35	30.0	85.71%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	35	29.0	82.86%
<b>Total Performance</b>	35	29.0	82.86%

**Variance Explanation:**

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

The Average Time (days) from Air, Water, and Waste Inspections to Report Completion was below projections for FY 2010. 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. The desired performance for this measure is to be below projections.

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

---

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	5,300	4,746.0	89.55%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for the Number of Citizen Complaints Investigations is below projections at the end of the fourth quarter for FY 2010. Citizen complaint investigations are an on-demand activity and are based upon the number of complaints received from citizens that result in investigations. This number can vary widely from quarter to quarter. During this reporting period, fewer complaints requiring investigation were received.

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	5,000	5,477.0	109.54%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for the Number of Emission Events Investigations was above projections for FY 2010. These are on-demand, statutorily required activities. The number of emissions events, which are outside of the agency's control, drives the number of investigations. More emissions events were reported than projected.

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

---

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	250	276	110.40%
2nd Quarter	250	281	112.40%
3rd Quarter	250	283	113.20%
4th Quarter	250	281	112.40%
<b>Total Performance</b>	250	281	112.40%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Environmental Laboratories Accredited was above projected levels for FY 2010. The measure reflects the number of environmental laboratories accredited according to standards adopted by the National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Conference. TCEQ received and issued additional accreditations via mutual or reciprocal recognition to out-of-state laboratories. These applications were not anticipated and were not included in the projected number of laboratory accreditations.

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	15,000	32,134	53.56%
2nd Quarter	15,000	22,283	37.14%
3rd Quarter	15,000	16,402	27.34%
4th Quarter	15,000	4,272	7.12%
<b>Total Performance</b>	60,000	75,091	125.15%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Small Businesses and Local Governments Assisted was above projections for FY 2010. 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 is above projected levels due to increased outreach to Petroleum Storage Tank facilities concerning rule changes and new compliance tools.

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

---

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

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1st Quarter</b>	70	51.0	72.86%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	70	53.0	75.71%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	70	46.0	65.71%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	70	46.0	65.71%
<b>Total Performance</b>	70	46.0	65.71%

**Variance Explanation:**  
 BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL  
 Performance for the Average Number of Days to File an Initial Settlement Offer was below projections for FY 2010. 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 processing procedures in place to ensure that all cases are processed below the average time frame. For this type of measure, performance below the target level is desirable.

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

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>Total Performance</b>	NA	\$ 11,309,521	NA

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

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

---

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	N/A	\$ 3,558,484	N/A

**Variance Explanation:**

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

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	1,000	1,640.0	164.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**  
The Number of Administrative Enforcement Orders Issued was above projections for FY 2010. This measure reflects agency efforts. However, the total number of orders issued is largely a function of the rate of significant noncompliance documented during agency investigations. Performance exceeded projections due to an increase in the number of facilities that were documented to be in significant noncompliance.

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

---

**Output Measure 01:**

**Number of On-Site Technical Assistance Visits, Audits, Presentations and Workshops on Pollution Prevention/Waste Minimization and Voluntary Program Participation**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	62.5	64	25.60%
2nd Quarter	62.5	49	19.60%
3rd Quarter	62.5	85	34.00%
4th Quarter	62.5	53	21.20%
<b>Total Performance</b>	250	251	100.40%

**Variance Explanation:**

MEETS PROJECTIONS

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Output Measure 02:**

**Number of Entities Participating in Voluntary Programs**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	240	248	103.33%
2nd Quarter	240	227	94.58%
3rd Quarter	240	226	94.17%
4th Quarter	240	227	94.58%
<b>Total Performance</b>	240	227	94.58%

**Variance Explanation:**

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the Number of Entities Participating in Voluntary Programs was below projections for FY 2010. More members than anticipated did not renew their membership or did not submit a progress report and were removed from the program. The resulting benefit to the state is that members unwilling to participate are no longer included. Increased marketing and outreach will continue in an effort to increase participation, and membership is expected to meet FY 2011 projections.

**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
<b>1st Quarter</b>	8.25	0.00	0.00%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	8.25	8.29	25.12%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	8.25	11.00	33.33%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	8.25	14.20	43.03%
<b>Total Performance</b>	33	33.49	101.48%

**Variance Explanation:**

MEETS PROJECTIONS

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Efficiency Measure 01:**

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	\$ 600	\$ 297.63	49.61%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	\$ 600	\$ 201.97	33.66%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	\$ 600	\$ 318.76	53.13%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	\$ 600	\$ 590.49	98.42%
<b>Total Performance</b>	\$ 600	\$ 354.90	59.15%

**Variance Explanation:**

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

The Average Cost Per On-Site Technical Assistance Visit was below projections for FY 2010. This measure reports the average cost of each technical site assistance visit performed by Pollution Prevention Staff. The savings are a result of more efficient use of regional staff that has resulted in more local visits, inducing fewer travel costs. Future performance is expected to remain below \$600.00.

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

---

**Explanatory Measure 01:**

**Tons of Hazardous Waste Reduced as a Result of Pollution Prevention Planning**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>Total Performance</b>	1,000,000	807,482.53	80.75%

**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 2010. 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. This number is very volatile since reductions in hazardous waste are strongly dependent on a few large reporters. Additionally, projects can take years to implement and yield reductions. Continued efforts at outreach, education and marketing the benefits of pollution prevention planning will enhance future performance.

**Explanatory Measure 02:**

**Tons of Waste Collected by Local and Regional Collection and Cleanup Events**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>Total Performance</b>	1,050	5,207	495.90%

**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 2010. This measure reports the tons of waste collected through cleanup events sponsored by or assisted by TCEQ. In September 2008, rules on household hazardous waste (HHW) collections changed to include a requirement to annually report the pounds of HHW collected, and the report does not require segregation of waste collected. Reports are done on a calendar year basis, and the report received in FY 2010 is for calendar year 2009. The lack of segregation of wastes resulted in larger numbers being reported. Interest in these cleanup and collection events is expected to continue into the future.

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

---

**Explanatory Measure 03:**

**Tons of Agricultural Waste Chemicals Collected by TCEQ-Sponsored Entities**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>Total Performance</b>	125	160.70	128.56%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Tons of Agricultural Waste Chemicals Collected by TCEQ-Sponsored Entities is above the projected level for FY 2010. This measure provides data on how many agricultural waste chemicals were collected and properly disposed of in Texas, thus reducing the impact on the environment. Increased marketing and targeting areas with the greatest need resulted in greater amounts of chemicals collected. Future performance is expected to remain at the projected level.

**Explanatory Measure 04:**

**Number of Registered Waste Tire Facilities and Transporters**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>Total Performance</b>	600	694	115.67%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Number of Registered Waste Tire Facilities and Transporters was above projections for FY 2010. This measure reports the number of regulated facilities involved in scrap tire management. The number of registered waste tire facilities and transporters includes facilities registered from the previous year in addition to those newly registered in the reporting period. The agency continues updating its waste tire facilities database by contacting facilities to ensure that they are still active as waste tire transporters. There has been an increase in the number of transporters and processors in FY 2010.

## Goal 04-01: Pollution Cleanup

---

**Outcome Measure 01:**

**Percent of Leaking Petroleum Storage Tank Sites Cleaned Up (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	86.00%	91.22%	106.07%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Percent of Leaking Petroleum Storage Tank Sites Cleaned Up was above projections for FY 2010. This measure provides an indication of the agency's efforts to clean up leaking petroleum storage tank sites relative to the total population of known leaking petroleum storage tank sites. Most cleanups are finalized after responsible parties complete all field work and formally request closure review. The agency has limited control over the number of requests for closure submitted within a fiscal year.

**Outcome Measure 02:**

**Percent of Superfund Sites Cleaned Up (Key)**

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	63.50%	66.50%	104.72%

**Variance Explanation:**

**MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

**Outcome Measure 03:**

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	66.00%	74.00%	112.12%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Percent of Voluntary and Brownfield Cleanup Properties Made Available for Commercial/Industrial Redevelopment, Community or Other Economic Reuse was above projections for FY 2010. This outcome measure indicates the total number of sites that have been accepted into the program divided by the total number of certificates of completion issued since the inception of the program. Performance is above projected levels due to applicants submitting technical documents and other program related documents in a timely manner.

## Goal 04-01: Pollution Cleanup

---

### Outcome Measure 04:

#### Percent of Industrial Solid and Municipal Hazardous Waste Facilities Cleaned Up

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	57.00%	62.1%	108.9%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Percent of Industrial Solid and Municipal Hazardous Waste Facilities Cleaned Up was above projections for FY 2010. This outcome measure indicates the achievement of final cleanup goals of all closure and/or remediation projects at industrial solid waste and municipal hazardous waste facilities. This measure is calculated by taking the total number of facilities which have achieved no further action status in the program divided by the total number of facilities participating in the program since its inception. The agency has limited control over the number of corrective action cleanup and closure projects submitted for approval.

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

---

### Output Measure 01:

#### Number of Petroleum Storage Tank Self-Certifications Processed

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	4,125	3,100	18.79%
2nd Quarter	4,125	4,190	25.39%
3rd Quarter	4,125	4,617	27.98%
4th Quarter	4,125	4,995	30.27%
<b>Total Performance</b>	16,500	16,902	102.44%

**Variance Explanation:**

MEETS PROJECTIONS

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

### Output Measure 02:

#### Number of Emergency Response Actions at Petroleum Storage Tank Sites

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	4	3	18.75%
2nd Quarter	4	7	43.75%
3rd Quarter	4	4	25.00%
4th Quarter	4	0	0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	16	14	87.50%

**Variance Explanation:**

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for the Number of Emergency Response Actions at Petroleum Storage Tank Sites was below projections for FY 2010. This measure reports the number of sites to which a state lead contractor is dispatched to address an immediate threat to human health or safety or the environment. This is an on-demand activity.

Fluctuations in performance are likely to occur due to the unpredictable number of sites requiring emergency responses.

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

---

### Output Measure 03:

#### Number of Petroleum Storage Tank Reimbursement Fund Applications Processed (Key)

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	350	409	29.21%
2nd Quarter	350	370	26.43%
3rd Quarter	350	496	35.43%
4th Quarter	350	481	34.36%
Total Performance	1,400	1,756	125.43%

**Variance Explanation:**

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL  
 Performance for the Number of Petroleum Storage Tank Reimbursement Fund Applications Processed was above projections for FY 2010. This measure reflects program performance in processing reimbursement applications received for petroleum storage tank cleanups. The number of reimbursement applications received by the program fluctuates in any given fiscal year.

### Output Measure 04:

#### Number of Petroleum Storage Tank Cleanups Completed

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	50	137	68.50%
2nd Quarter	50	140	70.00%
3rd Quarter	50	140	70.00%
4th Quarter	50	189	94.50%
Total Performance	200	606	303.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL  
 Performance for the Number of Petroleum Storage Tank Cleanups Completed was above projections for FY 2010. Most cleanups are finalized after responsible parties complete all field work and formally request closure review. The TCEQ has limited control over the number of requests for closure that are submitted within a given period of time.

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

---

### Efficiency Measure 01:

#### Average Time (days) to Review and Respond to Remedial Action Plans

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	30	21.00	70.00%
2nd Quarter	30	21.00	70.00%
3rd Quarter	30	21.54	71.80%
4th Quarter	30	20.42	68.07%
<b>Total Performance</b>	30	20.68	68.93%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Average Time (days) to Review and Respond to Remedial Action Plans was below projections for FY 2010. This measure reports the average number of days for the agency to review and respond to remedial action plans over the reporting period. The agency has implemented procedures for reviewing remedial action plans to ensure average review times remain below the legislatively mandated time frame of 30 days. The desired performance for this measure is to be below projections.

### Efficiency Measure 02:

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	30	25.00	83.33%
2nd Quarter	30	24.00	80.00%
3rd Quarter	30	21.89	72.97%
4th Quarter	30	21.56	71.87%
<b>Total Performance</b>	30	23.04	76.80%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Average Time (days) to Review and Respond to Risk-Based Site Assessments was below projections for FY 2010. This measure reports the average number of days for the agency to review and respond to risk-based site assessments over the reporting period. The agency has implemented procedures for reviewing these assessments to ensure average review times remain below the legislatively mandated time frame of 30 days. The desired performance for this measure is to be below projections.

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

---

**Efficiency Measure 03:**

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

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1st Quarter</b>	90	34	37.78%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	90	46	51.11%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	90	45	50.00%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	90	47	52.22%
<b>Total Performance</b>	90	44	48.89%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

The Average Time (Days) to Process Petroleum Storage Tank (PST) Remediation Fund Reimbursement Claims was below projections for FY 2010. This measure reports the average number of days to process 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. The desired performance for this measure is to be below projections.

**Explanatory Measure 01:**

**Average Cost per Petroleum Storage Tank Cleanup**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>Total Performance</b>	\$ 86,700	\$ 84,705	97.70%

**Variance Explanation:**

**MEETS PROJECTIONS**

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	0	0.00%
2nd Quarter	1.25	0	0.00%
3rd Quarter	1.25	0	0.00%
4th Quarter	1.25	6.0	120.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	5	6.0	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 2010. Response action completions are not expected to be evenly distributed over each reporting period. This measure is an on-demand activity.

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	18	46	63.89%
2nd Quarter	18	18	25.00%
3rd Quarter	18	10	13.89%
4th Quarter	18	114	158.33%
<b>Total Performance</b>	72	188	261.11%

**Variance Explanation:**  
 ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL  
 The number of Superfund Site Assessments completed was above projections for FY 2010. This measure reports the number of site assessments conducted to determine Superfund program eligibility. Performance is above projected levels due to focused efforts in the Houston area and the concentrated efforts by program staff which determined that approximately 80 formerly utilized U. S. Department of Defense Sites were ineligible for the Superfund program. However, these sites were determined to be eligible for the TCEQ corrective action program.

**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>1st Quarter</b>	22.50	27	30.00%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	22.50	18	20.00%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	22.50	23	25.56%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	22.50	25	27.78%
<b>Total Performance</b>	90	93	103.33%

**Variance Explanation:**

MEETS PROJECTIONS

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>1st Quarter</b>	51	47	92.16%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	51	48	94.12%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	51	48	94.12%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	51	45	88.24%
<b>Total Performance</b>	51	45	88.24%

**Variance Explanation:**

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

The Number of Superfund Sites Undergoing Evaluation and Cleanup was below projections for FY 2010. This measure reports the combined number of state and federal Superfund sites that are undergoing evaluation and/or cleanup. While the program has continued to clean up sites, fewer sites were added to the National Priority List than originally projected because assessed sites did not meet Superfund program eligibility criteria. This has caused a net reduction of the number of sites in the Superfund program undergoing evaluation and cleanup. The program expects this trend to continue in FY 2011 and future fiscal years.

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

---

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	1	1	25.00%
2nd Quarter	1	0	0.00%
3rd Quarter	1	1	25.00%
4th Quarter	1	3	75.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	4	5	125.00%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for the Number of Superfund Cleanup Completions was above projections for FY 2010. Superfund cleanup completions are not expected to be evenly distributed over each reporting quarter due to the complexity, magnitude, and scope of the cleanup activities at each site.

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	7	5	17.86%
2nd Quarter	7	2	7.14%
3rd Quarter	7	0	0.00%
4th Quarter	7	0	0.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	28	7	25.00%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for the Number of Dry Cleaner Remediation Program (DCRP) Site Assessments Initiated was below projections for FY 2010. This measure indicates the number of work orders issued to initiate site cleanups during the reporting period. The number of site assessments initiated is based on the number of DCRP Applications that are received, and fewer applications were received than projected. Entry into the DCRP is voluntary, and the program has no control of the number of DCRP Applications received.

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

---

**Output Measure 07:**

**Number of Dry Cleaner Remediation Program Site Cleanups Completed**

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1st Quarter</b>	2.5	1	10.00%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	2.5	4	40.00%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	2.5	1	10.00%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	2.5	4	40.00%
<b>Total Performance</b>	10	10	100.00%

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

**Efficiency Measure 01:**

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

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>1st Quarter</b>	90	41	45.56%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	90	48	53.33%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	90	21	23.33%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	90	48	53.33%
<b>Total Performance</b>	90	42.0	46.67%

<p><b><u>Variance Explanation:</u></b>  <b>BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL</b>                  Performance for the Average Time (days) to Process Dry Cleaner Remediation Program Applications was below projections for FY 2010. The measure reports the average number of days required by the agency staff to process the dry cleaner remediation program applications. The program has implemented procedures for screening and reviewing the applications to ensure that the average processing time is less than the legislatively mandated 90-day time frame. The desired performance for this measure is to be below projections.</p>
--

**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
<b>Total Performance</b>	561	849	151.34%

**Variance Explanation:**  
**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**  
 Performance for the Number of Potential Superfund Sites to be Assessed was above projections for FY 2010. This measure reports the number of potential Superfund sites that have not undergone an eligibility assessment for either the state or federal Superfund program. In FY 2009, the number of sites requiring assessment increased significantly due to increased referrals from EPA and other TCEQ programs as well as an internal audit of program central records. In FY 2010, the program continued to assess sites identified in FY 2009.

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	63	60	95.24%

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

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

---

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

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>Total Performance</b>	96	98	102.08%

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

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

	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent of Annual Projection Attained</b>
<b>Total Performance</b>	206	179	86.89%

**Variance Explanation:**  
 BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL  
 Performance for the Number of Dry Cleaner Remediation Program (DCRP) Eligible Sites was below projections for FY 2010. This measure reports the number of DCRP sites that have been ranked, prioritized, and evaluated for corrective action. The number of eligible sites is based on the number of DCRP applications that are received. Entry into the DCRP is voluntary; therefore, the program has no control over the number of DCRP applications received.

## Goal 05-01: River Compact Commissions

---

**Outcome 01:**

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	100.00%	30.00%	30.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

**BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Percent of Quality Water received was below projections for FY 2010. This measure reports the extent to which Texas receives its share of water as apportioned by the Canadian River compact with New Mexico. The acre-feet of quality water received by Texas from the Canadian River was less than average due to drought conditions in the Canadian River watershed. New Mexico is in compliance with the Compact.

**Outcome 02:**

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	100.00%	269.00%	269.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the Percent of Quality Water received was above projections for FY 2010. This measure reports the extent to which Texas receives its share of water as apportioned by the Compact. The acre-feet of quality water received by Texas from the Pecos River was higher than projected due to New Mexico's credits accumulated under the Compact. New Mexico was in compliance with 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
<b>Total Performance</b>	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

**Variance Explanation:**

**MEETS PROJECTIONS**

Performance met projections. No variance explanation required.

## Goal 05-01: River Compact Commissions

---

**Outcome 04:**

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>Total Performance</b>	100.00%	133.40%	133.40%

**Variance Explanation:**

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL

Performance for The Percent of Quality Water received was above projections for FY 2010. This measure reports the extent to which Texas receives its share of water as apportioned by the Compact. The acre-feet of quality water received by Texas from the Rio Grande was higher than projected due to New Mexico's credits accumulated under the Compact. New Mexico was in compliance with the Compact.

**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
<b>Total Performance</b>	100.00%	86.20%	86.20%

**Variance Explanation:**

BELOW PROJECTED LEVEL

The Percentage of Sabine Water Received was below the projected level for FY 2010. This measure is based on water usage compared to the last five year running average. Texas has implemented water conservation measures, and the level of the state's water usage of the Sabine River has been relatively constant or slightly decreasing. Based on the current rate of water use in Texas and Louisiana, the Compact does not anticipate the need for additional rules to apportion water from the Sabine River.

## Historically Underutilized Businesses

---

### Output Measure 01:

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	20.00%	44.60%	223.00%
2nd Quarter	20.00%	31.50%	157.50%
3rd Quarter	20.00%	27.80%	139.00%
4th Quarter	20.00%	28.22%	141.10%
<b>Total Performance</b>	20.00%	28.22%	141.10%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

The performance for the Percentage of Professional Services Going to Historically Underutilized Businesses (HUBs) was above projections for FY 2010. The primary reason the agency was able to perform above projected levels was because several invoices for work performed by HUB subcontractors in FY 2009 were paid in FY 2010. The majority of HUB actual expenditures came from the Remediation division.

### Output Measure 02:

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
1st Quarter	33.00%	38.84%	117.70%
2nd Quarter	33.00%	37.50%	113.64%
3rd Quarter	33.00%	39.10%	118.48%
4th Quarter	33.00%	39.38%	119.33%
<b>Total Performance</b>	33.00%	39.38%	119.33%

**Variance Explanation:**

**ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL**

Performance for the percentage of Other Services awarded to Historically Underutilized Businesses (HUBs) was above projections for FY 2010. The agency exceeded this target because the Office of Administrative Services Information Resources Division was able to award a large portion of their contracts to HUBs.

## Historically Underutilized Businesses

---

**Output Measure 03:**

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

	Projected	Actual	Percent of Annual Projection Attained
<b>1st Quarter</b>	12.60%	31.30%	248.41%
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	12.60%	27.80%	220.63%
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	12.60%	29.20%	231.75%
<b>4th Quarter</b>	12.60%	30.23%	239.92%
<b>Total Performance</b>	12.60%	30.23%	239.92%

**Variance Explanation:**

ABOVE PROJECTED LEVEL.

The Percentage of Commodity Purchasing Awarded to Historically Underutilized Businesses (HUBs) was above projections for FY 2010. HUB subcontracting activity in this category is strong throughout the agency.