

Data Quality Record for Long-Term Performance Goals

Long-Term Performance Goal Text: By September 30, 2026, conduct 55% of annual EPA inspections at facilities that affect communities with potential environmental justice concerns.

Corresponding Annual Performance Goal: Percentage of EPA inspections at facilities affecting communities with potential environmental justice concerns.

Goal Number/Objective: Goal 3/Objective 3.2

NPM Lead: Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA)

1a. Purpose of Long-Term Performance Goal:

The purpose of this long-term performance goal (LTPG) is to increase the number of Federal inspections affecting communities with potential environmental justice (EJ) concerns.

1b. Performance Measure Term Definitions:

OECA's 2023 *Final Guidance for Evaluating and Recording Environmental Justice (EJ) Information for On-Site Inspections and Enforcement Case Initiations* ("Guidance") identifies two ways in which EPA staff may review inspections or case initiations for potential EJ concerns:

Standard EJ Review: A standard EJ review will return "Yes" if one or more of EJScreen's Supplemental Indexes are at or above the 90th state or national percentile for the Census block group or one-mile radius around the facility location, or if the facility is located in federally-recognized tribal land or a US territory. Typically, the standard review is conducted automatically, but it can also be conducted manually if the system returns "No Score."

Expanded EJ Review: An expanded review uses reasoning falling outside of the "Standard EJ Review" definition to arrive at a different determination. This includes manual determinations based on geographic focus areas or programmatic/inspector knowledge, for example, but excludes manual determinations where staff conducts a Standard EJ Review after receiving a "No Score" Auto Flag.

EPA's Integrated Compliance Information System (ICIS) automatically calculates the Standard EJ Review for both inspections and case initiations, presented to users as the "EJScreen Auto Flag".

The Guidance then defines the two ways in which EPA staff may use the Standard and Expanded EJ Reviews to determine whether new inspections or case initiations affect communities with possible EJ concerns:

Automatic Determination: EPA staff accept the determination presented by the EJScreen Auto Flag in ICIS. This flag is automatically generated based on the Standard EJ Review criteria described above. Possible values include "Yes," "No," and (if an automatic determination is not possible) "No Score."

Manual Determination: EPA staff make a determination that differs from the Auto Flag. This includes situations where a "No" is changed to "Yes," a "Yes" is changed to "No," or a "No Score" is changed to "Yes" or "No." For a "No Score" Auto Flag, a manual determination is required. The suggested best practice in this case is to first conduct a Standard EJ Review.

Thus, a manual determination may be based on either the Standard EJ Review or an Expanded EJ Review. In contrast, all determinations where staff *agrees with the EJScreen Auto Flag in ICIS* are based on the Standard EJ Review.

1c. Unit of Measure:

The percentage of inspections affecting communities with potential environmental justice concerns.

2a. Data Source:

- Relevant information system: EJScreen and Enforcement & Compliance History Online (ECHO).
- Entity that reports data to the system: Reported by OECA and EPA regions.

2b. Data needed for interpretation of (calculated) Performance Result:

- Baseline: The national baseline for the measure is 40%, which represents the number of inspections where the facility had at least one of EJScreen’s EJ indexes greater than or equal to the 80th percentile in the facility’s Census block group, divided by the total number of inspections. The average FY 2017-2019 results (prior to COVID-19 pandemic) equals 40%. Note however that this methodology was different from the Standard EJ Review, which OECA began using on October 1, 2023. The FY 2017-2019 baseline is therefore not directly comparable to the percent of inspections with possible EJ concerns based on the Standard EJ Review.
- Frequency for reporting result: Monthly
- Universe: Total number of inspections

3. Calculation Methodology:

The total number of inspections affecting communities with potential environmental justice concerns (using the definition in 1b) divided by the total number of inspections.

4. Quality Assurance/Quality Controls:

OECA has an annual data certification process for quality assuring EPA’s enforcement and compliance data. The certification process was established to ensure all reporting entities are aware of the reporting deadlines, receive the most up-to-date reporting instructions, and follow best data management practices to assure reporting completeness and accuracy. Civil enforcement case data is covered by the annual data certification process.

5. Data Limitations/Qualifications:

Relies on complete, timely, and accurate reporting of information to the ICIS Federal Enforcement and Compliance (FE&C) data system by EPA regions and OECA.

6. Technical Contact:

Michele McKeever (OECA) 202-564-3688

7. Certification Statement/Signature:

I certify the information in this DQR is complete and accurate.

PDAA Signature Original signed by Cecil Rodrigues Date 1/27/2024