

**Draft 6/18/13**  
**Annual Data Metric Analysis**

This document was developed in response to questions about the level of effort associated with the Annual Data Metric Analysis (annual DMA). This document contains two parts. The first is a very brief description of the actual steps associated with conducting an annual DMA responsive to the level of effort question. The second part provides an updated version of the annual DMA guidance for your review.

**Annual DMA Steps In Brief**

Annually, EPA reviews SRF metrics in the annual Data Metrics Analysis (DMA), utilizing the counts verified in the Data Verification process. The annual DMA is a simple check-in between SRF reviews that supports the ongoing and regular performance reviews that already occur during annual planning and grant discussions between EPA and states. It is a management tool to guide discussions with states around known or potential performance issues.

In short, the annual DMA consists of the following steps for each state:

- Pulling frozen data from OTIS that is derived from the yearly Data Verification process.
- Briefly noting any issues with data counts or performance metrics on the spreadsheet derived from OTIS
- Sending the spreadsheet to the state as a tool that can be used as part of routine communication that occurs between the Region and the state in regard to enforcement. A copy should also be placed in the SRF Tracker for the record.

During the 4 year SRF review, annual DMA information can be used to help plan the review and to provide context for review findings and recommendations.

*Draft 6/18/13*

## *State Review Framework Round 3 Guidance*

# **Conducting an Annual Data Metric Analysis**

Annually, EPA reviews SRF metrics in the annual Data Metrics Analysis (DMA), utilizing the counts verified in the Data Verification process. The annual DMA is a simple check-in between SRF reviews that supports the ongoing and regular performance reviews that already occur during annual planning and grant discussions between EPA and states. It is a management tool to guide discussions with states around known or potential performance issues.

### **Using Verified Data for the Annual DMA**

The annual DMA uses frozen data verified by states during the yearly Data Verification process. The Data Verification process occurs once annually and culminates in the frozen data set at the end of February.

If inaccuracies are found during the Data Verification process, states and regions are expected to correct the data in the national database at that time. Data Verification is a critical activity. Once Data Verification is complete, frozen data is made available to the public (ECHO, State Performance Dashboards and Maps) and used in the SRF process (annual DMA and quadrennial SRF reviews). Therefore the frozen data set must be accurate and ready to be released to the public and used in the annual DMA, in the 4 year SRF review.

There is no expectation that regions or states undergo a second data verification process if issues with data counts are found as part of the analysis described below.

### **Conducting the Annual DMA**

An annual DMA should be conducted for every state in a Region. *Option:* Regions can also conduct an annual DMA for state districts or locals if such a review would be helpful for program oversight and data is readily available.

#### **A. Pulling Data from OTIS**

1. Go to the OTIS SRF home page at <http://www.epa-echo.gov/otis/srf/>.
2. Click on the Metrics Query tab:
  - a. Select program (CAA, CWA, or RCRA).

- b. Select year.
  - c. For geographic breakdown, choose the state being reviewed, then, if applicable, the local air agency.
3. Click the Submit button.
4. A table containing the data metrics should appear. Click on the Download button in the top right corner of the screen.
5. A popup window should appear giving you the option to choose between saving as a CSV or Excel file. Most users will want to choose the Excel format. Upon choosing either option the file should download. Open the file and save it to your hard drive.

### **Analyzing Data in the Annual DMA**

1. You will create a column at the far right of the spreadsheet to conduct the DMA. Label this new column with the header “Analysis.”
2. For all metrics, briefly note any potential problems with national goals, universe counts, and/or other data in the Analysis column.
3. Email your DMA to your contact at the state agency and upload a copy of the DMA spreadsheet to the SRF Tracker by the **end of the fiscal year**. No other documentation is necessary and HQ will not formally review the content in the spreadsheet as part of the annual DMA process.
4. As part of normal Region/state communication processes, it is suggested that Regions discuss the results of their DMAs with their states to resolve significant issues and to inform their other oversight activities. For example, the DMAs can be used as an aid in the upcoming year’s work planning.

### **How the Annual DMA Supports the SRF Reviews**

The Annual DMA supports the 4 year SRF process by:

- Providing a means to demonstrate performance improvements between SRF reviews;
- Identifying potential issues or troubling trends that may arise, and may also be resolved, between full SRF reviews;
- Recognizing good performance as it occurs; and
- Providing trend information that can inform the SRF review preparation and findings.

During the annual DMA, EPA reviewers will review data metrics, and activity count information. This information will help plan SRF reviews and to provide additional context for findings. For example, a look at activity counts may help EPA determine areas of focus for the file review. If, say, the verified data show a declining trend in enforcement actions, EPA may

choose to select additional files with violations to determine whether the level of enforcement activity was appropriate. When you are developing findings during the state's SRF review, it is appropriate to consider not only data and file metric values for the year reviewed but also the results of the annual DMAs conducted. For example, if the file review identifies violations that did not receive appropriate enforcement, but the overall enforcement trend is up, that may be factored into the findings.