

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary**Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)****Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)**

1. Date of Submission: 9/11/2006
2. Agency: Department of Transportation
3. Bureau: Office of the Secretary
4. Name of this Capital Asset: DOTXX071: DOT eGrants Consolidation
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 021-04-04-00-01-1326-00
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2009? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY2009, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2009 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.) Mixed Life Cycle
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? FY2007
8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap:
- The DOT eGrants consolidation effort will automate paper grant processes and reduce the number of Departmental grant systems. Eliminating paper and reducing the number of systems will improve grantor efficiency and minimize system maintenance costs. Currently, grantors create their own spreadsheets to track grant applications, awards and spending. Some grantors spend 25% of their time checking payments. The FY07/FY08 DOT budgets do not increase grantor FTE. Thus, existing personnel must be given better tools to manage the entire grant process. The 1st priority is establishing an interface to Grants.gov. As grantors now download applications from Grants.gov to their workstations, they sometimes do not know where the files reside. Accountability of incoming grant applications is weak at the Agency/Dept levels. The DOT interface to Grants.gov will provide routing to the specific DOT office and/or system as well as establish a central grants database for reporting/accountability. The 2nd priority is to automate over 40 paper grant processes. Two DOT grant agencies are entirely paper based and all of the others, but one, have a mix of paper and automated systems. Paper grant processes will be at risk with the new A-123 (Internal Controls) and new legislation (HR5060, S2590) for a public facing grant reporting website. A consolidated DOT grants system will standardize grantor steps and help new grantors. Two of the existing grant systems, at the Office of the Secretary level, are available for the entire DOT grant community - GIS (Grant Information System) and GNS (Grant Notification System). GIS collects grant award data and transfers it to the Census FAADS system; GNS transfers grant notices over \$1 million to Congress. Both of these reporting systems contain common data items and need to be combined. Several DOT grant systems are fairly new-- SOAR (FAA) and FedStar (PHMSA), and have not yet come near exhausting their life cycle. It is a better investment to address consolidating and refreshing the modules of older systems as a priority through the proposed GMLoB consortia partnership with HUD. Several DOT grant systems are very small--GADICS and GMS. They need to be consolidated. Grant payment methods vary and need to be standardized/streamlined. Faxed invoices for grant payment are not efficient and the number of interfaces to the DOT Delphi system (Federal CoE) needs to be reduced. GMLoB partnership with HUD will benefit both DOT & HUD grantors & grantees.
9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes
- a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? 8/16/2006
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? Yes
11. Contact information of Project Manager?
- Name Swecker, Ron
- Phone Number Redacted
- Email ron.swecker@dot.gov
- a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager? TBD
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project? Yes
- a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? Yes

- b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) No
1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?
2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?
3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?
13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives? Yes
- If "yes," check all that apply:
- Expanded E-Government
 - R and D Investment Criteria
 - Budget Performance Integration
 - Financial Performance
 - Eliminating Improper Payments
- a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s) (e.g. If E-Gov is selected, is it an approved shared service provider or the managing partner?) The consolidated eGrants project will address OMB's GMLoB initiative as well as PL 106-107 to streamline Federal grant making. Automation of paper processes improves efficiency, accountability and financial management. Consolidation of 10 grant systems minimizes O&M expenditures. GmLoB CoE partnership with HUD will cross level grants expertise and IT resources to minimize development expenses. The DOT/HUD CoE will be integrated with the DOT FMLoB CoE - Delphi.
14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.) Yes
- a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review? Yes
- b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? All FTA Grant Funding Programs
- c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? Adequate
15. Is this investment for information technology? Yes
- If the answer to Question 15 is "Yes," complete questions 16-23 below. If the answer is "No," do not answer questions 16-23.
- For information technology investments only:
16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) Level 3
17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) (1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment
18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23) No
19. Is this a financial management system? Yes
- a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area? Yes
1. If "yes," which compliance area: Sections 2 and 4
2. If "no," what does it address?
- b. If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52
- FTA:
 TEAM - Transportation Electronic Award Management system
 DOTS
 DELPHI (FMLoB CoE)
 ECHO - Electronic Clearing House Operation system
- FHWA:
 FMIS - Fiscal Management Information System
 DELPHI (FMLoB CoE)
20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2009 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware 2.000000
 Software 8.000000
 Services 90.000000
 Other

21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities? Yes

22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:

Name Carcirieri, Pamela
 Phone Number Redacted
 Title DOT Privacy Officer
 E-mail pamela.carcirieri@dot.gov

23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval? No

Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:

24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas? No

Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)

1. Provide the total estimated life-cycle cost for this investment by completing the following table. All amounts represent budget authority in millions, and are rounded to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included only in the row designated "Government FTE Cost," and should be excluded from the amounts shown for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." The "TOTAL" estimated annual cost of the investment is the sum of costs for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." For Federal buildings and facilities, life-cycle costs should include long term energy, environmental, decommissioning, and/or restoration costs. The costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this report.

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)									
(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2007	CY 2008	BY 2009	BY+1 2010	BY+2 2011	BY+3 2012	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	0.528	0.948	2.106	1.399	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Acquisition:	11.48	3	4.92	5.273	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	12.008	3.948	7.026	6.672	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Operations & Maintenance:	33.915	6.17	6.395	8.377	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
TOTAL:	45.923	10.118	13.421	15.049	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	3.238	1.379	1.872	3.319	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	5	7	7	7	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted

Note: For the multi-agency investments, this table should include all funding (both managing partner and partner agencies). Government FTE Costs should not be included as part of the TOTAL represented.

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? No

a. If "yes," How many and in what year?

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2008 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:
 Since submission of the FY2007 Ex. 300, DOT submitted a Declaration of Intent to become a GMLoB CoE partnering with HUD. In support of becoming a CoE, DOT moved some Steady State money to the DME line in the Funding Sources Table. If DOT is not selected to be a CoE, the DME dollars will be used to transition to another CoE. DOT discussed this strategy with OMB on August 28, 2006 and OMB concurred.

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

1. Complete the table for all (including all non-Federal) contracts and/or task orders currently in place or planned for this investment. Total Value should include all option years for each contract. Contracts and/or task orders completed do not need to be included.

Exhibit 300: DOTXX071: DOT eGrants Consolidation (Revision 11)

Contracts/Task Orders Table:																* Costs in millions
Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start date of Contract/ Task Order	End date of Contract/ Task Order	Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition ? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N)	Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses? (Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer Certification Level (Level 1,2,3,N/A)	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition ? (Y/N)
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

Earned value is not required on contracts for steady state projects.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

a. Explain why:

4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? Yes

a. If "yes," what is the date? 7/19/2006

b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?

1. If "no," briefly explain why:

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

In order to successfully address this area of the exhibit 300, performance goals must be provided for the agency and be linked to the annual performance plan. The investment must discuss the agency's mission and strategic goals, and performance measures (indicators) must be provided. These goals need to map to the gap in the agency's strategic goals and objectives this investment is designed to fill. They are the internal and external performance benefits this investment is expected to deliver to the agency (e.g., improve efficiency by 60 percent, increase citizen participation by 300 percent a year to achieve an overall citizen participation rate of 75 percent by FY 2xxx, etc.). The goals must be clearly measurable investment outcomes, and if applicable, investment outputs. They do not include the completion date of the module, milestones, or investment, or general goals, such as, significant, better, improved that do not have a quantitative or qualitative measure.

Agencies must use the following table to report performance goals and measures for the major investment and use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for each of the four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov. The table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond FY 2009.

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2004	Organizational Excellence	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	How many State DOTs exchange data with FMIS via automated electronic data sharing	9 State DOTs exchange data with FMIS via automated electronic data sharing	Increase number of electronic data sharing States to 10	10 States exchanging electronic data with FMIS; goal met.
2005	Organizational Excellence	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	How many customers directly access FMIS, and how many are fully automated	41 of 53 States and territories directly access FMIS. Of the 41, nine are fully automated for electronic data sharing	Increase the number of States and territories that directly access FMIS from 41 to 42 (2% increase)	Actual number of States using direct access to FMIS will be available in FY 2006 Q1
2005	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Workforce Management	Training and Employment	How many users and employees receive training	4-6% of users and employees require training due to turnover and FMIS enhancements	Train 4% of users and employees on FMIS	Actual number of users and employees trained will be available in FY 2006 Q1
2005	Organizational Excellence	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Compliance	Section 508 compliance for FMIS	FMIS is not Section 508 compliant	FMIS will be 100% Section 508 compliant by December 31, 2005	10% complete due to resource limitations
2005	Organizational Excellence	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Compliance	Number of projects that have correct project balances	4% of FHWA projects have incorrect balances in DOT's DELPHI accounting system	Reduce the percentage of incorrect project balances by 90%	Actual results available by FY 2006 Q1
2005	Organizational Excellence	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	How quickly contract authority and fund obligations are posted after receipt	FMIS contract authority and fund obligations are posted within two days of receipt	Continue to post contract authority and obligation data within two days of receipt to improve stewardship and accountability for expenditures and to implement SAFETEA	Actual results available in FY 2006 Q1

Exhibit 300: DOTXX071: DOT eGrants Consolidation (Revision 11)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2006	Organizational Excellence	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	GTS: 175	GTS currently only tracks NHTSA grant funding information.	requirements This measurement is the % of GTS processes integrated with Grants.gov by FY06 - permitting customers to go to a single source to apply and track all Federal grant requests, thereby eliminating the need to go through the same process with multip	Percentage available 1st quarter FY07.
2006	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	GTS: Ground Transportation	GTS tracks State NHTSA grant funds. However, the users do not track applications and evaluations.	This will be the measurement of the number of users with the capability to submit all grant plans, applications, evaluations, etc. electronically through GTS by FY06	The results of this measurement will be a percentage of the total number of users that use all functions of the system.
2006	Organizational Excellence	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Compliance	TEAM: Implement new legislation in SAFETEA-LU.	Currently using old legislation	Efficiency of operations for budget execution	100% implemented in 1st Qtr FY06
2006	Organizational Excellence	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Number of programs that adapt to Grants.gov FIND	All discretionary programs plan to use Grants.gov in FY 2006.	10% increase in number of programs per year, based on available data sets	Available 1st Qtr FY07
2006	Organizational Excellence	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Number of programs that adapt to Grants.gov APPLY	75% of discretionary grant programs plan to use Grants.gov in FY 2006.	10% increase in number of programs per year, based on available data sets	As of August 2006, the percentage is 92%.
2006	Organizational Excellence	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	GTS: 194	55% of system interfaces with Grants.gov system	100% of system interfaces with Grants.gov system	Waiting for GMLoB solution decision
2006	Organizational Excellence	Technology	Effectiveness	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	GTS: User requirements	Grant submission is not a fully electronic process.	Complete upgrades to system so that grants can be completely submitted electronically	It is expected that by FY06, GTS will have the capability to submit and process all grants electronically. The actual measure of which will be the percentage of the system that is not yet electronic.
2006	Organizational Excellence	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	TEAM: Automate a consolidated grant release process that interfaces with the OST Grants Notification System.	manual	Incrementally process based on value of grant processing	100% electronic data transfer 2nd Qtr FY06
2006	Organizational Excellence	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	TEAM: System-to-system interface with Grants.gov	manual	Electronically receive all Grants.gov applications and load into TEAM.	100% in 2nd Qtr FY06
2007	Organizational Excellence	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	FTA: Monitor average grant processing time	9/2005: 28 days	36 days overall average	TBD

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					across programs			
2007	Organizational Excellence	Processes and Activities	Financial (Processes and Activities)	Financial Management	FMIS: Percentage reduction of unexpended balance	In FY06 the unexpended balance for projects with no activity for 12 months or more was	Improve by 5%	TBD
2007	Organizational Excellence	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Compliance	TEAM: Consolidation of TEAM operations in new DOT headquarters building.	Operations running independently at current site.	Migrate hardware and software technology to new DOT facility.	2nd Qtr FY07
2007	Organizational Excellence	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Compliance	TEAM: Monitor closure of fully disbursed grants	9/2005: 98%	95% of fully disbursed grants included in the measure list	TBD
2007	Organizational Excellence	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Compliance	FTA: Monitor closure of old and inactive grants.	9/2005: 77%	Target 90%	TBD
2007	Organizational Excellence	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Expand COOP capability	2 to 4 days to switch to COOP site	1 day to stand up COOP site	TBD: 2007
2007	Organizational Excellence	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	TEAM up and running 95% of the time	New measure	Customer access to system should be 95% of the time	TBD
2008	Organizational Excellence	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Complaints	FTA: Monitor closure of fully disbursed grants	9/2005: 77%	Target 90%	TBD
2008	Organizational Excellence	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	FMIS: Increase the number of reports available in spreadsheet format to FMIS users.	10% of reports now available in spreadsheet format	35% of reports should be available in spreadsheet format	TBD
2008	Organizational Excellence	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	FHWA: Increase number of states with systems compatible to FMIS who can submit data electronically	Present number is 20 states	Increase number of states by 15%	TBD
2008	Organizational Excellence	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	FTA: Monitor average grant processing time across programs	9/2005: 28 days	36 days overall average	TBD
2008	Organizational Excellence	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Training	Increase number of customers trained in TEAM.	Mostly existing employees have TEAM training	Require training for new FTA employees	TBD in 2008
2008	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Reporting and Information	FTA: Monitor closure of old and inactive grants	9/2005: 77%	Target 90%	TBD
2008	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	NHTSA: 100% interface with the Grants Notification System to Congress	No interface at present	100% successful interface	TBD
2008	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	System Development	NHTSA: 100% interface of use of GMLoB consolidated eGrants system	GTS is now a standalone NHTSA grants system	Percentage of integration/consolidation with GMLoB solution	TBD

Section E: Security and Privacy (IT Capital Assets only)

In order to successfully address this area of the business case, each question below must be answered at the system/application level, not at a program or agency level. Systems supporting this investment on the planning and operational systems security tables should match the systems on the privacy table below. Systems on the Operational Security Table must be included on your agency FISMA system inventory and should be easily referenced in the inventory (i.e., should use the same name or identifier).

For existing Mixed-Life Cycle investments where enhancement, development, and/or modernization is planned, include the investment in both the "Systems in Planning" table (Table 3) and the "Operational Systems" table (Table 4). Systems which are

already operational, but have enhancement, development, and/or modernization activity, should be included in both Table 3 and Table 4. Table 3 should reflect the planned date for the system changes to be complete and operational, and the planned date for the associated C&A update. Table 4 should reflect the current status of the requirements listed. In this context, information contained within Table 3 should characterize what updates to testing and documentation will occur before implementing the enhancements; and Table 4 should characterize the current state of the materials associated with the existing system.

All systems listed in the two security tables should be identified in the privacy table. The list of systems in the "Name of System" column of the privacy table (Table 8) should match the systems listed in columns titled "Name of System" in the security tables (Tables 3 and 4). For the Privacy table, it is possible that there may not be a one-to-one ratio between the list of systems and the related privacy documents. For example, one PIA could cover multiple systems. If this is the case, a working link to the PIA may be listed in column (d) of the privacy table more than once (for each system covered by the PIA).

The questions asking whether there is a PIA which covers the system and whether a SORN is required for the system are discrete from the narrative fields. The narrative column provides an opportunity for free text explanation why a working link is not provided. For example, a SORN may be required for the system, but the system is not yet operational. In this circumstance, answer "yes" for column (e) and in the narrative in column (f), explain that because the system is not operational the SORN is not yet required to be published.

Please respond to the questions below and verify the system owner took the following actions:

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment? Yes
 - a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year: 4.60
2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment? Yes

3. Systems in Planning and Undergoing Enhancement(s), Development, and/or Modernization - Security Table(s):			
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Date of Planned C&A update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems)
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:							
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level (High, Moderate, Low)	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37? (Y/N)	Date Completed: C&A	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests? (FIPS 200/NIST 800-53, Other, N/A)	Date Complete(d): Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted

5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG? Yes
 - a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process? Yes
6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses? Redacted
 - a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness.

Redacted

7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above? Redacted

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:					
(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or Explanation	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Internet Link or Explanation

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:					
(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or Explanation	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Internet Link or Explanation
FedStar	No	No	This system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	No	The system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
FMIS	No	No	This system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	No	The system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
GIS	No	No	This system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	No	The system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
GNS	No	No	This system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	No	The system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
GTS	No	No	This system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	No	The system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
SOAR	No	No	This system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	No	The system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
TEAM	No	No	This system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	No	The system is not a Privacy Act system of records.

Details for Text Options:
 Column (d): If yes to (c), provide the link(s) to the publicly posted PIA(s) with which this system is associated. If no to (c), provide an explanation why the PIA has not been publicly posted or why the PIA has not been conducted.
 Column (f): If yes to (e), provide the link(s) to where the current and up to date SORN(s) is published in the federal register. If no to (e), provide an explanation why the SORN has not been published or why there isn't a current and up to date SORN.
 Note: Working links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites. Non-working links will be considered as a blank field.

Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA) (IT Capital Assets only)

In order to successfully address this area of the capital asset plan and business case, the investment must be included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process and mapped to and supporting the FEA. The business case must demonstrate the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? Yes
 - a. If "no," please explain why?

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy? Yes
 - a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. DOT consolidated eGrants and Grants Management Line of Business
 - b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture? Yes
 - a. If "yes," provide the name of the segment architecture as provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. Grants Segment Architecture

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:								
Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.egov.gov .								
Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
		Back Office Services	Asset / Materials Management	Computers / Automation			Internal	5

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:
 Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to <http://www.egov.gov>.

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
				Management				
		Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Exchange			No Reuse	5
		Back Office Services	Data Management	Meta Data Management			Internal	5
		Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Data Integration			No Reuse	10
		Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Enterprise Application Integration			No Reuse	10
		Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Software Development			Internal	20
		Back Office Services	Financial Management	Auditing			No Reuse	5
		Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Configuration Management			Internal	5
		Business Management Services	Organizational Management	Network Management			Internal	5
		Digital Asset Services	Content Management	Content Publishing and Delivery			No Reuse	5
		Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Library / Storage			Internal	5
		Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Sharing			No Reuse	5
		Support Services	Security Management	Access Control			No Reuse	5
		Support Services	Security Management	Identification and Authentication			No Reuse	5
		Support Services	Systems Management	System Resource Monitoring			Internal	5

a. Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.

b. A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.

c. 'Internal' reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. 'External' reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.

d. Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount transferred to another agency to pay for the service. The percentages in the column can, but are not required to, add up to 100%.

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:
 To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Software Development	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Redacted
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	Redacted
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	Redacted
Data Integration	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	Redacted
Data Integration	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	Redacted
Auditing	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	Redacted
Content Publishing and Delivery	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	Redacted
Content Publishing and Delivery	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	Redacted
Content Publishing and Delivery	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	Redacted
Access Control	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	Redacted
Access Control	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Redacted

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:				
To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.				
FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	Redacted
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Redacted
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Redacted
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Redacted
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Peer to Peer (P2P)	Redacted
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	Redacted
Enterprise Application Integration	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	Redacted
System Resource Monitoring	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	Redacted
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	Redacted
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	Redacted
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	Redacted
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	Redacted
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	Redacted
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	Redacted
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	Redacted
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	Redacted
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	Redacted
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	Redacted
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	Redacted
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	Redacted
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	Redacted
Meta Data Management	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	Redacted
Information Sharing	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	Redacted
Information Sharing	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	Redacted
Information Sharing	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Discovery	Redacted
Information Sharing	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	Redacted
Content Publishing and Delivery	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Transformation	Redacted
Information Sharing	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	Redacted
Information Sharing	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	Redacted
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Redacted
Enterprise Application Integration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Redacted
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	Redacted
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Redacted
Configuration Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	Redacted
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	Redacted

a. Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications

b. In the Service Specification field, agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

6. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)?

a. If "yes," please describe.

The DOT/HUD consolidated eGrants solution will leverage Federal projects like E-Authentication and Grants.gov. It will also leverage the DOT Financial Center of Excellence - Delphi for grant payment. Established COTS tools will be used such as business intelligence for reporting and business process management to efficiently automate and integrate workflow with business rules. Maintenance costs will be minimized by reusing software components and COTS software products.

Exhibit 300: Part II: Planning, Acquisition and Performance Information

Section A: Alternatives Analysis (All Capital Assets)

Part II should be completed only for investments identified as "Planning" or "Full Acquisition," or "Mixed Life-Cycle" investments in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

In selecting the best capital asset, you should identify and consider at least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline, i.e., the status quo. Use OMB Circular A-94 for all investments and the Clinger Cohen Act of 1996 for IT investments to determine the criteria you should use in your Benefit/Cost Analysis.

- 1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project? No
 - a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed?
 - b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed? 3/14/2008
 - c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

2. Alternative Analysis Results: * Costs in millions			
Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:			
Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted

- 3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen?
Redacted
- 4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?
Redacted
- 5. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole? Yes
 - a. If "yes," are the migration costs associated with the migration to the selected alternative included in this investment, the legacy investment, or in a separate migration investment? This Investment
 - b. If "yes," please provide the following information:

List of Legacy Investment or Systems		
Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement

Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

- 1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? No
 - a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? 3/14/2008
 - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? No
 - c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:
- 2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed? Yes
 - a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date? 11/20/2006
 - b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule:

A detailed Project Plan which will include a Risk Management Plan will be developed. Costs will be risk adjusted. Joint DOT/HUD Project Management Office (PMO) personnel will monitor risk on a periodic basis. The joint PMO will be comprised of grant, IT,

financial and project management personnel to cover multiple areas of risk. The CoE effort will follow the PMI project management ANSI standard.

Section C: Cost and Schedule Performance (All Capital Assets)

EVM is required only on DME portions of investments. For mixed lifecycle investments, O&M milestones should still be included in the table (Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline). This table should accurately reflect the milestones in the initial baseline, as well as milestones in the current baseline.

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard-748? No
2. Is the CV% or SV% greater than +/- 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100) No
 - a. If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?
 - b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance:
 - c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions:
3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? No
 - a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head?

Exhibit 300: DOTXX071: DOT eGrants Consolidation (Revision 11)

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

Complete the following table to compare actual performance against the current performance baseline and to the initial performance baseline. In the Current Baseline section, for all milestones listed, you should provide both the baseline and actual completion dates (e.g., "03/23/2003"/ "04/28/2004") and the baseline and actual total costs (in \$ Millions). In the event that a milestone is not found in both the initial and current baseline, leave the associated cells blank. Note that the 'Description of Milestone' and 'Percent Complete' fields are required. Indicate '0' for any milestone no longer active.

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost (\$M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost (\$M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted							