

Exhibit 300 FY2011

FMCSA009: FMCSA Modernization Project

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Description: In Part I, complete Sections A, B, C, and D for all capital assets (IT and non-IT). Complete Sections E and F for IT capital assets.

I.A. Overview (All Capital Assets)

Description: The following series of questions are to be completed for all investments.

I.A.1. Date of Submission:	2010-01-08
I.A.2. Agency:	021
I.A.3. Bureau:	17
I.A.4. Name of this Investment: Description: (Up to 250 characters)	FMCSA009: FMCSA Modernization Project
I.A.5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: Description: For IT investment only, see section 53.9. For all other, use agency ID system.	021-17-01-14-01-1280-00
I.A.6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2011? Description: Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY2011, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2011 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.	Mixed Life Cycle
I.A.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; this description may include links to relevant information which should include relevant GAO reports, and links to relevant findings of independent audits. Description: (Up to 2500 characters)	<p>The FMCSA Modernization Project (also known as COMPASS) is aligned with FMCSA's mission of saving lives and making America's roads safer by providing more efficient access to safety information on behalf of FMCSA, state partners, and customers, and developing new tools for streamlining and enhancing enforcement processes. The current application architecture severely restricts FMCSA's service delivery due to a lack of flexibility, adaptability, data accessibility, and ease of use, which makes it challenging to meet customers' business needs. In response to these challenges, FMCSA has elected to invest in a new, highly integrated and flexible systems architecture. Through this investment, FMCSA plans to improve high-risk carrier data formulation, improve services delivered by its systems application suite, and improve key IT portfolio and related management practices. Ultimately, FMCSA expects this investment to result in substantial improvement in the efficiency and effectiveness of Field safety operations. Enforcement Staff for example, will be able to conduct roadside and border safety inspections, safety audits, and compliance reviews more efficiently thanks to the integration of the applications and improved data quality. The new workflow and rule engine capabilities will allow Enforcement Staff to automatically monitor commercial vehicle activities to determine if action is required and then trigger processes for suspending or revoking registration or operating authority, when necessary. FMCSA customers will also see a significant improvement in their ability to access information and synthesize data, and FMCSA will be able to maintain its ongoing IT costs based on industry standards.</p>
I.A.8.a. Enter dates for approved rebaselining, alternative analysis, and risk management plan and risk register information. Description: Provide here the date of any approved rebaselining within the past year, the date for the most recent (or planned) alternatives analysis for this investment, and whether this investment has a risk management plan and risk register. (Up to 500 characters)	
This investment has not been rebaselined within the past year. The most recent alternatives analysis was completed on 1/4/2010; it shows that the alternative being followed since the investment was first submitted remains the preferable alternative. The FMCSA IT Risk Management Plan was updated on 7/15/2009. A risk register is maintained and reviewed bi-weekly by the Modernization Program Management Office (PMO).	
I.A.9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?	yes
I.A.9.a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?	2009-08-11
I.A.12. If this investment is a financial management system, then please fill out the following as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory (FMSI):	
I.A.12.a. Financial Management System Table	
I.A.12.b. If this investment is a financial management system AND the investment is part of the core financial system then select the primary FFMIA compliance area that this investment addresses (choose only one):	
I.B. Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)	
I.B.1. Summary of Funding Table Description: 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. Funding for all costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this report. Funding levels should be shown for budget authority by year consistent with funding levels in Exhibit 53. The Summary of Funding table shall include the amounts allocated to the investment from, and should be directly tied to, the Fiscal Year Budget. This includes direct appropriations (discretionary or mandatory accounts), user fees, and approved self-funding activities and will provide the actual annual "budget" for the investment. This "budget" will be a subset of the congressionally approved budget for	

each fiscal year. This will provide Departments/Agencies and OMB useful information on the actual Fiscal Year dollars being asked for and spent on an investment.

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.

I.B.1.a. Summary of Spending for Project Phases (Reported in Millions)

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2009	CY 2010	BY 2011
Planning	\$13.331	\$4.400	\$4.500	\$0.000
Acquisition	\$25.932	\$7.500	\$7.800	\$18.852
Subtotal Planning and Acquisition	\$39.263	\$11.900	\$12.300	\$18.852
Operations and Maintenance	\$39.650	\$8.300	\$8.400	\$9.000
Disposition Costs (Optional)	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
SUBTOTAL	\$78.913	\$20.200	\$20.700	\$27.852
Government FTE Costs	\$12.447	\$4.023	\$4.120	\$4.978
TOTAL	\$91.360	\$24.223	\$24.820	\$32.830

I.B.1.b. Summary of Spending for Project Phases (Government FTE Costs Only)

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2009	CY 2010	BY 2011
Number of FTE represented by Costs	113	36	36	41

I.B.2. If the summary of funding has changed from the FY2010 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:

Description: (Up to 2500 characters)

Additional funding is included in 2011. FMCSA will use these resources to accelerate the COMPASS initiative. COMPASS will incorporate the numerous regulatory and data system requirements that directly support new agency safety initiatives. Without the additional funding, FMCSA may not meet the growing field operations requirements associated with enforcement, inspection and crash reporting. As operations and maintenance costs associated with current legacy systems continue to escalate, planned enhancements cannot be met under the current budget. Accelerating COMPASS will allow FMCSA to meet planned mission critical needs and the retirement of functionality associated with several legacy systems and prepare for cost-effective implementation of new business requirements.

I.D. Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

I.D.1. Performance Information Table.

Description: 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 and the relevant Agency Segment Architecture. The investment must discuss its performance measures in support of the agency's mission and strategic goals as outlined in the corresponding Segment Architecture. Performance measures (indicators) must be provided. 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 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 <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/e-gov/>. The table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond the next President's Budget.

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator
2006	Safety	Customer Results	Access	Customer score of ability to accomplish the desired service via the website
2006	Safety	Customer Results	Access	Satisfaction score for the usefulness of information in enabling customers to make better decisions
2006	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Ground Transportation	Fatalities involving large trucks and buses per 100 million vehicle miles traveled
2006	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Ground Transportation	Number of serious hazardous materials incidents involving large trucks
2006	Safety	Processes and Activities	Compliance	Average time an issue is open
2006	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Number of compliance reviews (Federal)
2006	Safety	Technology	Data Reliability and Quality	Percentage of FMCSA reported crash data matched to a carrier
2007	Safety	Customer Results	Integration	Number of systems that require an independent sign on not automatically provided by the COMPASS portal

2007	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Ground Transportation	Number of serious hazardous materials incidents involving large trucks
2007	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Ground Transportation	Fatalities involving large trucks and buses per 100 million vehicle miles traveled
2007	Safety	Processes and Activities	Security	Average time to resolve a security risk identified in the vulnerability scan
2007	Safety	Technology	Data Standardization or Tagging	Percentage of technical coverage of business concepts
2008	Safety	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Satisfaction score from Federal system users
2008	Safety	Customer Results	Integration	Number of systems that require an independent sign on not automatically provided by the COMPASS portal
2008	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Ground Transportation	Fatalities involving large trucks and buses per 100 million vehicle miles traveled
2008	Safety	Processes and Activities	Security	Average time to resolve high vulnerabilities
2008	Safety	Technology	Data Standardization or Tagging	Percentage of technical coverage of business concepts
2009	Safety	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Satisfaction score from Federal system users
2009	Safety	Customer Results	Integration	Number of systems that require an independent sign on not automatically provided by the COMPASS portal
2009	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Ground Transportation	Fatalities involving large trucks and buses per 100 million vehicle miles traveled
2009	Safety	Processes and Activities	Security	Average time to resolve high vulnerabilities
2009	Safety	Technology	Availability	Percent of time systems are available
2010	Safety	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Satisfaction score from Federal system users
2010	Safety	Customer Results	Integration	Total number of existing systems replaced by investment
2010	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Ground Transportation	Fatalities involving large trucks and buses per 100 million vehicle miles traveled
2010	Safety	Processes and Activities	Security	Average time to discover total exposure, develop remediation, test against current infrastructure, deploy and re - assess remediation for new vulnerabilities and/or other related issues
2010	Safety	Technology	Availability	Percent of time systems are available
2011	Safety	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Satisfaction score from Federal system users
2011	Safety	Customer Results	Integration	Total number of existing systems replaced by investment
2011	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Ground Transportation	Fatalities involving large trucks and buses per 100 million vehicle miles traveled
2011	Safety	Processes and Activities	Security	Average time to discover total exposure, develop remediation, test against current infrastructure, deploy and re - assess remediation for new vulnerabilities and/or other related issues
2011	Safety	Technology	Availability	Percent of time systems are available
2012	Safety	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Satisfaction score from Federal system users
2012	Safety	Customer Results	Integration	Total number of existing systems replaced by investment
2012	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Ground Transportation	Fatalities involving large trucks and buses per 100 million vehicle miles traveled

2012	Safety	Processes and Activities	Security	Average time to discover total exposure, develop remediation, test against current infrastructure, deploy and re - assess remediation for new vulnerabilities and/or other related issues
2012	Safety	Technology	Availability	Percent of time systems are available
2013	Safety	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Satisfaction score from Federal system users
2013	Safety	Customer Results	Integration	Total number of existing systems replaced by investment
2013	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Ground Transportation	Fatalities involving large trucks and buses per 100 million vehicle miles traveled
2013	Safety	Processes and Activities	Security	Average time to discover total exposure, develop remediation, test against current infrastructure, deploy and re - assess remediation for new vulnerabilities and/or other related issues
2013	Safety	Technology	Availability	Percent of time systems are available
2014	Safety	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Satisfaction score from Federal system users
2014	Safety	Customer Results	Integration	Total number of existing systems replaced by investment
2014	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Ground Transportation	Fatalities involving large trucks and buses per 100 million vehicle miles traveled
2014	Safety	Processes and Activities	Security	Average time to discover total exposure, develop remediation, test against current infrastructure, deploy and re - assess remediation for new vulnerabilities and/or other related issues
2014	Safety	Technology	Availability	Percent of time systems are available
2015	Safety	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Satisfaction score from Federal system users
2015	Safety	Customer Results	Integration	Total number of existing systems replaced by investment
2015	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Ground Transportation	Fatalities involving large trucks and buses per 100 million vehicle miles traveled
2015	Safety	Processes and Activities	Security	Average time to discover total exposure, develop remediation, test against current infrastructure, deploy and re - assess remediation for new vulnerabilities and/or other related issues
2015	Safety	Technology	Availability	Percent of time systems are available

I.F. Enterprise Architecture (EA) (IT Capital Assets only)

Description: 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.

Have the requisite investment-level architecture documentation requirements (e.g., reference model mappings, FTF mappings, etc.) for this investment been documented in the corresponding Segment Architecture? For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture requirements, please refer to <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/e-gov/>. See this guidance also regarding the reporting of six digit codes corresponding to agency segment architectures in Exhibit 53, and, for limited cases determined by the Chief Architect, reporting an investment alignment with multiple segments.

I.F.1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? yes no

Part IV: Planning for "Multi-Agency Collaboration" ONLY

Description: Part IV should be completed only for investments identified as an E-Gov initiative, a Line of Business (LOB) Initiative, or a Multi-Agency Collaboration effort. The "Multi-Agency Collaboration" choice should be selected in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above. Investments identified as "Multi-Agency Collaboration" will complete only Parts I and IV of the exhibit 300.

IV.A. Multi-Agency Collaboration Oversight (All Capital Assets)

Description: Multi-agency Collaborations, such as E-Gov and LOB initiatives, should develop a joint exhibit 300.

<p>IV.A.1. Stakeholder Table Description: As a joint exhibit 300, please identify all the agency stakeholders (all participating agencies, this should not be limited to agencies with financial commitment). All agency stakeholders should be listed regardless of approval. If the partner agency has approved this joint exhibit 300 please provide the date of approval.</p>	
<p>IV.A.5. Does this investment replace any legacy systems investments? Description: Disposition costs (costs of retirement of legacy systems) may be included as a category in Part I, Section B, Summary of Funding, or in separate investments, classified as major or non-major. For legacy system investments being replaced by this investment, include the following data on these legacy investments.</p>	