

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: 4/10/2009
2. Agency: Environmental Protection Agency
3. Bureau: Office Of Solid Waste And Emergency Response
4. Name of this Capital Asset: BY2010 Emergency Management Portal (EMP)
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 020-00-01-13-01-3013-00
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY 2010? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY 2010, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY 2010 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 EPA Emergency Management Portal is the central piece of EPA Emergency Management Architecture. EMP was reported as a non-major system starting in FY2005 for BY 2007 through BY 2009. It directly ties to EPA's Strategic Plan goals 3.2.1: Prepare for and respond to accidental and intentional releases and 4.1.2: Reduce chemical risks at facilities and in communities. When complete it will tie together prevention, preparedness & response information to allow EPA's Emergency Management community to have access to the information they need to respond to & efficiently store data from large and small sites. The EMP will also tie together data from the removal and remedial programs in OSWER by allowing for automated data and document transfer to other OSWER assets (CERCLIS, SDMS) and by providing a central data store for all of OSWER's environmental analytical data. To improve emergency management capabilities & meet its Strategic Plan goals, the Office of Emergency Management developed the National Approach to Response (NAR). The NAR lists 14 priority areas which require data integration to succeed, including health & safety, Incident & Data Management, Response Support Corps, Training and Exercises, Decontamination Strategy/Portfolio, Equipment Management, and Environmental Laboratory Capacity. The focus of the NAR is to provide seamless functionality between and among Regions who may need to respond together in a regionally or nationally significant incident. The EPA EMP provides the tools necessary to allow data collection to scale up from a single small site to a large disaster, such as the World Trade Center, Columbia Shuttle disaster or the Katrina/Rita hurricanes. The concepts documented in the Emergency Management Architecture were tested during these incidents & demonstrated the need for a permanent structure capable of moving data from the field to a central data store, managing deployment for personnel and equipment and communicating information to the rest of EPA, other Federal and state agencies & the general public.
- The Emergency Management Portal supports Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response. It will consist of the following general areas: Site & Data Management, ER Equipment Management; Personnel Field Readiness, and Technical Information (including WMD decontamination technologies).
9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes
- a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? 8/28/2008
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? Yes
11. Contact information of Program/Project Manager?
- Name
- Phone Number
- Email
- a. What is the current FAC-P/PM (for civilian agencies) or DAWIA (for defense agencies) certification level of the program/project manager?
- b. When was the Program/Project Manager Assigned?
- c. What date did the Program/Project Manager receive the FAC-P/PM certification? If the certification has not been issued, what is the anticipated date for certification?

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Emergency Management Portal (EMP) (Revision 2)

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
- 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?) EMP provides rapid transfer of data from field to central data storage. It allows EPA's Emergency Management community, Federal, state and tribal partners to have immediate access to response information. EMP stores data from large and small sites by providing online tools to capture documents and data as they are being created. EMP responds to the citizen need for the EPA to prepare for and respond to accidental and intentional releases and reduce chemical risks at facilities and in communities
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? 10000238 - Superfund Removal
- c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? Moderately Effective
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 1
17. In addition to the answer in 11(a), what project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)
18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2008 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23) No
19. Is this a financial management system? No
- a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMI compliance area?
1. If "yes," which compliance area:
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
20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2010 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)
- | | |
|----------|----|
| Hardware | 10 |
| Software | 5 |
| Services | 85 |

- Other 0
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
- Phone Number
- Title
- E-mail
23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval? Yes
- 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 2008	CY 2009	BY 2010	BY+1 2011	BY+2 2012	BY+3 2013	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	1.5	1	0.5	0.4					
Acquisition:	1.953	1.155	1.6	2.25					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	3.453	2.155	2.1	2.65					
Operations & Maintenance:	0	0.5	0.5	0.6					
TOTAL:	3.453	2.655	2.6	3.25					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	0.052	0.053	0.053	0.137					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	1	1	1	1					

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 FY2009 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:

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: BY2010 Emergency Management Portal (EMP) (Revision 2)

Contracts/Task Orders Table:																* Costs in millions
Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	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 FAC-C or DAWIA 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)
68-W-04-005/TO49	Cost Plus Incentive Fee	Yes	1/8/2004	3/28/2005	12/31/2009	6.9	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes				
EP07D000102	Blanket Purchase Agreement	Yes	8/17/2007	8/17/2007	8/16/2010	4.7	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes				
68-W-04-005/New TO	Cost Plus Incentive Fee	Yes	1/8/2004	1/8/2009	12/31/2013	10	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes				

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:

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

a. Explain why not or how this is being done? EPA requires all contracts to comply with applicable Section 508 standards. EPA systems must demonstrate complete 508 compliance before submission to the EPA Maintenance Review Board. 508 compliance reviews are performed with system releases and on an ad hoc basis. EMP systems are not fully accepted by the government until 508 compliance testing is completed.

4. Is there an acquisition plan which reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? Yes

a. If "yes," what is the date? 8/31/2008

1. Is it Current? Yes

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

1. If "no," briefly explain why: TBD

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 the next President's Budget.

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Training	Number of training sessions/communications on EMP usage	5	10	results available 10/1/2008
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Management	Disaster Preparedness and Planning	Number of regions/offices using the EMP equipment module to manage their warehouses.	0	3	results available 10/1/2008
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Processes and Activities	Quality	Errors	Number of WMD Chemicals with technical information for decontamination, Health and Safety, etc stored and peer reviewed in national system.	0	3	results available 10/1/2008
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Information and Data	Internal Data Sharing	Technical Information links and documents available thru portal technology	0	50%	Results available 10/1/2008
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Training	Number of training sessions/communications on EMP usage	10	20	results available 10/1/2009
2009	Goal 3: Land	Mission and	Disaster	Disaster	Number of	3	13	results available

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Emergency Management Portal (EMP) (Revision 2)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Preservation and Restoration	Business Results	Management	Preparedness and Planning	regions/offices using the EMP equipment module to manage their warehouses.			10/1/2009
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Processes and Activities	Quality	Errors	Number of WMD Chemicals with technical information for decontamination, Health and Safety, etc stored and peer reviewed in national system.	3	6	results available 10/1/2009
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Effectiveness	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	Number of EMP components available for use offering convenient and efficient data/information management.	1	3	results available 10/1/2009
2010	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Percentage of EMP Components continuously updated with high quality information	10%	50%	results available 10/1/2010
2010	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Management	Disaster Repair and Restore	Percentage of data used for program measures extracted from EMP.	0	50%	results available 10/1/2010
2010	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Management	Disaster Repair and Restore	Percentage of removal sites represented by a record in EMP.	0	50%	results available 10/1/2010
2010	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Management	Emergency Response	EPA ER equipment inventory accessible from national system.	20%	100%	results available 10/1/2010
2010	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Compliance	Percentage of Regions and Special teams using EMP to track field readiness of response personnel.	0%	50%	results available 10/1/2010
2010	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Compliance	Percentage of EPA Offices (AA) and Regions using EMP to track numbers and readiness of the Response Support Corps volunteers	0%	50%	results available 10/1/2010
2010	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Effectiveness	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	Number of EMP components available for use offering convenient and efficient data/information management.	3	6	results available 10/1/2010
2010	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Effectiveness	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	Percentage of Action Memos and Pollution Reports created using the new automated technology	20%	50%	results available 10/1/2010

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

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Emergency Management Portal (EMP) (Revision 2)

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: 10
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)
Emergency Management Portal	Contractor and Government	12/31/2009	12/1/2009

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 Completed: Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
Emergency Management Portal	Contractor and Government	Moderate	yes	9/17/2007	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	6/16/2008	7/11/2008

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? No
 - a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process?
6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses? No
 - a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness.
7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above?

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Emergency Management Portal (EMP) (Revision 2)

(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
Emergency Management Portal	Yes	Yes	This system does not collect PII on members of the public. Therefore, no PIA is required to be posted.	Yes	http://epa.gov/privacy/assess/emp.htm

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. Emergency Management Portal
 - b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed and approved segment architecture? No
 - a. If "yes," provide the six digit code corresponding to the agency segment architecture. The segment architecture codes are maintained by the agency Chief Architect. For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture codes, please refer to <http://www.egov.gov>.

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)
Site and Data Management	Management of removal/emergency response sites including all data, documents and images generated as a result of site cleanup.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Program / Project Management			No Reuse	30
Readiness Management	Management of field readiness status for On-Scene- Coordinators and EPA Response Support Corps volunteers	Business Management Services	Organizational Management	NEW	Education / Training	020-00-01-16-02-6037-00	Internal	20
Knowledge Management	Collect, manage and present technical information to support emergency response,	Customer Services	Customer Initiated Assistance	Self-Service	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	020-00-01-16-02-6029-00	Internal	10

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Emergency Management Portal (EMP) (Revision 2)

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)
	including, decontamination technologies, health and safety, risk and toxicology, field tools, administrative, chem/bio/rad general info.							
Document Management	Manage a library containing documents and images that support equipment management, site management, and technical information sharing.	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Library / Storage	Program / Project Management	020-00-01-13-01-1020-00	Internal	5
ER Equipment Management	National management of EPA inventory of emergency response equipment.	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	30
Identity and Access Management	Manage access to the EMP for EPA employees and trusted partners	Support Services	Security Management	Identification and Authentication	Access Control	020-00-01-16-02-6037-00	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)
Program / Project Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
NEW	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	
Self-Service	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	

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., USA.gov, Pay.Gov, No

etc)?

a. If "yes," please describe.

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? Yes
 - a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? 8/5/2008
 - b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?
 - 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
Alternative 1 - Modify Current			
Alternative 2- Regionally Distributed Application			
Alternative 3 Integrated database with Portal user interface			
Current			

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen?

Alternative 3: The specific quantitative cost benefits and cost avoidance for Alternative 3 are in the Federal Quantitative Benefits table. The major requirements for the solution that addresses the Emergency Management target architecture are: Scalability-practical for daily use, while being able to adapt to larger situations; Portability - data must flow seamlessly from the field to the ICS Units (Planning, Ops, Environmental) to the Public; Integration - to reduce data entry burden, increase data quality, reuse OSWER and Agency data, and connect documents/decisions with supporting data; Accessibility - accessible from outside the agency network by EPA emergency responders and their trusted partners; Enhances Decision-making - reporting, counting and data analysis for outcome and readiness measures, spatial display of information and risk communication.

Creating one central integrated database/application (Alt 3) met these requirements the best while maximizing the use of the Agency's existing technologies and data registries. This application will allow each region to own and manage all data associated with its removal sites including site descriptions, documents, analytical & recon data, personnel, and equipment. Smaller sites can be managed solely using field tools until they are complete, at which point final data would be uploaded. Moderate to large sites can be managed using a combination of field tools and central database. The data is then readily available for public access via existing agency applications. This alternative will also allow the use of agency data registries for persons, facilities, substances, and document management. This solution will provide a national picture of EPA's readiness to respond both for its personnel and its equipment and will integrate these data with site data. It will also allow the program to calculate output and outcome measures. While it will be somewhat complex and expensive to build initially, in the long run it will be less problematic than attempting to maintain separate regional applications. Our alternatives analysis also supports the selection of Alt 3 from a quantitative perspective. Alt 3 is the only one that breaks even in terms of budgeted costs savings exceeding cumulative costs. Further, the ROI for Alt 3 is 18.9% higher than the next best alternative.

a. What year will the investment breakeven? (Specifically, when the budgeted costs savings exceed the cumulative costs.)

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

Site Management: The Agency will be ready to manage data from large sites and national emergencies because this solution will allow OSCs to use these tools on a daily basis for all sized sites. Having the database and processes in place will permit a seamless, rapid flow of information from the field to the public to enhance risk communication and public safety. Central management of sites will also allow the removal program to capture data from Action Memoranda, Pollution Reports and Situation Reports. These data can be used to update the OSWER central system (CERCLIS) automatically and to measure the success of the program. Central management will also allow the removal program to take advantage of the Superfund Document Management System (SDMS) developed by the remedial program.

Equipment Management: All regions will have a uniform nomenclature and system for managing warehouses. The central database will allow EPA to easily share its assets internally among regions and with other Federal agencies through enhanced knowledge of national assets and enhances ability to track what has been shared.

Field Readiness: Central management of Response Support Corp volunteers and response personnel training and experience will provide EPA with a regional and national picture of the readiness of EPA personnel. This solution will also allow individuals to easily see a picture of their own status, so they can schedule needed training before certifications expire.

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Emergency Management Portal (EMP) (Revision 2)

Technical Information: The collection of decontamination, containment, health and safety and toxicity information in this central system will provide EPA's responders and their trusted partners with vital information for both preparedness and response. This information is vetted by EPA's National Decontamination Team of subject matter experts, which ensures that it is always current, accurate and practical for our responders.

5. Federal Quantitative Benefits				
What specific quantitative benefits will be realized (using current dollars) Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:				
	Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings	Justification for Budgeted Cost Avoidance
PY - 1 2007 & Prior	0	0		
PY 2008	0	0		
CY 2009	0.7	0	Stop supporting separate regional equipment databases. Decontamination research, H&S, risk and tox and other info easy to find	
BY 2010	5.3	3	Stop supporting regional site databases. Stop supporting large incident databases. Stop supporting separate regional equipment databases. Measures of success and readiness are reported from data in EMP instead of manually counted. CERCLIS data auto entered from EMP instead of manually entered. Decontamination research, H&S, risk and tox and other info easy to find	For regions that do not have them, avoid building regional site databases.
Total LCC Benefit			LCC = Life-cycle Cost	

6. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole?

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?

b. If "yes," please provide the following information:

5b. List of Legacy Investment or Systems		
Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement
various regional equipment applications		9/30/2009
Various small systems and manual processes		

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? Yes
 - a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? 3/24/2009
 - 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? No
 - a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?
 - 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:

Risks were considered during the EMP project conception and planning, however a formal plan was not completed. While life cycle cost estimates and investment schedule do not formally reflect investment risks, the EMP project has taken steps to mitigate typical investment risks in an IT project of this type. These mitigation steps include making staffing and resource decisions conservatively, including a user acceptance process and developing an EMP acquisition strategy. The Risk Management Plan being developed will formally address risks and mitigations; quantify them and their possible effects; address the impacts on cost and schedule for planning purposes; and describe the methodology of risk weighting in project planning.

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? Yes

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: BY2010 Emergency Management Portal (EMP) (Revision 2)

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			
1	FY 2007 & Earlier - Planning & Acquisition	9/30/2007	\$3.453000	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	\$3.453000	\$3.453000	0	\$0.000000	100%
2	Field Readiness: RSC software ready for user acceptance testing.	9/30/2008	\$0.500000	7/31/2008	7/21/2008	\$0.500000	\$0.466000	10	\$0.034000	100%
3	Site and Data Management: Site software available for use acceptance testing	9/30/2008	\$1.000000	9/30/2008	9/30/2008	\$1.000000	\$1.000000	0	\$0.000000	100%
4	EMP: Develop portal template/homepage for all modules	10/31/2008	\$0.100000	10/31/2008		\$0.100000	\$0.077000		\$0.013000	90%
5	Equipment - Incorporate existing central Equipment application as a module of the Emergency Management Portal. All EPA warehouses routinely using this module to manage emergency response equipment	12/31/2009	\$1.350000	12/31/2009		\$1.350000				0%
6	Field Readiness: OSC training software ready for user acceptance testing	3/31/2009	\$1.500000	3/31/2009		\$1.500000				0%
7	Field Readiness – Software available for regions and AAships enter Response Support Corp and On Scene Coordinator training and experience in EMP. All data migrated from legacy systems. Legacy systems taken offline.	12/31/2009	\$1.700000	12/31/2009		\$1.700000				0%
8	Site and Data Management – Software available for regions to create & store Sites, Action Memos, PolReps/Sit Reps & other site documentation in EMP. Legacy system taken	12/31/2009	\$2.000000	12/31/2009		\$2.000000				0%

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Emergency Management Portal (EMP) (Revision 2)

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			
	offline.									
9	Site and Data Management – Users able to store sampling and monitoring, facilities recon, and hazardous debris data associated with sites in EMP. Database available to OSWER's Remedial program for data storage.	9/30/2010	\$2.000000	9/30/2010		\$2.000000				0%
Project Totals										18.37%