

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:

2. Agency: Department of Commerce

3. Bureau: Bureau Of The Census

4. Name of this Capital Asset: Census - MAF/TIGER Enhancements

5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 006-07-01-02-01-4011-00

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? FY2002

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 Master Address File/Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing (MAF/TIGER), contains geographic and address data for the entire nation. In order to meet the needs of the re-engineered 2010 Census, the Census Bureau launched this initiative, - the MAF/TIGER Enhancement Program (MTEP). The MTEP implementation consists of the following five objectives that, when completed, will provide the Census Bureau with the modern technology and the geographic data required to achieve its mission: 1. Improve street location accuracy: Aggressively seek highly accurate and available state, local, tribal, and private sector Geographic Information System (GIS) files without restrictions, and to improve street location accuracy. A contractor will use these files, where available, use commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) imagery, or obtain, when necessary, source information of sufficient quality to update and improve existing MAF/TIGER street location accuracy. 2. Implement a modern processing environment. This objective was completed in FY06. 3. Expand and encourage geographic partnership options: Institute a program to maintain an up-to-date address list with current street information. Allow program partners to review and update MAF/TIGER information electronically. Use geospatial files from local and tribal governments to update the MAF/TIGER system. 4. Implement the Community Address Updating System (CAUS): Develop an address listing and geolocation system that will identify and list new addresses and map new streets in mainly rural areas that do not use city-style addresses for mail delivery or for locating housing units. 5. Implement periodic evaluation activities and expand quality metrics: Implement evaluation activities to check that corrected information is accurate and complete, and identify new areas requiring additional work. This program will come to a close in FY 2012, with the Community Address Updating System (CAUS) moving to the Geographic Support Systems (or GSS - Unique Project Identifier #4009) in FY 2013.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes

a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? 2/2/2006

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? New Program Manager

b. When was the Program/Project Manager Assigned? 7/17/2008

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? 7/17/2009

12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project? Yes

Exhibit 300: Census - MAF/TIGER Enhancements (Revision 19)

- 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?) This initiative supports the Geospatial one-stop and Geospatial Line of Business Initiatives by coordinating the spatial data gathering efforts to eliminate the duplication within the Federal government. Geospatial data collected from state, local and tribal governments and managed into a seamless nationwide spatial database with the data being made available through the Geospatial One Stop portal.
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.) No
- a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review? No
- b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program?
- c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive?
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. In addition to the answer in 11(a), 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 2008 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23) Yes
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 | 0 |
| Software | 0 |
| Services | 60 |
| Other | 40 |
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?

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

Name

Phone Number

Title

Chief Privacy Officer

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: | 37.154 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | | | | |
| Acquisition: | 223.946 | 27.652 | 3.1 | 3.605 | | | | | |
| Subtotal Planning & Acquisition: | 261.100 | 28.652 | 4.1 | 3.605 | | | | | |
| Operations & Maintenance: | 50.609 | 10.528 | 0.639 | 14.453 | | | | | |
| TOTAL: | 311.709 | 39.180 | 4.739 | 18.058 | | | | | |
| Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above. | | | | | | | | | |
| Government FTE Costs | 57.176 | 15.872 | 13.605 | 12.038 | | | | | |
| Number of FTE represented by Costs: | 824 | 194 | 158 | 148 | | | | | |

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.

| 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) |
| Harris 50YABC266005 | Cost Plus Award Fee | Yes | 9/30/2005 | 9/30/2005 | 9/30/2010 | | No | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | Yes | | michael.i.palensky@census.gov | Level 3 | |
| ARTS YA132308CO0012 | Time & Materials and IDIQ Firm Fixed Price | Yes | 8/1/2008 | 8/4/2008 | 8/3/2013 | | No | Yes | No | NA | No | Yes | | michael.i.palensky@census.gov | Level 3 | |
| Acquis YA132308CN0034 | Time & Materials | Yes | 7/31/2008 | 8/1/2008 | 7/31/2010 | | No | No | No | NA | No | Yes | | michael.i.palensky@census.gov | Level 3 | |
| CNSI 50YABC266039 | Time & Materials | Yes | 3/26/2003 | 3/26/2003 | 9/30/2008 | | No | No | Yes | NA | No | Yes | | michael.i.palensky@census.gov | Level 3 | |
| Oracle YA132307NC0432 | Time & Materials | Yes | 7/6/2007 | 7/6/2007 | 9/30/2011 | | No | No | No | NA | No | Yes | | michael.i.palensky@census.gov | Level 3 | |
| Michael Baker YA132304CN0027 | Fixed Price | Yes | 10/28/2005 | 10/28/2005 | 12/30/2008 | | No | Yes | Yes | NA | No | Yes | | william.h.russell@census.gov | Level 3 | |
| Sabre YACM1301-05-CT-0055 | Performance Based | Yes | 7/25/2005 | 7/25/2005 | 6/15/2011 | | No | Yes | Yes | NA | No | Yes | | michael.i.palensky@census.gov | Level 3 | |

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:

For the development components of the MTEP project (approximately 70% of all contract dollars) earned value management is required. The 30% of contract dollars not requiring EVM are for maintenance activities where tracking earned value would not be beneficial. For these contracts, cost and performance are closely monitored to ensure the requirements of each contract are being met.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

a. Explain why not or how this is being done? The Geographic Process and Quality Management Branch (GPQMB) perform quality assessment and ensure Section 508 standard compliance on internal & external division websites using Dreamweaver software. Dreamweaver ensures content to be Section 508 compliant in two ways: 1. It prompts the user for accessibility information when they add content or when they edit content, accessibility information using can be provided in dialog boxes. 2. Validate XHTML code for compliance with Section 508 standards.

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? 2/20/2008

1. Is it Current?

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 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 |
| 2005 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Mission and Business Results | General Government (CrossAgency) | Central Fiscal Operations | Percent of budget | MAF/TIGER Enhancement project is managed within 10% of the total budget. | MAF/TIGER Enhancement project will be managed within 9% of the total budget. | MAF/TIGER was managed within 1% of the total budget. |
| 2005 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Processes and Activities | Productivity | Productivity | Number of counties for which map feature locations have been corrected in the MAF/TIGER database. | Goal of 600 counties corrected in FY 2004. | Correct 610 counties in FY 2005. | 610 counties were corrected in FY 2005. |
| 2005 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making | Technology | Efficiency | Technology Improvement | Average time to train MAF/TIGER system developers. | 12 weeks. | Reduce average training time by 10%. | Goal was reached as training was reduced by 10% to 11 weeks. |

Exhibit 300: Census - MAF/TIGER Enhancements (Revision 19)

| Performance Information Table | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Category | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual Results |
| | of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | | | | | | | |
| 2006 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Customer Results | Service Coverage | Frequency and Depth | % of counties completed compared to all counties in the nation. | 45% of the national counties completed by the efforts of this initiative. | Complete 66.8% of the national counties by the end of FY 2006. | 66.8% of national counties complete. |
| 2006 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Mission and Business Results | General Government (CrossAgency) | Central Fiscal Operations | Percent of budget. | MAF/TIGER Enhancement project is managed within 9% of the total budget. | MAF/TIGER Enhancement project is managed within 9% of the total budget. | Closed out FY06 within 1% of total Budget. |
| 2006 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Processes and Activities | Productivity | Productivity | Number of counties for which map feature locations have been corrected in the MAF/TIGER database. | Goal of 700 counties corrected in FY 2005. | Correct 700 counties in FY 2006. | 700 counties were corrected in FY 2006. |
| 2006 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Technology | Efficiency | Technology Improvement | Average time to train MAF/TIGER system developers. | 11 weeks. | Reduce average training time by 10%. | Average training time was reduced by 10% |
| 2007 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Customer Results | Service Coverage | Frequency and Depth | % of counties completed compared to all counties in the nation. | 66.8% of the national counties completed by the efforts of this initiative. | Complete 88.2% of the national counties by the end of FY 2007. | Completed 89% of the national counties. |
| 2007 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Mission and Business Results | General Government (CrossAgency) | Central Fiscal Operations | Percent of budget. | MAF/TIGER Enhancement project is managed within 9% of the total budget. | MAF/TIGER Enhancement project is managed within 9% of the total budget. | Closed out FY 2007 within 1% of budget. |
| 2007 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Processes and Activities | Productivity | Productivity | Number of counties for which map feature locations have been corrected in the MAF/TIGER database. | Goal of 700 counties in FY 2006. | Correct 690 counties in FY 2007. | Completed 730 counties. |
| 2007 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and | Technology | Efficiency | Technology Improvement | Average time to train MAF/TIGER system | 10 weeks. | Reduce average training time by 10% to 9 weeks. | Reduced training time to 9 weeks. |

Exhibit 300: Census - MAF/TIGER Enhancements (Revision 19)

| Performance Information Table | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Category | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual Results |
| | demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | | | | developers. | | | |
| 2008 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Customer Results | Service Coverage | Frequency and Depth | % of counties completed compared to all counties in the nation. | 88.2% of the national counties completed by the efforts of this initiative. | Complete 100% of the national counties by the end of FY 2008. | Completed 100% of the national counties |
| 2008 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Mission and Business Results | General Government (CrossAgency) | Central Fiscal Operations | Percent of budget. | MAF/TIGER Enhancement project is managed within 9% of the total budget. | MAF/TIGER Enhancement project is managed within 9% of the total budget. | Closed out FY2008 within 2% of budget |
| 2008 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Processes and Activities | Productivity | Productivity | Number of counties for which map feature locations have been corrected in the MAF/TIGER database. | Goal of 690 counties in FY 2007. | Correct 100% (320 remaining) of counties in FY 2008. | Completed remaining 320 counties |
| 2008 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Technology | Efficiency | Technology Improvement | Average time to train MAF/TIGER system developers. | 9 weeks. | Reduce average training time by 10% to 8 weeks. | Reduced training time to 8 weeks |
| 2009 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Customer Results | Service Coverage | Frequency and Depth | Yes or No - block section algorithm developed to Re-establish infrastructure for the Community Address Update System. | This is the first year that this activity has been measured in this context. | Develop block infrastructure document outlining Procedures in place to begin data collection in 2010. | |
| 2009 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Mission and Business Results | General Government (CrossAgency) | Central Fiscal Operations | Percent of budget. | MAF/TIGER Enhancement project is managed within 9% of the total budget. | MAF/TIGER Enhancement project is managed within 8% of the total budget. | |
| 2009 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Processes and Activities | Productivity | Productivity | Yes or No - CAUS database update procedures document developed to Re-establish infrastructure for the Community Address Update System. | This is the first year that this activity has been measured in this context. | Develop CAUS database update procedures document outlining Procedures in place to begin data collection in 2010. | |

Exhibit 300: Census - MAF/TIGER Enhancements (Revision 19)

| Performance Information Table | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|---|----------------|
| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Category | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual Results |
| 2009 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Technology | Efficiency | Technology Improvement | Average time to train MAF/TIGER system developers. | 8 weeks. | Reduce average training time by 10% to 7 weeks. | |
| 2010 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Customer Results | Service Coverage | Frequency and Depth | % of blocks completed compared to the universe of blocks to be listed in the nation. | List 15,000 of the national blocks in non-urban communities. | Complete 2% of the national blocks (750,000) by the end of FY 2010. | |
| 2010 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Mission and Business Results | General Government (CrossAgency) | Central Fiscal Operations | Percent of budget. | MAF/TIGER Enhancement project is managed within 8% of the total budget. | MAF/TIGER Enhancement project is managed within 7% of the total budget. | |
| 2010 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Processes and Activities | Productivity | Productivity | Number of blocks listed within the Community Address Update System. | This is the first year that this activity has been measured in this context. | List 15,000 blocks in FY 2010. | |
| 2010 | 1.3 Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policy makers, businesses, and the American public. | Technology | Efficiency | Technology Improvement | Average time to train MAF/TIGER system developers. | 7 weeks. | Reduce average training time by 10% to 6 weeks. | |

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

| 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 |
| CEN07- Geographic Support Systems (GSS) includes MTEP | No | Yes | http://www.census.gov/po/pia/pias/Final_MAF/TIGER_Enhancements_PIA.xls | No | No Because the system not a Privacy Act system of records. |
| <p>Details for Text Options:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Note: Working links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites. Non-working links will be considered as a blank field.</p> | | | | | |

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. Geographic-MAF-TIGER

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>. 153-000

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) |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| MAF/TIGER Enhancements | The MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program assures badly needed modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | Back Office Services | Data Management | Data Classification | | | No Reuse | 9 |
| MAF/TIGER Enhancements | The MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program assures badly needed modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | Back Office Services | Data Management | Data Cleansing | | | No Reuse | 9 |
| MAF/TIGER Enhancements | The MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program assures badly needed modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | Back Office Services | Data Management | Data Exchange | | | No Reuse | 9 |
| MAF/TIGER Enhancements | The MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program assures badly needed | Back Office Services | Data Management | Extraction and Transformation | | | No Reuse | 9 |

Exhibit 300: Census - MAF/TIGER Enhancements (Revision 19)

| 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) |
| | modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | | | | | | | |
| MAF/TIGER Enhancements | The MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program assures badly needed modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | Back Office Services | Data Management | Loading and Archiving | | | No Reuse | 9 |
| MAF/TIGER Enhancements | The MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program assures badly needed modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | Back Office Services | Data Management | Loading and Archiving | | | No Reuse | 9 |
| MAF/TIGER Enhancements | The MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program assures badly needed modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | Back Office Services | Data Management | Meta Data Management | | | No Reuse | 9 |
| MAF/TIGER Enhancements | The MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program assures badly needed modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | Business Analytical Services | Analysis and Statistics | Mathematical | | | No Reuse | 1 |
| MAF/TIGER Enhancements | The MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program assures badly needed modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | Business Analytical Services | Reporting | OLAP | | | No Reuse | 4 |
| MAF/TIGER Enhancements | The MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program assures badly needed modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | Business Analytical Services | Reporting | Standardized / Canned | | | No Reuse | 5 |

Exhibit 300: Census - MAF/TIGER Enhancements (Revision 19)

| 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) |
| | badly needed modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | | | | | | | |
| MAF/TIGER Enhancements | The MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program assures badly needed modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | Business Analytical Services | Visualization | Imagery | | | No Reuse | 5 |
| MAF/TIGER Enhancements | The MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program assures badly needed modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | Business Analytical Services | Visualization | Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS | Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS | 006-07-01-02-01-4004-00 | Internal | 5 |
| MAF/TIGER Enhancements | The MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program assures badly needed modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | Business Analytical Services | Visualization | Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS | | | No Reuse | 5 |
| MAF/TIGER Enhancements | The MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program assures badly needed modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | Business Analytical Services | Visualization | Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS | | | No Reuse | 5 |
| MAF/TIGER Enhancements | The MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program assures badly needed modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | Business Management Services | Management of Processes | Program / Project Management | Program / Project Management | 006-07-01-02-01-4004-00 | Internal | 1 |
| MAF/TIGER Enhancements | The MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program assures badly needed modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | Digital Asset Services | Content Management | Tagging and Aggregation | Tagging and Aggregation | 006-07-01-02-01-4004-00 | Internal | 3 |

Exhibit 300: Census - MAF/TIGER Enhancements (Revision 19)

| 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) |
| | Program assures badly needed modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | | | | | | | |
| MAF/TIGER Enhancements | The MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program assures badly needed modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | Digital Asset Services | Knowledge Management | Information Sharing | Information Sharing | 006-07-01-02-01-4004-00 | Internal | 1 |
| MAF/TIGER Enhancements | The MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program assures badly needed modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | Digital Asset Services | Knowledge Management | Knowledge Capture | Knowledge Capture | 006-07-01-02-01-4004-00 | Internal | 1 |
| MAF/TIGER Enhancements | The MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program assures badly needed modernization of the MAF/TIGER geographic system in time to meet the needs of the 2010 Census and its associated testing activities. | Digital Asset Services | Knowledge Management | Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | 006-07-01-02-01-4004-00 | Internal | 1 |

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) |
| Meta Data Management | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Independent Technologies | Oracle |
| Data Classification | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Independent | Oracle |

Exhibit 300: Census - MAF/TIGER Enhancements (Revision 19)

| 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) |
| | | | Technologies | |
| Tagging and Aggregation | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Independent Technologies | Oracle |
| Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Independent Technologies | Oracle |
| Meta Data Management | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Independent Technologies | Red Hat Linux |
| Data Classification | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Independent Technologies | Red Hat Linux |
| Tagging and Aggregation | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Independent Technologies | Red Hat Linux |
| Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Independent Technologies | Red Hat Linux |
| Data Exchange | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Independent Technologies | Red Hat Linux |
| Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Independent Technologies | Red Hat Linux |
| Mathematical | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Independent Technologies | Red Hat Linux |
| Imagery | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Independent Technologies | Red Hat Linux |
| Standardized / Canned | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Independent Technologies | Red Hat Linux |
| Loading and Archiving | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Independent Technologies | Red Hat Linux |
| Information Sharing | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Independent Technologies | Red Hat Linux |
| Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Independent Technologies | Windows XP; WS 2003 |
| Data Exchange | Component Framework | Data Interchange | Data Exchange | Oracle |
| Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS | Component Framework | Data Interchange | Data Exchange | Oracle |
| Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | Component Framework | Data Interchange | Data Exchange | Oracle |
| Data Cleansing | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | Java Online Analytical Processing (JOLAP) |
| Extraction and Transformation | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | Java Online Analytical Processing (JOLAP) |
| Program / Project Management | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | Microsoft Excel |
| OLAP | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | Online Analytical Processing (OLAP) |
| Mathematical | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | Oracle |
| Imagery | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | Oracle |
| Standardized / Canned | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | Oracle |
| Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS | Component Framework | User Presentation / Interface | Content Rendering | ESRI ARC/GIS |
| Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS | Component Framework | User Presentation / Interface | Dynamic Server-Side Display | Oracle |
| Information Sharing | Service Access and Delivery | Delivery Channels | Internet | Microsoft I.E. |
| Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS | Service Access and Delivery | Delivery Channels | Internet | Safe Software - FME |
| Knowledge Capture | Service Access and Delivery | Service Transport | Service Transport | Secure File Transfer Protocol (SFTP) |
| Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS | Service Interface and Integration | Interoperability | Data Transformation | ESRI ARC/GIS, ARC/IMS |
| Loading and Archiving | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | Oracle |
| Information Sharing | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | Oracle |
| Loading and Archiving | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Storage | Storage Area Network (SAN) |
| Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | Dell Desktop; CISCO Server |
| Meta Data Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | Egenera Blades |
| Data Classification | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | Egenera Blades |
| Tagging and Aggregation | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | Egenera Blades |
| Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | Egenera Blades |

Exhibit 300: Census - MAF/TIGER Enhancements (Revision 19)

| 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) |
| Data Exchange | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | Egenera Blades |
| Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | Egenera Blades |
| Mathematical | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | Egenera Blades |
| Imagery | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | Egenera Blades |
| Standardized / Canned | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | Egenera Blades |
| Loading and Archiving | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | Egenera Blades |
| Information Sharing | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | Egenera Blades |
| Program / Project Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | Task Management |

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, etc)? Yes

a. If "yes," please describe.

MAF/TIGER has leveraged existing components or applications across the government wherever possible. The US Department of Agriculture's National Agriculture Imagery Program (NAIP) imagery has been used extensively in the work to realign features in TIGER where no local file exists. Likewise, the US Geological Survey's (USGS) DOQ imagery has been used in some cases where the accuracy meets the requirements of the MAF/TIGER Accuracy Improvement Program (MTAIP). Most importantly, Tribal, State, County, and local files have been used extensively to update the features in TIGER where the agency could share their data freely and the accuracy met the needs of the MTAIP program. To date, more than 2,750 of these types of source files have been acquired. Of these, 1,168 so far have been used or will be used to update the features in TIGER. The Census Bureau provides a national set of TIGER/Line files to the USGS to put into the National Map every release it puts out. Additionally, extracts from the TIGER Enhancement Database (TED), a Census Bureau-maintained inventory of Tribal, State, County, and local geospatial data, have been provided to other Federal agencies twice annually. The Census Bureau also has provided its GPS coordinates for testing local files and contractor files in an encrypted format to the USGS to test imagery for the Department of Homeland Security's 133 Cities initiative. All geospatial products and planned geospatial data development and acquisitions are posted to the Geospatial One Stop portal, which is part of the president's e-gov initiative. The MAF-TIGER enhancement program will leverage the capabilities, telecommunications, processors, storage and information technology infrastructure associated with the DoC IT Infrastructure initiative

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? 8/15/2002
 - 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: | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table: | | | * Costs in millions |
| Alternative Analyzed | Description of Alternative | Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate | Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate |
| 1 | This selected alternative will allow MAF/TIGER to use a mixture of government employees, civilian COTS packages, contractors, and state, local, and tribal records to modernize and enhance the current MAF/TIGER system. | 536.63 | 708.165 |
| 2 | Contract out all requirements for enhancing the current MAF/TIGER system, including system design, development, and data population. This will require contractors to update all geospatial data once the system is deployed. | 763.11 | 708.165 |
| 3 | Full-time Census employees will submit all requirements for enhancing the current MAF/TIGER system, including system design, development, and data population. This will require full-time Census employees to update all geospatial data once the system is deployed. | 613.88 | 708.165 |
| Baseline | Status quo-Geospatial activities and investment approach that supports the agency specific requirements in alignment with individual agency goals and objectives. The status quo results in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -mapping system products first produced for the 1970 Census, where streets were computerized with stick representation -the average county road file had an average error of approximately 100 meters -some cases the centerlines had errors greater than 250 meters | 534.313 | 288.342 |

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

Alternative 1 was selected because it represents the best, risk-adjusted value for producing the enhancements to MAF/TIGER. Additionally, Alternative 1 is the least costly alternative. The cost for contractors in Alternative 2 is significantly higher. Based on consultations with the Geographic Information System and technology company representatives, it was determined that the average annual cost for a consultant was just under \$250,000 a year. The cost for Government FTEs in Alternative 3 is higher than the cost in the chosen alternative because of the higher number of government FTEs required and because in order to obtain the required technology and geography expertise, additional senior individuals will be needed. Training costs in Alternative 3 are also 20 to 30% higher.

a. What year will the investment breakeven? (Specifically, 2018 when the budgeted costs savings exceed the cumulative costs.)

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

The MTEP will improve the accuracy of the street locations used for all Census Bureau fieldwork, including the American Community Survey (ACS), the Economic Census, and the 2010 Census. Having street locations consistent with Global Positioning System (GPS) coordinates will allow the Bureau to use GPS-enabled mobile computers to help enumerators be more efficient, facilitate identifying duplicate addresses, reduce the costs of locating housing units that require follow-up visits, and

Exhibit 300: Census - MAF/TIGER Enhancements (Revision 19)

ensure accurate tabulation of Census data to the correct geographic area. Using COTS and GIS software will enable more effective interactive MAF/TIGER (M/T) update activities (the current system allows only one person to access a particular county at a time), and more efficient and productive file transfers to the mobile computing devices that will be used in the 2010 Census, the ACS, and in conjunction with geographic databases provided by state, local, and tribal government partners. One of the key avenues to success in the MTEP is the highly successful geographic partnerships program that began in conjunction with the 2000 Census. Local partners enable Census acquire the street address and boundary updates known best to the state, local, and tribal staff who initiate and approve them. This work includes address list reviews, computer-based updates of governmental unit boundaries, support for converting to (and U.S. Postal Service adoption of) the E-911 addressing systems, and active participation recruitment of more state, local, and tribal governments. Both the M/T database and its environment will provide extensive geocoding services throughout the decade to other Census programs. These other programs include the administrative records research, the intercensal population estimates, and the Economic Census. M/T supports the President's Management Agenda initiative for expanded electronic government through the Geospatial One-Stop (#0120) initiative. The Geospatial One-Stop (#0120) initiative coordinates the data gathering efforts of federal, state, and local governments to provide a "One-Stop Center" for governmental unit boundaries and other spatial data. The geospatial data in M/T also indirectly support the numerous private sector mapping systems available over the Internet and in publication throughout the country. Materials this program produces not only save money throughout many government agencies, but also provide services to private industry every year.

| 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 | | New methods will allow the Census Bureau to replace address listing activities with block canvassing methodology and reduce costs of decennial field verification activities. Enumerators efficiency attained with more accurate maps available and data collection activities packaged in handheld computers. Assumption based on number of housing units included in address listing fieldwork and address listing verification costs from Census 2000. |
| PY 2008 | 0 | 0 | | New methods will allow the Census Bureau to replace address listing activities with block canvassing methodology and reduce costs of decennial field verification activities. Enumerators efficiency attained with more accurate maps available and data collection activities packaged in handheld computers. Assumption based on number of housing units included in address listing fieldwork and address listing verification costs from Census 2000. |
| CY 2009 | 0 | 0.131067 | | New methods will allow the Census Bureau to replace address listing activities with block canvassing methodology and reduce costs of decennial field verification activities. Enumerators efficiency attained with more accurate maps available and data collection activities packaged in handheld computers. Assumption based on number of housing units included in address listing fieldwork and address listing verification costs from Census 2000. |
| BY 2010 | 0 | 0.036 | | New methods will allow the Census Bureau to replace address listing activities with block canvassing methodology and reduce costs of decennial field verification activities. Enumerators efficiency attained with more accurate maps available and data collection activities packaged in handheld computers. Assumption based on number of housing units included in address listing fieldwork and address listing verification costs from Census 2000. |

Exhibit 300: Census - MAF/TIGER Enhancements (Revision 19)

| 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 |
| BY + 1 2011 | 0 | 0.001137 | | New methods will allow the Census Bureau to replace address listing activities with block canvassing methodology and reduce costs of decennial field verification activities. Enumerators efficiency attained with more accurate maps available and data collection activities packaged in handheld computers. Assumption based on number of housing units included in address listing fieldwork and address listing verification costs from Census 2000. |
| BY + 2 2012 | 0 | 0.00091 | | New methods will allow the Census Bureau to replace address listing activities with block canvassing methodology and reduce costs of decennial field verification activities. Enumerators efficiency attained with more accurate maps available and data collection activities packaged in handheld computers. Assumption based on number of housing units included in address listing fieldwork and address listing verification costs from Census 2000. |
| BY + 3 2013 | 0 | 0.000758 | | New methods will allow the Census Bureau to replace address listing activities with block canvassing methodology and reduce costs of decennial field verification activities. Enumerators efficiency attained with more accurate maps available and data collection activities packaged in handheld computers. Assumption based on number of housing units included in address listing fieldwork and address listing verification costs from Census 2000. |
| BY + 4 2014 & Beyond | 0 | 0.001663 | | New methods will allow the Census Bureau to replace address listing activities with block canvassing methodology and reduce costs of decennial field verification activities. Enumerators efficiency attained with more accurate maps available and data collection activities packaged in handheld computers. Assumption based on number of housing units included in address listing fieldwork and address listing verification costs from Census 2000. |
| Total LCC Benefit | 0 | 0.171535 | LCC = Life-cycle Cost | |

6. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part No 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 |

Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

Wednesday, May 20, 2009 - 1:45 PM

Exhibit 300: Census - MAF/TIGER Enhancements (Revision 19)

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? 2/14/2008
 - 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?
 - 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:
Risk expected value was calculated and applied in decision analysis

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: Census - MAF/TIGER Enhancements (Revision 19)

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 | Complete acquisition strategy and initial preparations | 6/28/2002 | \$1.500000 | 6/28/2002 | 6/25/2002 | \$1.500000 | \$1.500000 | 3 | \$0.000000 | 100% |
| 2 | Develop model of the objects currently in TIGER, including behaviors and attributes | 9/30/2002 | \$2.000000 | 9/30/2002 | 9/30/2002 | \$2.000000 | \$2.000000 | 0 | \$0.000000 | 100% |
| 3 | Begin to train staff in database structures and COTS application tools | 9/30/2002 | \$2.000000 | 9/30/2002 | 9/30/2002 | \$2.000000 | \$2.000000 | 0 | \$0.000000 | 100% |
| 4 | Develop plan to measure housing unit coverage | 9/30/2002 | \$2.000000 | 9/30/2002 | 9/30/2002 | \$2.000000 | \$2.000000 | 0 | \$0.000000 | 100% |
| 5 | Develop draft content and functional requirements for MAF/TIGER database | 9/30/2002 | \$2.500000 | 9/30/2002 | 9/30/2002 | \$2.500000 | \$2.500000 | 0 | \$0.000000 | 100% |
| 6 | Begin Phase 1 of the MTAIP | 12/31/2002 | \$5.000000 | 12/31/2002 | 9/30/2002 | \$5.000000 | \$5.000000 | 92 | \$0.000000 | 100% |
| 7 | Complete initial rectification phase for 250 counties | 9/30/2003 | \$21.962000 | 9/30/2003 | 9/30/2003 | \$21.962000 | \$21.962000 | 0 | \$0.000000 | 100% |
| 8 | Conduct Market Research on available COTS products | 1/31/2003 | \$1.561000 | 1/31/2003 | 1/31/2003 | \$1.561000 | \$1.700000 | 0 | -\$0.139000 | 100% |
| 9 | Complete database content and functional requirements | 3/1/2004 | \$2.500000 | 3/1/2004 | 5/10/2004 | \$2.500000 | \$2.445706 | -70 | \$0.054294 | 100% |
| 10 | Procure hardware/software licenses | 9/30/2003 | \$2.500000 | 9/30/2003 | 9/30/2003 | \$2.500000 | \$1.929000 | 0 | \$0.571000 | 100% |
| 11 | Develop system and software test plans | 7/29/2005 | \$1.000000 | 7/29/2005 | 7/29/2005 | \$1.000000 | \$1.053241 | 0 | -\$0.053241 | 100% |
| 12 | Complete initial rectification phase for 600 counties | 9/30/2004 | \$49.245000 | 9/30/2004 | 9/30/2004 | \$49.245000 | \$49.401046 | 0 | -\$0.156046 | 100% |
| 13 | Design logistical and physical database structure | 12/31/2004 | \$3.400000 | 12/31/2004 | 12/31/2004 | \$3.400000 | \$3.733079 | 0 | -\$0.333079 | 100% |
| 14 | Train staff in new languages, technology, GIS SW, and system | 9/8/2006 | \$1.000000 | 9/8/2006 | 9/8/2006 | \$1.000000 | \$1.122892 | 0 | -\$0.122892 | 100% |
| 15 | Develop program master plan for geographic partnership | 9/30/2004 | \$0.676000 | 9/30/2004 | 9/30/2004 | \$0.676000 | \$0.675743 | 0 | \$0.000257 | 100% |

Exhibit 300: Census - MAF/TIGER Enhancements (Revision 19)

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 | | | |
| | programs | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Identify requirements for and develop web access for geographic partners | 9/30/2004 | \$0.765000 | 9/30/2004 | 9/30/2004 | \$0.765000 | \$0.764663 | 0 | \$0.000337 | 100% |
| 17 | Enhance TIGER database capability. | 9/30/2004 | \$1.940600 | 9/30/2004 | 9/30/2004 | \$1.940600 | \$2.053003 | 0 | -\$0.112403 | 100% |
| 18 | Enhance systems and case controls for CAUS | 12/31/2004 | \$1.581200 | 12/31/2004 | 12/31/2004 | \$1.581200 | \$1.580682 | 0 | \$0.000518 | 100% |
| 19 | Procure hardware/software licenses | 9/30/2004 | \$2.623750 | 9/30/2004 | 9/30/2004 | \$2.623750 | \$2.623367 | 0 | \$0.000383 | 100% |
| 20 | Modify field procedures | 9/30/2004 | \$0.445000 | 9/30/2004 | 9/30/2004 | \$0.445000 | \$0.444898 | 0 | \$0.000102 | 100% |
| 21 | Train field staff | 9/30/2004 | \$0.632600 | 9/30/2004 | 9/30/2004 | \$0.632600 | \$0.631969 | 0 | \$0.000631 | 100% |
| 22 | Perform field work | 9/30/2004 | \$2.217400 | 9/30/2004 | 9/30/2004 | \$2.217400 | \$2.091053 | 0 | \$0.126347 | 100% |
| 23 | Methodology test of national MAF coverage for 2003 data study | 9/30/2004 | \$1.154000 | 9/30/2004 | 9/30/2004 | \$1.154000 | \$1.153345 | 0 | \$0.000655 | 100% |
| 24 | Collect quality assurance GPS points for 600 areas | 8/1/2004 | \$3.000000 | 8/1/2004 | 8/1/2004 | \$3.000000 | \$2.997436 | 0 | \$0.002564 | 100% |
| 25 | Develop Internet reporting system for MTEP production | 6/30/2004 | \$0.750000 | 6/30/2004 | 6/30/2004 | \$0.750000 | \$0.748192 | 0 | \$0.001808 | 100% |
| 26 | Develop and implement quality metrics to evaluate linear feature accuracy improvements | 9/30/2004 | \$2.690000 | 9/30/2004 | 9/30/2004 | \$2.690000 | \$2.687925 | 0 | \$0.002075 | 100% |
| 27 | Develop application software specifications | 3/3/2005 | \$1.100000 | 3/3/2005 | 3/3/2005 | \$1.100000 | \$1.406569 | 0 | -\$0.306569 | 100% |
| 28 | Develop operational plans for and begin implementing program master plan for partnership interactions | 9/30/2004 | \$2.065000 | 9/30/2004 | 9/30/2004 | \$2.065000 | \$2.063506 | 0 | \$0.001494 | 100% |
| 29 | Complete initial rectification phase for 610 counties | 9/30/2005 | \$53.561000 | 9/30/2005 | 9/30/2005 | \$53.561000 | \$53.074502 | 0 | \$0.486498 | 100% |
| 30 | Develop modern MAF/TIGER application software | 9/30/2006 | \$9.713000 | 9/30/2006 | 9/30/2006 | \$9.713000 | \$10.844125 | 0 | -\$1.131125 | 100% |

Exhibit 300: Census - MAF/TIGER Enhancements (Revision 19)

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 | | | |
| 31 | Continue to develop web access for geographic partners | 9/30/2005 | \$1.767000 | 9/30/2005 | 9/30/2005 | \$1.767000 | \$1.547602 | 0 | \$0.007358 | 88% |
| 32 | Enhance TIGER database capability | 9/30/2005 | \$1.307500 | 9/30/2005 | 9/30/2005 | \$1.307500 | \$1.193580 | 0 | -\$0.003754 | 91% |
| 33 | Continue developing operational plans and continue implementing program master plan for partnership interactions | 9/30/2005 | \$3.325000 | 9/30/2005 | 9/30/2005 | \$3.325000 | \$2.686207 | 0 | \$0.007043 | 81% |
| 34 | Enhance systems and case controls for CAUS | 9/30/2005 | \$1.400640 | 9/30/2005 | 9/30/2005 | \$1.400640 | \$1.566105 | 0 | -\$0.165465 | 100% |
| 35 | Procure hardware/software licenses | 9/30/2005 | \$1.611000 | 9/30/2005 | 9/30/2005 | \$1.611000 | \$1.677484 | 0 | -\$0.066484 | 100% |
| 36 | Modify field procedures | 9/30/2005 | \$0.224000 | 9/30/2005 | 9/30/2005 | \$0.224000 | \$0.340946 | 0 | -\$0.116946 | 100% |
| 37 | Train field staff | 9/30/2005 | \$0.475000 | 9/30/2005 | 9/30/2005 | \$0.475000 | \$0.611180 | 0 | -\$0.136180 | 100% |
| 38 | Perform field work | 9/30/2005 | \$5.040360 | 9/30/2005 | 9/30/2005 | \$5.040360 | \$5.000373 | 0 | -\$0.010416 | 99% |
| 39 | Perform national MAF coverage study of 2004 data | 9/30/2005 | \$1.187000 | 9/30/2005 | 9/30/2005 | \$1.187000 | \$0.961576 | 0 | \$0.225424 | 100% |
| 40 | Collect quality assurance GPS points for 570 areas | 8/1/2005 | \$3.122000 | 8/1/2005 | 8/1/2005 | \$3.122000 | \$1.872801 | 0 | \$0.000400 | 60% |
| 41 | Continue developing Internet reporting system for MTEP production | 6/30/2005 | \$0.771000 | 6/30/2005 | 6/30/2005 | \$0.771000 | \$0.397103 | 0 | \$0.003817 | 52% |
| 42 | Implement quality metrics to evaluate linear feature accuracy improvements | 9/30/2005 | \$2.765000 | 9/30/2005 | 9/30/2005 | \$2.765000 | \$1.720710 | 0 | -\$0.006410 | 62% |
| 43 | Complete initial rectification phase for 700 counties | 9/30/2006 | \$50.319000 | 9/30/2006 | 9/30/2006 | \$50.319000 | \$53.195960 | 0 | -\$2.876960 | 100% |
| 44 | Conduct Software Quality Assurance | 9/30/2006 | \$0.480000 | 9/30/2006 | 9/30/2006 | \$0.480000 | \$0.557832 | 0 | -\$0.077832 | 100% |
| 45 | Conduct integration system test/acceptance | 9/30/2006 | \$1.020000 | 9/30/2006 | 9/30/2006 | \$1.020000 | \$1.216413 | 0 | -\$0.196413 | 100% |
| 46 | Continue to develop web access | 3/31/2006 | \$1.005000 | 3/31/2006 | 9/30/2006 | \$1.005000 | \$0.560991 | -183 | \$0.001809 | 56% |

Exhibit 300: Census - MAF/TIGER Enhancements (Revision 19)

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 | | | |
| | for geographic partners | | | | | | | | | |
| 47 | Enhance TIGER database capability | 9/30/2006 | \$0.888000 | 9/30/2006 | 9/30/2006 | \$0.888000 | \$0.575484 | 0 | \$0.001716 | 65% |
| 48 | Continue developing operational plans and continue implementing program master plan for partnership interactions | 9/30/2006 | \$3.842000 | 9/30/2006 | 9/30/2006 | \$3.842000 | \$2.247201 | 0 | -\$0.018841 | 58% |
| 49 | Enhance systems and case controls for CAUS | 9/30/2006 | \$1.295430 | 9/30/2006 | 9/30/2006 | \$1.295430 | \$0.958861 | 0 | -\$0.000242 | 74% |
| 50 | Procure hardware/software licenses | 9/30/2006 | \$1.780310 | 9/30/2006 | 9/30/2006 | \$1.780310 | \$2.736576 | 0 | -\$0.956266 | 100% |
| 51 | Modify field procedures | 9/30/2006 | \$0.070000 | 9/30/2006 | 9/30/2006 | \$0.070000 | \$0.060887 | 0 | \$0.000013 | 87% |
| 52 | Train field staff | 9/30/2006 | \$0.450000 | 9/30/2006 | 9/30/2006 | \$0.450000 | \$0.251073 | 0 | \$0.000927 | 56% |
| 53 | Perform field work | 9/30/2006 | \$4.938260 | 9/30/2006 | 9/30/2006 | \$4.938260 | \$5.075156 | 0 | -\$0.136896 | 100% |
| 54 | Perform national MAF coverage study of 2005 data | 9/30/2006 | \$0.867000 | 9/30/2006 | 9/30/2006 | \$0.867000 | \$0.692559 | 0 | \$0.001041 | 80% |
| 55 | Collect quality assurance GPS points for required areas | 8/1/2006 | \$2.282000 | 8/1/2006 | 8/1/2006 | \$2.282000 | \$1.612546 | 0 | \$0.007674 | 71% |
| 56 | Maintain Internet reporting system for MTEP production | 6/30/2006 | \$0.564000 | 6/30/2006 | 6/30/2006 | \$0.564000 | \$0.432774 | 0 | \$0.119946 | 98% |
| 57 | Implement quality metrics to evaluate linear feature accuracy improvements | 9/30/2006 | \$2.021000 | 9/30/2006 | 9/30/2006 | \$2.021000 | \$1.551036 | 0 | \$0.469964 | 100% |
| 58 | Migrate data | 9/30/2006 | \$0.400000 | 9/30/2006 | 9/30/2006 | \$0.400000 | \$0.419151 | 0 | -\$0.019151 | 100% |
| 59 | Complete initial rectification phase for 690 counties | 9/30/2007 | \$50.299000 | 9/30/2007 | 9/30/2007 | \$53.102000 | \$53.100000 | 0 | \$0.002000 | 100% |
| 60 | Enhance TIGER database capability | 9/30/2007 | \$1.244000 | 9/30/2007 | 9/30/2007 | \$1.244000 | \$1.244006 | 0 | -\$0.000006 | 100% |
| 61 | Continue developing operational plans and continue implementing program master plan for partnership | 9/30/2007 | \$4.446000 | 9/30/2007 | 9/30/2007 | \$4.442000 | \$4.444026 | 0 | -\$0.002026 | 100% |

Exhibit 300: Census - MAF/TIGER Enhancements (Revision 19)

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 | | | |
| | interactions | | | | | | | | | |
| 62 | Enhance systems and case controls for CAUS | 9/30/2007 | \$1.411000 | | | \$0.000000 | | | | 0% |
| 63 | Procure hardware/software licenses | 9/30/2007 | \$1.956000 | | | \$0.000000 | | | | 0% |
| 64 | Modify field procedures | 9/30/2007 | \$0.074000 | | | \$0.000000 | | | | 0% |
| 65 | Train field staff | 9/30/2007 | \$0.450000 | | | \$0.000000 | | | | 0% |
| 66 | Perform field work | 9/30/2007 | \$5.128000 | | | \$0.000000 | | | | 0% |
| 67 | Perform national MAF coverage study of 2006 data | 9/30/2007 | \$0.861000 | 9/30/2007 | 9/30/2007 | \$0.861000 | \$0.860018 | 0 | \$0.000982 | 100% |
| 68 | Collect quality assurance GPS points for required areas | 8/1/2007 | \$2.264000 | 8/1/2007 | 8/1/2007 | \$2.266000 | \$2.264053 | 0 | \$0.001947 | 100% |
| 69 | Develop Internet reporting system for MTEP production | 6/30/2007 | \$0.559000 | 6/30/2007 | 6/30/2007 | \$0.559000 | \$0.562317 | 0 | -\$0.003317 | 100% |
| 70 | Implement quality metrics to evaluate linear feature accuracy improvements | 9/30/2007 | \$2.005000 | 9/30/2007 | 9/30/2007 | \$2.002000 | \$2.000007 | 0 | \$0.001993 | 100% |
| 71 | Complete initial rectification phase for 368 counties | 9/30/2008 | \$46.182000 | 9/30/2008 | 9/30/2008 | \$42.582000 | \$42.373774 | 0 | \$0.208226 | 100% |
| 72 | Enhance TIGER database capability | 9/30/2008 | \$1.270000 | 9/30/2008 | 9/30/2008 | \$2.192000 | \$2.084460 | 0 | \$0.107540 | 100% |
| 73 | Continue implementing program master plan for partnership interactions | 9/30/2008 | \$4.504000 | 9/30/2008 | 9/30/2008 | \$4.504000 | \$4.774888 | 0 | -\$0.270888 | 100% |
| 74 | Enhance systems and case controls for CAUS | 9/30/2008 | \$1.422000 | | | \$0.000000 | \$0.000000 | | \$0.000000 | 0% |
| 75 | Procure hardware/software licenses | 9/30/2008 | \$2.106000 | | | \$0.000000 | \$0.000000 | | \$0.000000 | 0% |
| 76 | Modify field procedures | 9/30/2008 | \$0.077000 | | | \$0.000000 | \$0.000000 | | \$0.000000 | 0% |
| 77 | Train field staff | 9/30/2008 | \$0.450000 | | | \$0.000000 | \$0.000000 | | \$0.000000 | 0% |
| 78 | Perform field work | 9/30/2008 | \$7.648000 | | | \$0.000000 | \$0.000000 | | \$0.000000 | 0% |

Exhibit 300: Census - MAF/TIGER Enhancements (Revision 19)

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 | | | |
| 79 | Perform national MAF coverage study of 2007 data | 9/30/2008 | \$0.873000 | 9/30/2008 | 9/30/2008 | \$0.873000 | \$0.879552 | 0 | -\$0.006552 | 100% |
| 80 | Collect quality assurance GPS points for required areas | 7/31/2008 | \$2.298000 | 7/31/2008 | 7/31/2008 | \$2.297000 | \$2.339548 | 0 | -\$0.042548 | 100% |
| 81 | Develop Internet reporting system for MTEP production | 6/30/2008 | \$0.568000 | 6/30/2008 | 7/31/2008 | \$0.568000 | \$0.591232 | -31 | -\$0.023232 | 100% |
| 82 | Implement quality metrics to evaluate linear feature accuracy improvements | 9/30/2008 | \$2.036000 | 9/30/2008 | 9/30/2008 | \$2.036000 | \$2.072730 | 0 | -\$0.036730 | 100% |
| 83 | Enhance TIGER database capability | 9/30/2009 | \$1.296000 | 9/30/2009 | | \$1.296000 | \$0.324046 | | -\$0.324046 | 0% |
| 84 | Continue implementing program master plan for partnership interactions | 9/30/2009 | \$4.593000 | 9/30/2009 | | \$4.593000 | \$1.148436 | | -\$1.148436 | 0% |
| 85 | Perform national MAF coverage study of 2008 data | 9/30/2009 | \$0.891000 | 9/30/2009 | | \$0.891000 | \$0.222699 | | -\$0.222699 | 0% |
| 86 | Collect quality assurance GPS points for required areas | 7/31/2009 | \$2.344000 | 7/31/2009 | | \$2.344000 | \$0.702899 | | -\$0.702899 | 0% |
| 87 | Develop Internet reporting system for MTEP production | 6/30/2009 | \$0.579000 | 6/30/2009 | | \$0.579000 | \$0.192947 | | -\$0.192947 | 0% |
| 88 | Implement quality metrics to evaluate linear feature accuracy improvements | 9/30/2009 | \$2.076000 | 9/30/2009 | | \$2.076000 | \$0.052014 | | -\$0.052014 | 0% |
| 89 | Complete second cycle rectification for early-vintage re-aligned counties | 9/30/2009 | \$3.534000 | 9/30/2009 | | \$3.534000 | \$0.883359 | | -\$0.883359 | 0% |
| 90 | Enhance systems and case controls for CAUS | 9/30/2009 | \$2.473010 | 9/30/2009 | | \$2.473010 | \$0.619019 | | -\$0.619019 | 0% |
| 91 | Procure hardware/software licenses | 9/30/2009 | \$0.557990 | 9/30/2009 | | \$0.557990 | \$0.096527 | | -\$0.096527 | 0% |
| 92 | Continue implementing program master plan for partnership interactions | 9/30/2010 | \$6.007000 | 9/30/2010 | | \$6.007000 | | | | 0% |

Exhibit 300: Census - MAF/TIGER Enhancements (Revision 19)

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 | | | |
| 93 | Collect quality assurance GPS points for required areas | 7/31/2010 | \$2.391000 | 7/31/2010 | | \$2.391000 | | | | 0% |
| 94 | Develop Internet reporting system for MTEP production | 6/29/2010 | \$0.591000 | 6/29/2010 | | \$0.591000 | | | | 0% |
| 95 | Implement quality metrics to evaluate linear feature accuracy improvements | 9/30/2010 | \$2.117000 | 9/30/2010 | | \$2.117000 | | | | 0% |
| 96 | Complete second cycle rectification for early-vintage re-aligned counties | 9/30/2010 | \$4.635000 | 9/30/2010 | | \$4.635000 | | | | 0% |
| 97 | Enhance systems and case controls for CAUS | 9/30/2010 | \$2.297587 | 9/30/2010 | | \$2.297587 | | | | 0% |
| 98 | Procure hardware/software licenses | 9/30/2010 | \$2.642660 | 9/30/2010 | | \$2.642660 | | | | 0% |
| 99 | Modify field procedures | 9/30/2010 | \$0.367450 | 9/30/2010 | | \$0.367450 | | | | 0% |
| 100 | Train field staff | 9/30/2010 | \$0.779180 | 9/30/2010 | | \$0.779180 | | | | 0% |
| 101 | Perform field work | 9/30/2010 | \$8.268130 | 9/30/2010 | | \$8.268130 | | | | 0% |