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:	8/11/2006
2. Agency:	Department of Transportation
3. Bureau:	Federal Aviation Administration
4. Name of this Capital Asset:	FAAXX032: Terminal Automation Replacement System (STARS)
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)	021-12-01-11-01-1020-00
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2009? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY2009, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2009 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)	Mixed Life Cycle
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?	FY2001 or earlier

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:

Standard Terminal Automation Replacement System (STARS) is a digital radar/flight data processing and display system for use by terminal air traffic controllers. Controllers use STARS to ensure the safety of military and civilian aircraft throughout the nation's airspace. STARS technology is open, expandable, and able to accommodate future growth. The STARS investment replaces the aging air traffic control equipment at 47 (43 ARTS IIIA sites and 4 ARTS IIE sites) at terminal radar approach control facilities (TRACONs) and airport traffic control towers. (As of 7/12/07, STARS is fully operational at 46 out of 47 sites (Dayton, OH installation is awaiting activities external to STARS).

STARS is a "joint" Department of Defense (DOD) and Department of Transportation (DOT) program. The joint program reduces the government's cost of ownership by cutting duplicate development, logistics, training, sustainment, and technology refreshment costs. This business case includes only the FAA's costs and benefits and does not capture joint benefits. However, the DOD estimates their life cycle costs savings for air traffic control systems (automation, sensors, and communications) will be reduced by $400M as a result of replacing obsolescent parts of their DOD systems. (Source: DOD NAS FY08 OMB-300). As a joint program from the start, STARS combined the requirements of both DOD and FAA into a single, major acquisition program, rather than two or more separate acquisitions (prior to STARS, each military Service developed and maintained several different Terminal air traffic control systems). Not easy to quantify, the savings could easily approach hundreds of millions of dollars. (For more information on the DOD air traffic control automation program, see DOD's OMB-300 @ UPI 007-57-05-12-01-6177-00-118-060.)

STARS "terminal automation enhancements" and "technical refreshment" activities enable the Agency to meet future operational requirements and address hardware and commercial end-of-life issues, sustain operational suitability, incorporate future operational requirements, and keep the system running reliably. STARS effectively closes performance gaps by providing a robust, modern platform with higher availability and capacity and security features not built-in to the legacy systems. Our FY09 focus is to sustain performance by qualifying new components to replenish off-the-shelf components that are becoming obsolete in the deployed systems.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?	Yes
a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?	6/30/2005
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?	Yes
11. Contact information of Project Manager?	
Name	Shah, Mohammed
Phone Number	Redacted
Email	mohammed.shah@faa.gov
a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager?	TBD
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project?	No

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?	No
If "yes," check all that apply:	
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?)	
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?	FAA AIr Traffic Services
c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive?	Adequate
15. Is this investment for information technology?	Yes

If the answer to Question 15 is "Yes," complete questions 16-23 below. If the answer is "No," do not answer questions 16-23.

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)	Level 3
17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)	(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment
18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23)	Yes
19. Is this a financial management system?	No
a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?	No
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 FY2009 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware	22.220000
Software	24.070000
Services	53.560000
Other	0.150000
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?	N/A

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

Name	Mauney, Carla

Phone Number	Redacted
Title	FAA Privacy Officer
E-mail	carla.mauney@faa.gov
23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?	No
Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:	
24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas?	Yes

Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)

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

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)
(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2007	CY 2008	BY 2009	BY+1 2010	BY+2 2011	BY+3 2012	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	0	0	0	0	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Acquisition:	1406.7	49.2	31.2	28.2	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	1406.7	49.2	31.2	28.2	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Operations & Maintenance:	28.1	19.697	21.403	28.631	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
TOTAL:	1434.8	68.897	52.603	56.831	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	163.728	24.376	21.081	29.286	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	1324	215	192	254	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted

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

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's?	No
a. If "yes," How many and in what year?	

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2008 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:

Redacted

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

1.

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:

STARS is implementing EVM at the program level with a target completion date in Fiscal year 2007. As part of the FAA's goal to have all programs be compliant with EVM Standard ANSI 748 for Total Program EVM reporting, the FAA's EVM assessment team is working closely with the Acquisition Organization and industry to begin to incorporate this requirement into new, as well as existing contracts. As per request of AIO reviewer, Contracts listed in the above table were established before AMS and its related policy guidance and as a result EVM was not required.

NOTE: Rows#2-5 in the Contract/Acquisition Table are contracts grouped by similar WBS activity as per the DOT guidance to the Circular A-11 OMBx300 Template. The Contract/Task Order # and the Name of the CO were selected based on the highest dollar value. This was done because this field does not provide a drop down menu option of "Various".

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?	N/A
a. Explain why:	The FAA awarded the STARS contract in 1996, prior to the June 21, 2001, and therefore the Section 508 standards do not apply to this procurement. The applicability of Section 508 will be analyzed for any updates in the procurement, such as for

	TAMR, as appropriate.
4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements?	Yes
a. If "yes," what is the date?	6/30/2005
b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?	
1. If "no," briefly explain why:	

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

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

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

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2005	Mobility	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	STARS System Availability (%)	Availability of system before STARS: 99.9845% (ARTS IIE – 2004)	Target 99.9890% availability at 37 STARS sites 15.6% sites supported (27 of 167) in FY04	99.994% availability at 37 sites
2005	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Percentage of on time arrivals	On time arrivals are for the 35 Operational Evolution Plan (OEP) airports was at 87.2% in FY04.	Improvement in on time arrivals (from 87.2% to 87.4%)	Achieved on-time arrival rate of 87.40%
2005	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Number of category A&B operational errors.	656 category A&B operational errors in FY 2004	3% reduction in category A&B operational errors (to 636).	STARS contributed to FAA meeting 5 of 8 safety goals
2005	Safety	Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Security	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with increased security features and an approved SCAP	27 (of 50) systems with an approved SCAP	37/47 of former ARTS/CARTS sites will have an approved SCAP.	STARS has been deployed to 37 of 47 planned sites. All deployed STARS sites have an approved SCAP.
2005	Mobility	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	STARS System Availability (%)	Maintain 99.95% or better availability at former ARTS IIIA sites	.999890 availibility at 37 STARS sites	99.994% availability at 37 former ARTS IIIA sites.
2006	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Aircraft Direct Operating Costs (ADOC) Benefits	Aircraft Direct Operating Costs (ADOC) Benefits = 0	Aircraft Direct Operating Costs (ADOC) Benefits = $100K	Jan 2011
2006	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Savings in terminal area delays.	In 2005 there were 35 flight delays caused by the predecessor system.	Cost Avoidance - $27.4M	Zero flight delays on STARS systems in 2006
2006	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	Passenger Value of Time (PVT) Benefits	Passenger Value of Time (PVT) Benefits = 0	Passenger Value of Time (PVT) Benefits = $100K	Jan 2010
2006	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	On time Arrivals	On time arrivals are for the 35 Operational Evolution Plan (OEP) airports was at 87.2% in	Improvement in on time arrivals (from 87.4% to 87.7%).	No flight delays or interruptions attributable to STARS

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
						FY04.		
2006	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Computer Memory and Data Processing Margins	Insufficient margin in computer memory and data processing capacity to allow the implementation of: surface movement strategies and infrastructure e.g., SMA & SMS, ADS-B, TIS-B, FIS-B, ASDE-X and PRM.	93.6% (44/47) of STARS sites will have an initial 50% margin in computer memory	45/47 sites deployed with 50% computer memory margin.
2006	Security	Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Security	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with enhanced security features.	ARTS/CARTS SCAP contigent upon replacement by STARS	Deploy STARS with security features that close the identified security gaps.	No CSIRC reports of system degradation
2006	Mobility	Technology	Efficiency	Load levels	STARS System Availability (%)	ARTS IIIA Availability = 99.989%, CATS IIE Availability = 99.987%	Target 99.9890% availability at 44 (of 47) STARS sites	Average STARS availability since 2003 is 99.999%
2007	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Aircraft Direct Operating Costs (ADOC) Benefits	Aircraft Direct Operating Costs (ADOC) Benefits = 0	Aircraft Direct Operating Costs (ADOC) Benefits = $100K	Jan 2011
2007	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Savings in terminal area delays.	These delay savings translate to benefits for users in the air carriers and the passenger classes.	Cost Avoidance - $27.4M	Jan 2011
2007	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Availability	Service Efficiency: Passenger Value of Time (PVT) Benefits	Passenger Value of Time (PVT) Benefits = 0	Passenger Value of Time (PVT) Benefits = $100K	Jan 2010
2007	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Computer Memory and Data Processing Margins	Insufficient margin in ARTS/CARTS computer memory and data processing capacity for functional and infrastructure improvements	47/47 STARS sites will have an initial margin in computer memory and data processing capacity.	Jan 2008
2007	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	On time arrivals.	On time arrivals are for the 35 Operational Evolution Plan (OEP) airports was at 87.2%	Improvement in on time arrivals (from 87.4% to 87.7%)	Jan 2008
2007	Security	Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Security	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with enhanced security features.	ARTS/CARTS SCAP contigent upon replacement by STARS	Deploy STARS with security features that close the identified security gaps.	Jan 2008
2007	Safety	Technology	Efficiency	Load levels	Increased availability and capacity	ARTS IIIA availability = 99.989%. CARTS IIE availability = 99.987%	100% (47/47) of STARS sites will have cumulative equipment availability of 99.9995% or greater	Jan 2008
2008	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Aircraft Direct Operating Costs (ADOC) Benefits	Aircraft Direct Operating Costs (ADOC) Benefits = 0	Aircraft Direct Operating Costs (ADOC) Benefits = $100K	Jan 2011
2008	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Savings in terminal area delays.	These delay savings translate to benefits for users in the air carriers and the	Cost Avoidance - $27.4M	Jan 2011

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
						passenger classes.		
2008	Safety	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Average number of general aviation and nonscheduled Part 135 fatal accidents over a three-year period.	Number of general aviation and nonscheduled Part 135 fatal accidents is 385, which represents the average number of fatal accidents for baseline period of 1996-1998.	Contribute to a reduction in general aviation and nonscheduled Part 135 fatal accidents to no more than 325 over a three-year period.	Jan 2011
2008	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Availability	Passenger Value of Time (PVT) Benefits	Passenger Value of Time (PVT) Benefits = 0	Passenger Value of Time (PVT) Benefits = $100K	Jan 2011
2008	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Computer Memory and Data Processing Margins	Insufficient margin in computer memory and data processing capacity for functional and infrastructure improvements	47 (of 47) of STARS sites sustain a margin in computer memory and data processing capacity.	Jan 2009
2008	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	On time arrivals.	On time arrivals are for the 35 Operational Evolution Plan (OEP) airports was at 87.2%	Improvement in on time arrivals (from 87.4% to 87.7%)	Jan 2009
2008	Safety	Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Security	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with an approved SCAP.	ARTS/CARTS SCAP contigent upon replacement by STARS	47 (of 47) of ARTS/CARTS sites will have an approved SCAP.	Jan 2009
2008	Safety	Technology	Efficiency	Load levels	STARS System Availability (%)	ARTS IIIA availability = 99.989% CARTS IIE availability = 99.987%	Cumulatively, 100% (47/47) of STARS sites will have availability of 99.9995% or greater	Jan 2009
2009	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Aircraft Direct Operating Costs (ADOC) Benefits	Aircraft Direct Operating Costs (ADOC) Benefits = 0	Aircraft Direct Operating Costs (ADOC) Benefits = $100K	Jan 2010
2009	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Savings in terminal area delays.	These delay savings translate to benefits for users in the air carriers and the passenger classes.	Cost Avoidance - $27.4M	Jan 2010
2009	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Average number of general aviation and nonscheduled Part 135 fatal accidents over a three-year period.	Number of general aviation and nonscheduled Part 135 fatal accidents is 385, which represents the average number of fatal accidents for baseline period of 1996-1998.	Contribute to a reduction in general aviation and nonscheduled Part 135 fatal accidents to no more than 325 over a three-year period.	Jan 2011
2009	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Availability	Passenger Value of Time (PVT) Benefits	Passenger Value of Time (PVT) Benefits = 0	Passenger Value of Time (PVT) Benefits = $100K	Jan 2010
2009	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Computer Memory and Data Processing Margins	Insufficient margin in computer memory and data processing capacity for functional and infrastructure improvements	47 (of 47) of STARS sites sustain a margin in computer memory and data processing capacity.	Jan 2010
2009	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	On time arrivals.	On time arrivals are for the 35 Operational	STARS contributes to the NAS goals of	Jan 2010

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
						Evolution Plan (OEP) airports was at 87.2% in FY04	(1) improvement in on time arrivals (from 87.4% to 87.7%)	
2009	Security	Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Security	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with an approved SCAP.	ARTS/CARTS SCAP contigent upon replacement by STARS	47 (of 47) of ARTS/CARTS sites will have an approved SCAP.	Jan 2010
2009	Safety	Technology	Efficiency	Load levels	STARS System Availability (%)	ARTS IIIA availability = 99.989% CARTS IIE availability = 99.987%	Cumulatively, 100% (47/47) of STARS sites will have availability of 99.9995% or greater.	Jan 2010
2010	Security	Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Security	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with an approved SCAP.	ARTS/CARTS SCAP contingent upon replacement by STARS.	47 (of 47) of ARTS/CARTS sites will have an approved SCAP.	Jan 2011
2010	Safety	Technology	Efficiency	Load levels	STARS System Availability (%)	ARTS IIIA availability = 99.989% CARTS IIE availability = 99.987%	Cumulatively, 100% (47/47) of STARS sites will have availability of 99.9995% or greater.	Jan 2011
2011	Safety	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Average number of general aviation and nonscheduled Part 135 fatal accidents over a three-year period.	Number of general aviation and nonscheduled Part 135 fatal accidents is 385, which represents the average number of fatal accidents for baseline period of 1996-1998.	Contribute to a reduction in general aviation and nonscheduled Part 135 fatal accidents to no more than 325 over a three-year period.	Jan 2011
2011	Security	Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Security	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with an approved SCAP.	ARTS/CARTS SCAP contingent upon replacement by STARS.	47 (of 47) of ARTS/CARTS sites will have an approved SCAP.	Jan 2012
2011	Safety	Technology	Efficiency	Load levels	STARS System Availability (%)	ARTS IIIA availability = 99.989% CARTS IIE availability = 99.987%	Cumulatively, 100% (47/47) of STARS sites will have availability of 99.9995% or greater.	Jan 2012
2012	Security	Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Security	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with an approved SCAP.	ARTS/CARTS SCAP contingent upon replacement by STARS.	47 (of 47) of ARTS/CARTS sites will have an approved SCAP.	Jan 2013
2012	Safety	Technology	Efficiency	Load levels	STARS System Availability (%)	ARTS IIIA availability = 99.989% CARTS IIE availability = 99.987%	Cumulatively, 100% (47/47) of STARS sites will have availability of 99.9995% or greater.	Jan 2013
2013	Security	Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Security	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with an approved SCAP	ARTS/CARTS SCAP contingent upon replacement by STARS.	47 (of 47) of ARTS/CARTS sites will have an approved SCAP.	Jan 2014
2013	Safety	Technology	Efficiency	Load levels	STARS System Availability (%)	ARTS IIIA availability = 99.989% CARTS IIE availability = 99.987%	Cumulatively, 100% (47/47) of STARS sites will have availability of 99.9995% or greater.	Jan 2014

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

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

identifier).

For existing Mixed-Life Cycle investments where enhancement, development, and/or modernization is planned, include the investment in both the "Systems in Planning" table (Table 3) and the "Operational Systems" table (Table 4). Systems which are already operational, but have enhancement, development, and/or modernization activity, should be included in both Table 3 and Table 4. Table 3 should reflect the planned date for the system changes to be complete and operational, and the planned date for the associated C&A update. Table 4 should reflect the current status of the requirements listed. In this context, information contained within Table 3 should characterize what updates to testing and documentation will occur before implementing the enhancements; and Table 4 should characterize the current state of the materials associated with the existing system.

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

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

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

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment: Yes

a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year: 0.37

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

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? No

6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses? Redacted

a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness.

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

Redacted

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:

(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or Explanation	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Internet Link or Explanation
STARS (operational systems)	No	No	A PIA is not required because the system does not contain, process, or transmit personal indentifying information.	No	A SORN is not required because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
STARS (systems in planning)	No	No	A PIA is not required because the system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	No	A SORN is not required because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.

Details for Text Options:
Column (d): If yes to (c), provide the link(s) to the publicly posted PIA(s) with which this system is associated. If no to (c), provide an explanation why the PIA has not been publicly posted or why the PIA has not been conducted.

Column (f): If yes to (e), provide the link(s) to where the current and up to date SORN(s) is published in the federal register. If no to (e), provide an explanation why the SORN has not been published or why there isn't a current and up to date SORN.

Note: Working links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites. Non-working links will be considered as a blank field.

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

In order to successfully address this area of the capital asset plan and business case, the investment must be included in the

agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process and mapped to and supporting the FEA. The business case must demonstrate the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture?	Yes
a. If "no," please explain why?	
2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?	Yes
a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.	The investment name, as identified in the "US Department of Transportation Transition Strategy, dated. February 2007 (Version 2)," is "Standard Terminal Automation Replacement System" (pg. 147).
b. If "no," please explain why?	
3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture?	Yes
a. If "yes," provide the name of the segment architecture as provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.	United States Department of Transportation Transition Strategy, February 2007, Version 2.0, and Page 145: Traffic Control Major Investments include "Terminal Automation Replacement System (STARS). Page 147 contains the description for this investment: Standard Terminal Automation Replacement System (STARS).

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)
Aircraft to Aircraft Separation Capability	Aircraft are separated from each other known aircraft in the terminal environment. Separation Assurance involves the application of separation standards to ensure aircraft remain an appropriate minimum distance form other known aircraft (NAS ATC-Separation Assurance).	Process Automation Services	Routing and Scheduling	NEW	Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS		No Reuse	50
ATC Traffic Advisory	Traffic advisories are provided to alert aircraft to potential conflicts with others, on the surface or in-flight. For example, traffic advisories are provided to aircraft or other flight objects that are in the proximity of hot air/gas balloons, missile launches, or other potential hazards. Traffic advisories for aircraft on the surface include the number, type, position, and intent of the ground traffic.	Process Automation Services	Routing and Scheduling	NEW	Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS		No Reuse	30

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)
	(NAS ATC-Traffic Advisory)							
Surface Separation Capability	Aircraft are separated from vehicle movements on the airport movement area, from taxiing aircraft, water vehicles, and from designated critical zones, etc. Standards are employed to ensure safe operation on the surface. While they are operating on the airport surface, surface separation of aircraft is a shared responsibility.	Process Automation Services	Routing and Scheduling	NEW	Multimedia		No Reuse	10
Weather Advisory Capability	ATC Advisories - Weather information is available either automatically or manually through communication with ATC and other facilities. For example, pilots receive weather advisories from automated surface observing systems and other systems, or from personnel at ATC facilities and aircraft operations centers (AOCs). Advisories provide both routine and hazardous weather information and/or flight conditions, at airports or along a flight path.	Process Automation Services	Routing and Scheduling	NEW	Logistics and Transportation		No Reuse	5
Monitoring and Maintenance	Monitoring and maintenance includes the activities necessary to monitor the NAS status, detect and isolate failures and outages, and perform corrective and preventive maintenance to ensure the operational readiness of the NAS. Maintaining, operating, and managing NAS infrastructure requires a	Support Services	Systems Management	System Resource Monitoring	Multimedia		No Reuse	5

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

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
	variety of planning, engineering, analysis, repair, and maintenance functions.							

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)
Logistics and Transportation	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Redacted
Logistics and Transportation	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	Redacted
Logistics and Transportation	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	Redacted
Multimedia	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	Redacted
Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Redacted
Logistics and Transportation	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	Redacted
Logistics and Transportation	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Redacted
Logistics and Transportation	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	Redacted
Logistics and Transportation	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	Redacted
Logistics and Transportation	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	Redacted
Logistics and Transportation	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	Redacted
Logistics and Transportation	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	Redacted
Logistics and Transportation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Redacted
Logistics and Transportation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	Redacted
Multimedia	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Media Servers	Redacted
Logistics and Transportation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	Redacted
Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Local Area Network (LAN)	Redacted
Logistics and Transportation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	Redacted
Multimedia	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Peripherals	Redacted
Logistics and Transportation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Redacted
Logistics and Transportation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Wide Area Network (WAN)	Redacted
Multimedia	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	Redacted
Logistics and Transportation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	Redacted
Logistics and Transportation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	Redacted
Logistics and Transportation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	Redacted

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

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

6. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)?	No

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? 4/12/2004

b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?

c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

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

Redacted

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

Redacted

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

a. If "yes," are the migration costs associated with the migration to the selected alternative included in this investment, the legacy investment, or in a separate migration investment. This Investment

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

List of Legacy Investment or Systems		
Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	**UPI if available**	**Date of the System Retirement**
Common Airport Radar Terminal System (CARTS) - IIIA		8/31/2007

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? 8/20/2007

b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? Yes

c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

As part of the weekly STARS Management Leads meeting, the STARS Program Manager, the STARS Risk Manager, and STARS functional area leads review existing and proposed STARS risks. During the last 17 months, 14 new risks were identified. During this time period, 10 risks were retired. A risk realization date has been established for each risk. STARS risks are tracked on the FAA DOORS database. The STARS risk database is updated when a change occurs. A listing of the STARS risk database is provided to STARS team members every week as part of the STARS Management Leads agenda. STARS risks are briefed at the monthly STARS Internal Program Review (IPR) as well as at the Terminal Automation Sector Review, which is held every 6 weeks.

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:

The estimate results were modified to address both the uncertainty associated with the estimate as well as the risk associated with meeting the program objectives in a Fixed Price contract environment. The Program Officer determined the programmatic

risk (documented in STARS Risk Matrix) and along with the cost team, incorporated those cost risks into the risk ranges on individual elements. Monte Carlo simulation was utilized to determine the overall effect of the individual risk elements on the estimate. Finally, the total risk dollars required to meet an 80% confidence level for program execution were then allocated back into the Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) elements based on their individual risk level.

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?