

**Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary**

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

**Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)**

1. Date of Submission: 9/10/2007
2. Agency: Department of Transportation
3. Bureau: Federal Railroad Administration
4. Name of this Capital Asset: FRAXX310: Automated Track Inspection Program Information System (ATIP/IS)
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 021-27-01-19-01-1050-00
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:
- The national deployment of the Automated Track Inspection Program (ATIP), track geometry vehicle, serves an important role in Federal Railroad Administration's (FRA's) overall compliance programs. Since the beginning of the program in 1974, the ATIP objective has been to provide accurate, comprehensive, and objective automated inspections as a supplement to the manual inspections conducted by the FRA inspectors to assure compliance with the FRA track safety standards. The ATIP program also provides a vital source of track condition data, which is used by the FRA Office of Safety Assurance and Compliance to assess industry safety trends, to respond to inquiries about the safety of surveyed track locations, to support standards development, and to assess the quality of railroads' track maintenance and inspection programs. FRA has long recognized the value of automated track inspection as a key part of the safety assurance mission for track. Over the past 30 years, the ATIP program has surveyed more than 900,000 track miles. The surveys are planned to focus on passenger and hazardous material (HAZMAT) routes as they pose the greatest risk to the public in the event of a derailment. FRA and State Track Inspectors in the field use the ATIP data to set priorities for their own inspection efforts. It helps inspectors pinpoint the railroads, and the locations along those railroads, which are at greatest risk to a track-caused derailment. FRA Headquarters and Regional staff rely on ATIP data to spot trends among railroads and within railroads over time. In recent years, ATIP data has served a vital role in the system safety assessments of the major railroads conducted by the FRA. ATIP currently inspects an average of 27,000 miles of the nation's 167,000 miles of Class 1 mainline track per year. The highest priorities are given to passenger, high density, HAZMAT routes, and the assigned Strategic Track Network (STRACNET). Since 1999, over 100,000 miles have been surveyed by ATIP, resulting in the discovery of thousands of defects, some of which could have caused derailments had they gone undetected. The effectiveness of ATIP relies heavily upon the availability of precise, accurate, reliable, and repeatable measurement and management systems, affording efficient data reporting and storage. The ATIP/IS project assures that ATIP has the necessary technology and inspection tools available to achieve the program goals.
9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes
- a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? 11/26/2006
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? Yes
11. Contact information of Project Manager?
- Name Lee, Sung
- Phone Number Redacted
- Email sung.lee@dot.gov
- a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager? TBD
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project? Yes
- a. Will this investment include electronic assets Yes

(including computers)?

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 PMA goal of Expanded E-Government by improving service to citizens and by providing an electronic interface of track anomaly data to other federal government agencies, the railroad industry and state inspection programs. ATIP/IS enables accurate, fast and convenient information capture and sharing of track safety data among authorities while automating portions of the track inspection process.

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](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part).) Yes

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? Federal Railroad Administration Railroad Safety Program

c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? Moderately Effective

15. Is this investment for information technology? Yes

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

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) Level 1

17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) (1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment

18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23) No

19. Is this a financial management system? 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 FY2009 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware	15.000000
Software	5.000000
Services	80.000000
Other	0.000000

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: Wissman, David  
 Phone Number: Redacted  
 Title: FRA Privacy Officer  
 E-mail: david.wissman@dot.gov

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 2007	CY 2008	BY 2009	BY+1 2010	BY+2 2011	BY+3 2012	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	0.18	0.03	0.03	0.03	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Acquisition:	2.724	0.3	0.25	0.25	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	2.904	0.33	0.28	0.28	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Operations & Maintenance:	1.038	0.607	0.717	0.97	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
TOTAL:	3.942	0.937	0.997	1.25	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
<b>Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.</b>									
Government FTE Costs	0.32	0.106	0.106	0.113	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	2	9	10	10	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? Yes

a. If "yes," How many and in what year? In FY 2008, ATIP will be required to hire one additional FTE.

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

Exhibit 300: FRAXX310: Automated Track Inspection Program Information System (ATIP/IS) (Revision 12)

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

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

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?

N/A

a. Explain why:

Section 508 compliance is not applicable to this investment since Railroad Safety standards restrict personnel who have sight, hearing, ambulatory, or tactile disabilities from working on the ATIP vehicles. At present, no ATIP data is posted on a website or other system that would require Section 508 compliance for display and/or access.

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

Yes

a. If "yes," what is the date?

8/30/2006

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

1. If "no," briefly explain why:

**Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)**

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

Agencies must use the following table to report performance goals and measures for the major investment and use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for each of the four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at [www.egov.gov](http://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
2006	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Decrease number of business days to turnaround inspection data to customers	2 days	2 days	2 days
2006	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	Decrease track geometry related derailments on mainline tracks	130 track derailments	Decreased 5% to 124 track derailments	139 track derailments
2006	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	Increase number of track miles inspected per year with the addition of two new inspection vehicles	28,946 track miles	200% increase to 86,838 track miles	25,383 track miles. Late delivery of the 2 new cars is the cause of ATIP missing its target.
2006	Organizational Excellence	Processes and Activities	Financial (Processes and Activities)	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Decrease cost to perform track inspection	\$92/mile	Decreased 5% to \$87/mile	\$158/mile. Unexpected maintenance expenses raised the price per mile.
2006	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Increase number of available survey days per car	167 survey days per car	Increase 5% to 175 survey days per car	170 survey days per car. Unexpected maintenance caused delays in survey days.
2006	Safety	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Increase Data Reliability and Quality (Precision, Accuracy, Repeatability, and Reliability)	90%	Increase 2% to 92%	92%
2007	Safety	Customer	Timeliness and	Delivery Time	Decrease	Once every four	Once every two	TBD March 2008

Exhibit 300: FRAXX310: Automated Track Inspection Program Information System (ATIP/IS) (Revision 12)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
		Results	Responsiveness		number of years between inspections on mainline track	years	years	
2007	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Decrease number of business days to turnaround inspection data to customers	2 Days	1 day	TBD March 2008
2007	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	Decrease track geometry related derailments on mainline tracks	139 track derailments	5%	TBD March 2008
2007	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	Increase number of miles of mainline tracks inspected per car	25,383 track miles.	5%	TBD March 2008
2007	Organizational Excellence	Processes and Activities	Financial (Processes and Activities)	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Decrease cost to perform track inspection	\$158/mile	5%	TBD March 2008
2007	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Increase number of available survey days per car	170 survey days per car	5%	TBD March 2008
2007	Safety	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Increase Data Reliability and Quality (Precision, Accuracy, Repeatability, and Reliability)	92%	2%	TBD March 2008
2007	Organizational Excellence	Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing	Reduce the timeframe for the remediation of high level system security vulnerabilities from the time of discovery	24-48 hours	6-18 hours	TBD October 2007
2007	Organizational Excellence	Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing	Reduce the timeframe for the remediation of high level system security vulnerabilities from the time of discovery	Medium: 120-160 days, Low: 160-360 months	Medium: <60-days, Low: < 180 days	TBD October 2007
2008	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Decrease number of years between inspections on mainline track	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	Maintain once every two years	TBD March 2009
2008	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Decrease number of business days to turnaround inspection data to customers	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	Maintain 1 day	TBD March 2009
2008	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	Decrease track geometry related derailments on mainline tracks	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2009
2008	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	Increase number of miles of mainline tracks inspected per car	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2009
2008	Organizational Excellence	Processes and Activities	Financial (Processes and Activities)	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Decrease cost to perform track inspection	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2009
2008	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Increase number of available survey days per car	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2009
2008	Safety	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Increase Data Reliability and Quality (Precision,	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	2%	TBD March 2009

Exhibit 300: FRAXX310: Automated Track Inspection Program Information System (ATIP/IS) (Revision 12)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					Accuracy, Repeatability, and Reliability)			
2008	Organizational Excellence	Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing	Reduce the timeframe for the remediation of high level system security vulnerabilities from the time of discovery	24-48 hours	6-18 hours	TBD October 2008
2008	Organizational Excellence	Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing	Reduce the timeframe for the remediation of high level system security vulnerabilities from the time of discovery	Medium: 120-160 days, Low: 160-360 months	Medium: <60-days, Low: < 180 days	TBD October 2008
2009	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Decrease number of years between inspections on mainline track	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	Maintain once every two years	TBD March 2010
2009	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Decrease number of business days to turnaround inspection data to customers	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	Maintain 1 day	TBD March 2010
2009	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	Decrease track geometry related derailments on mainline tracks	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2010
2009	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	Increase number of miles of mainline tracks inspected per car	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2010
2009	Organizational Excellence	Processes and Activities	Financial (Processes and Activities)	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Decrease cost to perform track inspection	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2010
2009	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Increase number of available survey days per car	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2010
2009	Safety	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Increase Data Reliability and Quality (Precision, Accuracy, Repeatability, and Reliability)	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	2%	TBD March 2010
2009	Organizational Excellence	Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing	Reduce the timeframe for the remediation of high level system security vulnerabilities from the time of discovery	24-48 hours	6-18 hours	TBD October 2009
2009	Organizational Excellence	Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing	Reduce the timeframe for the remediation of high level system security vulnerabilities from the time of discovery	Medium: 120-160 days, Low: 160-360 months	Medium: <60-days, Low: < 180 days	TBD October 2009
2010	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Decrease number of years between inspections on mainline track	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	Maintain once every two years	TBD March 2011
2010	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Decrease number of years between inspections on mainline track	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	Maintain once every two years	TBD March 2011
2010	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Decrease number of	Baseline TBD on prior year's	Maintain 1 day	TBD March 2011

Exhibit 300: FRAXX310: Automated Track Inspection Program Information System (ATIP/IS) (Revision 12)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					business days to turnaround inspection data to customers	actual results		
2010	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	Decrease track geometry related derailments on mainline tracks	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2011
2010	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	Increase number of miles of mainline tracks inspected per car	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD on March 2011
2010	Organizational Excellence	Processes and Activities	Financial (Processes and Activities)	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Decrease cost to perform track inspection	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2011
2010	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Increase number of available survey days per car	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2011
2010	Safety	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Increase Data Reliability and Quality (Precision, Accuracy, Repeatability and Reliability)	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	2%	TBD March 2010
2010	Organizational Excellence	Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing	Reduce the timeframe for the remediation of high level system security vulnerabilities from the time of discovery	24-48 hours	6-18 hours	TBD October 2010
2010	Organizational Excellence	Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing	Reduce the timeframe for the remediation of high level system security vulnerabilities from the time of discovery	Medium: 120-160 days, Low: 160-360 months	Medium: <60-days, Low: < 180 days	TBD October 2010
2011	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Decrease number of years between inspections on mainline track	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	Maintain once every two years	TBD March 2012
2011	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Decrease number of business days to turnaround inspection data to customers	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	Maintain 1 day	TBD March 2012
2011	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	Decrease track geometry related derailments on mainline tracks	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2012
2011	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	Increase number of miles of mainline tracks inspected per car	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2012
2011	Organizational Excellence	Processes and Activities	Financial (Processes and Activities)	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Decrease cost to perform track inspection	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2012
2011	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Increase number of available survey days per car	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2012
2011	Safety	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Increase Data Reliability and Quality (Precision, Accuracy, Repeatability, and Reliability)	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	2%	TBD March 2012
2011	Organizational Excellence	Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing	Reduce the timeframe for the remediation	24-48 hours	6-18 hours	TBD October 2011



Exhibit 300: FRAXX310: Automated Track Inspection Program Information System (ATIP/IS) (Revision 12)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					of high level security vulnerabilities from the time of discovery			
2011	Organizational Excellence	Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing	Reduce the timeframe for the remediation of high level system security vulnerabilities form the time of discovery	Medium: 120-160 days, Low: 160-360 months	Medium: <60-days, Low: <180 days	TBD October 2011
2012	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Decrease number of years between inspections on mainline track	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	Maintain once every two years	TBD March 2013
2012	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Decrease number of business days to turnaround inspection data to customers	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	Maintain 1 day	TBD March 2013
2012	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	Decrease track geometry related derailments on mainline tracks	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2013
2012	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	Increase number of miles of mainline tracks inspected per car	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2013
2012	Organizational Excellence	Processes and Activities	Financial (Processes and Activities)	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Decrease cost to perform track inspection	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2013
2012	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Increase number of available survey days per car	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2013
2012	Safety	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Increase Data Reliability and Quality (Precision, Accuracy, Repeatability)	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	2%	TBD March 2013
2012	Organizational Excellence	Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing	Reduce the timeframe for the remediation of high level system security vulnerabilities from the time of discovery	24-48 hours	6-18 hours	TBD October 2012
2012	Organizational Excellence	Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing	Reduce the timeframe for the remediation of high level system security vulnerabilities	Medium: 120-160 days, Low: 160-360 months	Medium: <60-days, Low: , 180 days	TBD October 2012
2013	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Decrease number of years between inspections on mainline track	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	Maintain once every two years	TBD March 2014
2013	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Decrease number of business days to turnaround inspection data to customers	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	Maintain 1 day	TBD March 2014
2013	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	Decrease track geometry related derailments on mainline tracks	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2014
2013	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	Increase number of miles of mainline tracks inspected per car	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2014

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2013	Organizational Excellence	Processes and Activities	Financial (Processes and Activities)	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Decrease cost to perform track inspection	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2014
2013	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Increase number of available survey days per car	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	5%	TBD March 2014
2013	Safety	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Increase Data Reliability and Quality (Precision, Accuracy, Repeatability, and Reliability)	Baseline TBD on prior year's actual results	2%	TBD March 2014
2013	Organizational Excellence	Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing	Reduce the timeframe for the remediation of high level system security vulnerabilities from the time of discovery	24-48 hours	6-18 hours	TBD October 2013
2013	Organizational Excellence	Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing	Reduce the timerame for the remediation of high level system security vulnerabilities from the time of discovery	Medium: 120-160 days, Low: 160-360 months	Medium: <60 days, Low: < 180 days	TBD October 2013

**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 Yes  
and integrated into the overall costs of the investment:  
 a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the 18.000000  
budget year:
2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part Yes  
of the overall risk management effort for each system  
supporting or part of this investment.

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

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:							
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level (High, Moderate, Low)	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37? (Y/N)	Date Completed: C&A	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests? (FIPS 200/NIST 800-53, NIST 800-26, Other, N/A)	Date Complete(d): Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
Redacted							

5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG? Yes

a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process? Yes

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

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

Redacted

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

Redacted

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:					
(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or Explanation	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Internet Link or Explanation
Automated Track Inspection Program Information System (ATIP/IS) - Operational	No	No		No	
Automated Track Inspection Program Information System (ATIP/IS) - Planning	No	No		No	
<b>Details for Text Options:</b>					
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. FRA Automated Track Inspection Program Information System (ATIP/IS)

b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a No

target architecture) and approved segment architecture?

a. If "yes," provide the name of the segment architecture as provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

**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)
Forensics	Defines the set of capabilities that support the analysis of physical elements using science and technology for investigative and legal purposes.	Business Analytical Services	Analysis and Statistics	Forensics			No Reuse	25
Decision Support and Planning	Defines the set of capabilities that support the analyze information and predict the impact of decisions before they are made.	Business Analytical Services	Business Intelligence	Decision Support and Planning			No Reuse	10
Standardized / Canned	Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of pre-conceived or pre-written reports.	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Standardized / Canned			No Reuse	5
Program / Project Management	Defines the set of capabilities for the management and control of a particular effort of an organization.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Program / Project Management			No Reuse	10
Quality Management	Defines the set of capabilities intended to help determine the level that a product or service satisfies certain requirements.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Quality Management			No Reuse	15
Information Retrieval	Defines the set of capabilities that allow access to data and information for use by an organization and its stakeholders.	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval			No Reuse	10
Information Sharing	Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of documents and data in a multi-user environment for use by an organization and its stakeholders.	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Sharing			No Reuse	15
Knowledge Capture	Defines the set of capabilities that facilitate collection of data and information	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Capture			No Reuse	10

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.

Exhibit 300: FRAXX310: Automated Track Inspection Program Information System (ATIP/IS) (Revision 12)

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)
Forensics	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Redacted
Information Sharing	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	Redacted
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	Redacted
Decision Support and Planning	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	Redacted
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Redacted
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Redacted
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Redacted
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Redacted
Knowledge Capture	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Wireless / PDA	Redacted
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Wireless / PDA	Redacted
Knowledge Capture	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Wireless / PDA	Redacted
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	Redacted
Program / Project Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	Redacted
Information Sharing	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	Redacted
Information Sharing	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	Redacted
Information Sharing	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	Redacted
Quality Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Redacted
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	Redacted
Information Sharing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Local Area Network (LAN)	Redacted
Information Sharing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Local Area Network (LAN)	Redacted
Information Sharing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	Redacted

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

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

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

a. If "yes," please describe.

By ATIP/IS publishing and posting information to the ATIP website, RITA and DOD can use and reuse the information from ATIP; thereby, alleviating the need for their own business processes and systems to do this work. There are informal meetings with these user groups to ensure that the ATIP/IS data continues to be useful to their needs.

**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?      5/27/2004
  - b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?
  - c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

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

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

Redacted

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

Redacted

5. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part      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:

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

**Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)**

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

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?      Yes
  - a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?      7/16/2007
  - 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:

The ATIP program management in conjunction with the project manager develops both a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risks. The different areas of risk evaluated are: schedule, initial costs, life-cycle costs, technical obsolescence, feasibility, reliability of systems, dependencies and interoperability between this investment and others, surety (asset protection) considerations, risk of creating a monopoly for future procurements, capability of agency to manage the investment, overall risk of investment failure, organizational and change management, business, data/info,

Exhibit 300: FRAXX310: Automated Track Inspection Program Information System (ATIP/IS) (Revision 12)  
technology, strategic, security, privacy, and project resources. After a risk index and profile are identified, we quantify the risk, rank them and then calculate the probability of occurrence to risk adjust the budget submitted for the project. A risk plan was developed and will be monitored throughout the investment lifecycle.

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

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

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard-748? No

2. Is the CV% or SV% greater than +/- 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100) No

- a. If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?
- b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance:
  
- c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions:

3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? No

- a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head?

Exhibit 300: FRAXX310: Automated Track Inspection Program Information System (ATIP/IS) (Revision 12)

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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

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