

Exhibit 300 FY2010

FAAXX709: Runway Status Lights (RWSL)

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

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

I.A. Overview (All Capital Assets)

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

I.A.1. Date of Submission:	2008-06-25
I.A.2. Agency:	021
I.A.3. Bureau:	12
I.A.4. Name of this Capital Asset: Description: (Up to 250 characters)	FAAXX709: Runway Status Lights (RWSL)
I.A.5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: Description: For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.	021-12-01-20-01-3060-00
I.A.6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2010? Description: Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY2010, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2010 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.	Full-Acquisition
I.A.8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap: Description: (Up to 2500 characters)	<p>A top priority of the Federal Aviation Administration is to enhance airport safety while ensuring airport capacity. Reducing runway incursions is a major component of this effort. The development, testing, evaluation and deployment of runway status lights (RWSL) at ASDE-X airports is one of the initiatives identified in the 2007-2011 FAA Flight Plan to reduce the risk of runway incursions. The RWSL System reduces runway incursions by indicating to pilots and vehicle operators that it would be in conflict with an aircraft if it crossed the hold line or begins its takeoff. Runway status lights display critical, time-sensitive safety status information directly to pilots and vehicle operators via in pavement lights giving them an immediate indication of potentially unsafe situations. The RWSL System uses computer processing of integrated surface and terminal surveillance information (ASDE-X) to establish the presence and motion of aircraft and surface vehicles on or near the runways. The system illuminates red runway-entrance lights (RELs) if the runway is unsafe for entry or crossing, and illuminates red takeoff-hold lights (THLs) if the runway is unsafe for departure. The system extinguishes the lights automatically as appropriate when the runway is no longer unsafe. RWSL Program received approval for an Initial Investment Decision on July 18, 2007 from the Joint Resources Council. The program received conditional approval for a Final Investment Decision on June 25, 2008. The JRC approved the program to procure systems for RWSL Segment 1 of 22 airport sites and 3 support systems(PSF, Tech Center Depot and the Academy). The JRC conditional approval included the cost and schedule baselines for the program of \$247.7M in F&E and \$4.3M in Ops with a schedule baseline of FY08 to FY12. The JRC also requested the Program Office to return to the JRC no later than the end of the 3rd quarter of FY09 to provide updated cost and schedule. The Prime Contract Award was made on October 16, 2008 to Sensis. In FY10, the program plans to obtain an In-Service Decision and start deployment of production systems to the field. Funding will be used to procure 22 systems and to start construction and installation of these 22 systems.</p>
I.A.9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?	yes
I.A.9.a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?	2008-06-25
I.A.10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?	yes
I.A.12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project?	yes
I.A.12.a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?	yes
I.A.12.b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)	no
I.A.12.b.1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?	
I.A.12.b.2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?	
I.A.12.b.3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?	
I.A.13. Does this investment directly support any of the PMA initiatives?	no
I.A.13.a. If "yes," select all that apply:	
I.A.13.b. 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? Description: (Up to 500 characters)	
I.A.14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? Description: (For more information about the PART, visit www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part .)	no
I.A.14.a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review?	
I.A.14.b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program?	
I.A.14.c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive?	
I.A.15. Is this investment for information technology?	yes
I.A.16 What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) Description: Level 1 - Projects with low-to-moderate complexity and risk. Example: Bureau-level project such as a stand-alone information system that has low- to-moderate complexity and risk. Level 2 - Projects with high complexity and/or risk which are critical to the mission of the organization. Examples: Projects that are part of a portfolio of projects/systems that impact each other and/or impact mission activities. Department-wide projects that impact cross-organizational missions, such as an agency-wide system integration that includes large scale Enterprise Resource Planning (e.g., the DoD Business Mgmt Modernization Program). Level 3 - Projects that have high complexity, and/or risk, and have government-wide impact. Examples: Government-wide initiative (E-GOV, President's Management Agenda). High interest projects with Congress, GAO, OMB, or the general public. Cross-cutting initiative (Homeland Security).	Level 2
I.A.17. In addition to the answer in 1.A.11.d, 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
I.A.18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4-FY 2008 agency high risk report? (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23)	no
I.A.19. Is this a financial management system?	no
I.A.19.a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFIA compliance area?	
I.A.19.a.1. If "yes," which compliance area: Description: (Up to 250 characters)	
I.A.19.a.2. If "no," what does it address? Description: (Up to 500 characters)	
I.A.19.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 Description: (Up to 2500 characters)	
I.A.20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2010 funding request for the following? Description: (This should total 100%)	
I.A.20.a. Hardware	10
I.A.20.b. Software	1
I.A.20.c. Services	80
I.A.20.d. Other	9
I.A.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
I.A.23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?	no
I.A.24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas?	no
I.B. Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)	
I.B.1 Summary of Spending Table Description: Provide the total estimated life-cycle cost for this investment by completing the following table. All amounts represent budget authority in millions, and are rounded to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included only in the row designated "Government FTE Cost," and should be excluded from the amounts shown for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." The "TOTAL" estimated annual cost of the investment is the sum of costs for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." For Federal buildings and facilities, life-cycle costs should include long-term energy, environmental, decommissioning, and/or restoration costs. The costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this	

report.

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

I.B.1.a. Summary of Spending for Project Phases

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2008	CY 2009	BY 2010
Planning	\$5.700	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
Acquisition	\$0.000	\$8.700	\$26.500	\$116.900
Subtotal Planning and Acquisition	\$5.700	\$8.700	\$26.500	\$116.900
Operations and Maintenance	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
TOTAL	\$5.700	\$8.700	\$26.500	\$116.900
Government FTE Costs	\$0.000	\$2.020	\$2.490	\$6.210

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

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2008	CY 2009	BY 2010
Number of FTE represented by cost	0	11	13	18

I.B.2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? no

I.B.2.a. If "yes," How many and in what year?

Description: (Up to 500 characters)

I.B.3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2009 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:

Description: (Up to 2500 characters)

During FY07, RWSL was a non-major investment in the planning phase. In FY08, RWSL completed the final investment analysis process and received JRC approval in June 2008. Cost and schedule estimates were updated for the JRC final investment and are represented in the SOS table.

I.D. Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

I.D.1. Performance Information Table

Description: In order to successfully address this area of the exhibit 300, performance goals must be provided for the agency and be linked to the annual performance plan. 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 measure.

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

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator
2008	Increase Safety	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Number of Category A&B Runway Incursions at the 22 RWSL airports since FY2011
2008	Increase Safety	Processes and Activities	Planning	Number of Runway Incursions Caused by Pilot Errors at the 22 RWSL airports since FY2011
2008	Increase Safety	Technology	Technology Improvement	Detections (a "detection" is a warnings of a runway being occupied) by RWSL
2008	Increase Safety	Customer Results	Service Availability	System availability results from MMS.
2009	Increase Safety	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Number of Category A&B Runway Incursions at the 22 RWSL airports since FY2011
2009	Increase Safety	Processes and Activities	Planning	Number of Runway Incursions Caused by Pilot Errors at the 22 RWSL airports since FY2011
2009	Increase Safety	Technology	Technology Improvement	Detections (a "detection" is a warnings of a runway being

				occupied) by RWSL
2009	Increase Safety	Customer Results	Service Availability	System availability results from MMS.
2010	Increase Safety	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Number of Category A&B Runway Incursions at the 22 RWSL airports since FY2011
2010	Increase Safety	Processes and Activities	Planning	Number of Runway Incursions Caused by Pilot Errors at the 22 RWSL airports since FY2011
2010	Increase Safety	Technology	Technology Improvement	Detections (a "detection" is a warnings of a runway being occupied) by RWSL
2010	Increase Safety	Customer Results	Service Availability	System availability results from MMS.
2011	Increase Safety	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Number of Category A&B Runway Incursions at the 22 RWSL airports since FY2011
2011	Increase Safety	Processes and Activities	Planning	Number of Runway Incursions Caused by Pilot Errors at the 22 RWSL airports since FY2011
2011	Increase Safety	Technology	Technology Improvement	Detections (a "detection" is a warnings of a runway being occupied) by RWSL
2011	Increase Safety	Customer Results	Service Availability	System availability results from MMS.
2012	Increase Safety	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Number of Category A&B Runway Incursions at the 22 RWSL airports since FY2011
2012	Increase Safety	Processes and Activities	Participation	Number of Runway Incursions Caused by Pilot Errors at the 22 RWSL airports since FY2011
2012	Increase Safety	Technology	Technology Improvement	Detections (a "detection" is a warnings of a runway being occupied) by RWSL
2012	Increase Safety	Customer Results	Service Availability	System availability results from MMS.
2013	Increase Safety	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Number of Category A&B Runway Incursions at the 22 RWSL airports since FY2011
2013	Increase Safety	Processes and Activities	Planning	Number of Runway Incursions Caused by Pilot Errors at the 22 RWSL airports since FY2011
2013	Increase Safety	Technology	Technology Improvement	Detections (a "detection" is a warnings of a runway being occupied) by RWSL
2013	Increase Safety	Customer Results	Service Availability	System availability results from MMS.

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

Description: In order to successfully address this area of the capital asset plan and business case, the investment must be included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process and mapped to and supporting the FEA. The business case must demonstrate the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

I.F.1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture?	yes
I.F.1.a. If "no," please explain why? Description: (Up to 2500 characters)	
I.F.2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?	yes
I.F.2.a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. Description: (Up to 500 characters)	Runway Status Lights
I.F.2.b. If "no," please explain why? Description: (Up to 2500 characters)	
I.F.3. Is this investment identified in a completed and approved segment architecture?	yes
I.F.3.a. If "yes," provide the six digit code corresponding to the agency segment architecture. The segment architecture codes are maintained by the agency Chief Architect. For detailed	102-000

guidance regarding segment architecture codes, please refer to <http://www.egov.gov>.
 Description: (In the format "XXX-000")

I.F.4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table

Description: 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>.

- 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 this column can, but are not required to, add up to 100%.

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused - Component Name (b)
Surface Separation Capability	Aircraft are separated from vehicle movements on the airport movement area, taxiing aircraft, water vehicles, and from designated critical zones, etc. Standards are employed to ensure safe operation on the surface. Surface separation of aircraft while they are operating on the airport surface is a shared responsibility.	Tracking and Workflow	Conflict Resolution	
Surface Separation Capability	Aircraft are separated from vehicle movements on the airport movement area, taxiing aircraft, water vehicles, and from designated critical zones, etc. Standards are employed to ensure safe operation on the surface. Surface separation of aircraft while they are operating on the airport surface is a shared responsibility.	Knowledge Management	Information Sharing	
Surface Separation Capability	Aircraft are separated from vehicle movements on the airport movement area, taxiing aircraft, water vehicles, and from designated critical zones, etc. Standards are employed to ensure safe operation on the surface. Surface separation of aircraft while they are operating on the airport surface is a shared responsibility.	Knowledge Discovery	Modeling	

I.F.5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table

Description: 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.

- 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.

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)
Conflict Resolution	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	Based on contract award
Information Sharing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	Based on contract award
Modeling	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	Based on contract award

I.F.6. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (e.g. USA.gov, Pay.gov,

etc.)?	
I.F.6.a. If "yes," please describe. Description: (Up to 2500 characters)	
Part IV: Planning for "Multi-Agency Collaboration" ONLY	
Description: Part IV should be completed only for investments identified as an E-Gov initiative, a Line of Business (LOB) Initiative, or a Multi-Agency Collaboration effort. The "Multi-Agency Collaboration" choice should be selected in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above. Investments identified as "Multi-Agency Collaboration" will complete only Parts I and IV of the exhibit 300.	
IV.A. Multi-Agency Collaboration Oversight (All Capital Assets)	
Description: Multi-agency Collaborations, such as E-Gov and LOB initiatives, should develop a joint exhibit 300.	
IV.A.1. Stakeholder Table Description: As a joint exhibit 300, please identify all the agency stakeholders (all participating agencies, this should not be limited to agencies with financial commitment). All agency stakeholders should be listed regardless of approval. If the partner agency has approved this joint exhibit 300 please provide the date of approval.	
IV.A.9. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole?	
IV.A.9.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?	
IV.A.9.b. If "yes," please provide the following information:	