

Exhibit 300 FY2011

FAAXX032: Terminal Automation Replacement System (STARS)

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:	2010-02-12
I.A.2. Agency:	021
I.A.3. Bureau:	12
I.A.4. Name of this Investment: Description: (Up to 250 characters)	FAAXX032: Terminal Automation Replacement System (STARS)
I.A.5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: Description: For IT investment only, see section 53.9. For all other, use agency ID system.	021-12-01-11-01-1020-00
I.A.6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2011? Description: Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY2011, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2011 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.	Mixed Life Cycle

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; this description may include links to relevant information which should include relevant GAO reports, and links to relevant findings of independent audits.
Description: (Up to 2500 characters)

STATUS: STARS is a digital radar/flight data processing and display system used by terminal air traffic controllers to ensure the safety of military and civilian aircraft throughout the nation's airspace. On February 18, 2009 the JRC recognized that the Norfolk, VA TRACON is the final STARS deployment. Norfolk achieved IOC in June 2007. While 47 STARS "systems" have been procured under this phase (TAMR Phase I), the FAA Joint Resources Council recently allowed the reclassification of one TRACON site to a remote tower. Since the equipment for this site, Dayton, has already been purchased, the JRC action will not result in a reduction in the number of sites. Instead, the site count will remain at 47 and the equipment purchased for Dayton "tower" will be installed as part of the already deployed Port Columbus TRACON. Towers are associated with TRACONS and as such do not have "IOC dates" assigned. The newly designated Dayton, OH, tower will become a remote tower associated with the Port Columbus, OH, TRACON, which became operational in April 2004. Once the remote display is installed in the new Tower in Dayton in FY2010, STARS will be 100% complete. STARS is still characterized as a "Mixed Life-Cycle" program for OMB purposes due to the continued use of F&E funding. It is also important to understand that STARS is now in the "In-Service" phase of its acquisition life-cycle. BACKGROUND: STARS has been a "joint" Department of Defense (DoD) / Department of Transportation (DOT) program since inception in 1996. The joint program reduces the government's cost of ownership by cutting duplicate development, logistics, training, sustainment and technology refreshment costs. This exhibit includes only the FAA's costs & benefits & does not capture joint benefits. 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. SUMMARY: During FY2011, STARS "terminal automation enhancements" and "technology refreshment" activities will 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.

I.A.8.a. Enter dates for approved rebaselining, alternative analysis, and risk management plan and risk register information. Description: Provide here the date of any approved rebaselining within the past year, the date for the most recent (or planned) alternatives analysis for this investment, and whether this investment has a risk management plan and risk register. (Up to 500 characters)	STARS has not been rebaselined in the past year. Alternatives Analysis is dated 04/12/04. Risk Management Plan is dated 06/10/08. The FAA DOORS risk database is the STARS Risk Register, and it is routinely updated.
--	--

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?	2005-06-30
--	------------

I.A.12. If this investment is a financial management system, then please fill out the following as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory (FMSI):

I.A.12.a. Financial Management System Table	
I.A.12.b. If this investment is a financial management system AND the investment is part of the core financial system then select the primary FFMIA compliance area that this investment addresses (choose only one):	

I.B. Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

I.B.1. Summary of Funding 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. Funding for all costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this report. Funding levels should be shown for budget authority by year consistent with funding levels in Exhibit 53. The Summary of Funding table shall include the amounts allocated to the investment from, and should be directly tied to, the Fiscal Year

Budget. This includes direct appropriations (discretionary or mandatory accounts), user fees, and approved self-funding activities and will provide the actual annual "budget" for the investment. This "budget" will be a subset of the congressionally approved budget for each fiscal year. This will provide Departments/Agencies and OMB useful information on the actual Fiscal Year dollars being asked for and spent on an investment.

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 (Reported in Millions)

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2009	CY 2010	BY 2011
Planning	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
Acquisition	\$1,487.115	\$28.205	\$28.005	\$22.005
Subtotal Planning and Acquisition	\$1,487.115	\$28.205	\$28.005	\$22.005
Operations and Maintenance	\$68.786	\$28.511	\$29.578	\$29.605
Disposition Costs (Optional)	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
SUBTOTAL	\$1,555.901	\$56.716	\$57.583	\$51.610
Government FTE Costs	\$209.186	\$29.286	\$30.750	\$32.288
TOTAL	\$1,765.087	\$86.002	\$88.333	\$83.898

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

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2009	CY 2010	BY 2011
Number of FTE represented by Costs	1,670	187	187	187

I.B.2. If the summary of funding has changed from the FY2010 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:
Description: (Up to 2500 characters)

Acquisition for FY11 has been revised to match the 7/20/09 OST FY11 Submission of the CIP. FY11 Tech Refresh was reduced by \$10M and \$10M was added back into Tech Refresh for FY15 and Beyond.

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 and the relevant Agency Segment Architecture. The investment must discuss its performance measures in support of the agency's mission and strategic goals as outlined in the corresponding Segment Architecture. Performance measures (indicators) must be provided. 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 <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/e-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
2005	Mobility	Customer Results	Service Efficiency	STARS System Availability (%)
2005	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Percentage of on time arrivals
2005	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Number of category A&B operational errors.
2005	Safety	Processes and Activities	Security	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with increased security features and an approved SCAP
2005	Mobility	Technology	Availability	STARS System Availability (%)
2006	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Aircraft Direct Operating Costs (ADOC) Benefits
2006	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Savings in terminal area delays.
2006	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Service Efficiency	Passenger Value of Time (PVT) Benefits
2006	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	On time Arrivals
2006	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Computer Memory and Data Processing Margins
2006	Security	Processes and Activities	Security	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with enhanced security features.
2006	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Load levels	STARS System Availability (%)
2007	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Computer Memory and Data Processing Margins
2007	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	On time arrivals.

2007	Security	Processes and Activities	Security	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with enhanced security features.
2007	Safety	Technology	Load levels	Increased availability and capacity
2008	Safety	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Average number of general aviation and nonscheduled Part 135 fatal accidents over a three-year period.
2008	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Computer Memory and Data Processing Margins
2008	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	On time arrivals.
2008	Safety	Processes and Activities	Security	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with an approved SCAP.
2008	Safety	Technology	Availability	STARS System Availability (%)
2009	Safety	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Average number of general aviation and nonscheduled Part 135 fatal accidents over a three-year period.
2009	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Computer Memory and Data Processing Margins
2009	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Service Efficiency	On time arrivals.
2009	Security	Processes and Activities	Security	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with an approved SCAP.
2009	Safety	Technology	Load levels	STARS System Availability (%)
2010	Safety	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Average number of general aviation and nonscheduled Part 135 fatal accidents over a three-year period.
2010	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Computer Memory and Data Processing Margins
2010	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	On time arrivals.
2010	Security	Processes and Activities	Security	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with an approved SCAP.
2010	Safety	Technology	Load levels	STARS System Availability (%)
2011	Security	Processes and Activities	Security	STARS Security Breaches
2011	Safety	Technology	Availability	STARS Equipment Availability (%)
2011	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Computer Data Processing Margins
2011	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Flight Delays due to STARS
2012	Security	Processes and Activities	Security	STARS Security Breaches
2012	Safety	Technology	Availability	STARS Equipment Availability (%)
2012	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Computer Data Processing Margins
2012	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Flight Delays due to STARS
2013	Security	Processes and Activities	Security	STARS Security Breaches
2013	Safety	Technology	Availability	STARS Equipment Availability (%)
2013	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Computer Data Processing Margins
2013	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Flight Delays due to STARS
2014	Security	Processes and Activities	Security	STARS Security Breaches
2014	Safety	Technology	Availability	STARS Equipment Availability (%)
2014	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Computer Data Processing Margins
2014	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Flight Delays due to STARS
2015	Security	Processes and Activities	Security	STARS Security Breaches
2015	Safety	Technology	Availability	STARS Equipment Availability (%)
2015	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Computer Data Processing Margins
2015	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Flight Delays due to STARS

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.

Have the requisite investment-level architecture documentation requirements (e.g., reference model mappings, FTF mappings, etc.) for this investment been documented in the corresponding Segment Architecture? For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture requirements, please refer to <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/e-gov/>. See this guidance also regarding the reporting of six digit codes corresponding to agency segment

architectures in Exhibit 53, and, for limited cases determined by the Chief Architect, reporting an investment alignment with multiple segments.

I.F.1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? | yes

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.5. Does this investment replace any legacy systems investments?

Description: Disposition costs (costs of retirement of legacy systems) may be included as a category in Part I, Section B, Summary of Funding, or in separate investments, classified as major or non-major. For legacy system investments being replaced by this investment, include the following data on these legacy investments.