

Exhibit 300 FY2011

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:	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)	FAAXX709: Runway Status Lights (RWSL)
I.A.5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: Description: For IT investment only, see section 53.9. For all other, use agency ID system.	021-12-01-20-01-3060-00
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)	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 conditional approval by JRC granted RWSL approval to procure systems for 22 airport sites and 3 support systems (PSF, Tech Center Depot and the Academy); to proceed with prime contract award; and 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 Program returned to the JRC on January 20, 2010 and received approval to proceed with a revised baseline and to procure systems for 23 airport sites and 3 support systems. The JRC granted a Lifecycle cost baseline approval to the program of \$367.7M in F&E and 105.5M in Ops; with a Lifecycle schedule baseline of FY10 – FY33 (including sunk costs of \$35.2M for FY08 –FY09).
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)	The program rebaselined on January 20, 2010 based on an action item from the FID. A business case analysis report was developed and approved for this investment. The business case analysis report did contain a risk register.
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?	2010-01-20
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 FFMI compliance area that this investment addresses (choose only one):	Not a core financial system - does not need to comply with FFMI

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	\$5.700	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
Acquisition	\$8.700	\$26.500	\$116.900	\$54.600
Subtotal Planning and Acquisition	\$14.400	\$26.500	\$116.900	\$54.600
Operations and Maintenance	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.300	\$0.400
Disposition Costs (Optional)	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
SUBTOTAL	\$14.400	\$26.500	\$117.200	\$55.000
Government FTE Costs	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$4.500	\$4.600
TOTAL	\$14.400	\$26.500	\$121.700	\$59.600

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	11	13	18	19

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)

During FY07, RWSL was a non-major investment in the planning phase. In FY08, RWSL completed the final investment analysis process and received JRC conditional approval in June 2008. The program returned to the JRC in January 2010 and presented revised cost and schedule estimates based on contract award and the cost estimates as a result of the contractor's site engineering reports (CSERs). RWSL is currently a major investment. Cost and schedule estimates were updated for the return to JRC and are represented in the SOS table. Since the previous JRC decision, RWSL Program selected Sensis as the Prime Contractor on October 16, 2008. The Program has obtain revised cost and schedule estimates based on contractor site engineering reports; which were more than 10% of the proposed estimate in the June 2008 JRC. As a result, the Program returned to the JRC on January 20, 2010 and received approval to proceed with a revised baseline and to procure systems for 23 airport sites and 3 support systems. The JRC granted a Lifecycle cost baseline approval to the program of \$367.7M in F&E and 105.5M in Ops; with a Lifecycle schedule baseline of FY10 – FY33 (including sunk costs of \$35.2M for FY08 –FY09).

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
2008	Increase Safety	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Number of Category A&B Runway Incursions at the 22 RWSL airports since FY2012
2008	Increase Safety	Processes and Activities	Planning	Number of Runway Incursions Caused by Pilot Errors at the 22 RWSL airports since FY2012
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 FY2012
2009	Increase Safety	Processes and Activities	Planning	Number of Runway Incursions Caused by Pilot Errors at the 22 RWSL airports since

				FY2012
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 23 RWSL airports since FY2012
2010	Increase Safety	Processes and Activities	Planning	Number of Runway Incursions Caused by Pilot Errors at the 23 RWSL airports since FY2012
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 23 RWSL airports since FY2012
2011	Increase Safety	Processes and Activities	Planning	Number of Runway Incursions caused by Pilot Errors at the 23 RWSL airports since FY2012
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 23 RWSL airports since FY2012
2012	Increase Safety	Processes and Activities	Planning	Number of Runway Incursions Caused by Pilot Errors at the 23 RWSL airports since FY2012
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 23 RWSL airports since FY2012
2013	Increase Safety	Processes and Activities	Planning	Number of Runway Incursions Caused by Pilot Errors at the 23 RWSL airports since FY2012
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.
2014	Increase Safety	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Number of Category A&B Runway Incursions at the 23 RWSL airports since FY2012
2014	Increase Safety	Processes and Activities	Planning	Number of Runway Incursions Caused by Pilot Errors at the 23 RWSL airports since FY2012
2014	Increase Safety	Technology	Technology Improvement	Detections (a "detection" is a warnings of a runway being occupied) by RWSL
2014	Increase Safety	Customer Results	Service Availability	System availability results from MMS.
2015	Increase Safety	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Number of Category A&B Runway incursions at the 23 RWSL airports since FY2012
2015	Increase Safety	Processes and Activities	Planning	Number of Category A&B Runway incursions at the 23 RWSL airports since FY2012
2015	Increase Safety	Technology	Technology Improvement	Detections (a "detection" is a warnings of a runway being occupied) by RWSL
2015	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.

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.