

for

Project Title:

This Checklist to be filled out by VDOT NRO's Planning Staff and the Project Manager

Checklist Status as of	(MM/DD/YYYY)
Checkingt Status as of	(17117)

Section	Status	Name
1 Project Information	☐ Complete	
2 Needs Assessment	☐ Complete	
3 Regional Architecture Assessment and Concept Exploration	☐ Complete	
4 Alternatives Analysis	☐ Complete	
5 Concept of Operations	☐ Complete	
6 Requirements	☐ Complete	
7 Detailed Design	☐ Complete	
8 Implementation	☐ Complete	
9 Integration and Test	☐ Complete	
10 System Verification and Acceptance	☐ Complete	
11 Operations and Maintenance	☐ Complete	

CHANGE LOG			
PROJECT TITLE			
DATE CREATED/MODIFIED	CREATOR/MODIFIER NAME	NOTES	

	SECTION 1 – Pro	ject Information	
1.1 PROJECT TITLE			1.2 PROJECT NUMBER
			New Project
			■ Modification to existing Project
1.3 BRIEF DESCRIPTION/PURI	POSE		
1.4 CONTACT PERSON/GROUP	1.5 PROJECT LOCATION	1.6 PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE	1.7 BUDGET & FUNDING SOURCE
1.8 NATURE OF WORK			
☐ Scoping ☐ Design ☐ Softw	vare/Integration ☐ Implementa	tion	■ Evaluations ■ Others (Please Specify)
If Other, Please Specify			
1.9 RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER	PROJECTS AND PHASES		
1.10 EQUIPMENT TO BE PURC	CHASED WITH PROJECT FUND	ING	
1.11 STATUS ☐ ECCB Approval ☐ TIP/STIP Amendment	fannliaghla	☐ FHWA PE Authoriza ☐ FHWA CN Authoriza	
	FOR THIS PROJECT WITH TASK nt reference To Be Develope nce here.		
	SECTION 2 – No	eds Assessment	
2.1 WHAT IS/ARE THE PROBL			
2.2 WHAT NEEDS DOES THIS	PROJECT ADDRESS?		
2.3 HOW WERE THESE NEEDS	IDENTIFIED?		
☐ Internal VDOT Assessment ☐	Stakeholder Involvement	rom Technical Reviev	vs or other studies 🔲 Other
Please provide details on how ne	eds were identified – If other do	cumentation was used	d as reference, please identify it here.

3.1 WHAT ARCHITECTURES WERE EXAMINED FOR INPUTS TO THIS PROJECT?
☐ Northern VA ☐ VA Statewide ☐ DC Regional (MWCOG) ☐ Maryland Statewide ☐ Other VA Regional
3.2 STAKEHOLDERS FROM ARCHITECTURE INCLUDED IN PROJECT
Turbo Architecture "Stakeholder Report"
3.3 INVENTORY ELEMENTS FROM ARCHITECTURE INCLUDED IN PROJECT
Turbo Architecture "Inventory Report" Attached Unavailable
3.4 INTERFACE IMPACTS (I.E. INFORMATION EXCHANGES) DUE TO PROJECT. IDENTIFY PORTIONS OF ARCHITECTURE BEING IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT.
Turbo Architecture "Project Architecture Report" Attached Unavailable
Turbo Architecture "Interconnect and Flow Diagrams" Attached Unavailable
3.5 OTHER REGIONAL ARCHITECTURES IMPACTED BY PROJECT
☐ VA Statewide ☐ DC Regional (MWCOG) ☐ Maryland Statewide ☐ Other VA Regional
Impact communicated to appropriate architecture maintenance agencies?
3.6 CHANGES RECOMMENDED TO NORTHERN VIRGINIA AND/OR OTHER ITS ARCHITECTURES?
☐ Yes ☐ No
If "Yes", please specify and attach detail
Turbo Architecture "Region to Project Comparison Report"

SECTION 4 – Alternatives Analysis	
4.1 WERE ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTS/IDEAS/SOLUTIONS TO ADDRESS THE PROBLEM CONSIDERED DURING FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS OR CONCEPT EXPLORATION?	
☐ Yes ☐ No	
Please specify how the best concept was selected	
4.2 REFERENCE DOCUMENTS (If any)	
SECTION 5 – Concept of Operations	
5.1 IS THERE A CONCEPT OF OPERATIONS (COO) FOR THIS PROJECT?	
Yes No To Be Developed	
If "No" was selected, please specify reason	
5.2 IF "Yes" WAS SELECTED, PLEASE FILL OUT THE FOLLOWING	
COO Contains: - Scope (Geographic, Timeframe, Region, etc.) - Operational Description (Stakeholder Roles and Responsibilities) - Operational Needs - System Overview (System Description, Project Architecture) - Operational and Support Environment - Operational Scenarios - Next Steps - Scope (Geographic, Timeframe, Region, etc.) - Yes	
If "No" was checked in any of the boxes, please specify reason	
5.3 HAVE ALL STAKEHOLDERS AFFECTED BY THIS PROJECT REVIEWED AND ACCEPTED THE CONCEPT OF OPERATIONS?	
☐ Yes ☐ No	
5.4 IF "No" WAS SELECTED, WHICH STAKEHOLDERS HAVE NOT BEEN INVOLVED?	
E E DI FACE DEQUIDE COO DOCUMENTA DEFENDANCE LE AVAILABLE	
5.5 PLEASE PROVIDE COO DOCUMENT REFERENCE IF AVAILABLE	
Turbo Architecture – "Roles and Responsibilities Report"	
SECTION 6 – Requirements Definitions (High-Level and Detailed)	
6.1 ARE HIGH-LEVEL FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS WRITTEN AND DOCUMENTED?	
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ To Be Developed	
6.2 IF "Yes" WAS SELECTED, PROVIDE REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT REFERENCE IF AVAILABLE	
Turbo Architecture "Functional Requirements Report" Attached Unavailable	
6.3 WERE REQUIREMENTS DERIVED FROM OTHER SOURCES SUCH AS ITS MASTER PLANS? ☐ Yes ☐ No	

SECTION 7 - Detailed Design
7.1 IS THERE A DESIGN DOCUMENT AVAILABLE?
Yes No To Be Developed
Please provide reference to design document
7.2 IF "Yes" WAS SELECTED, PLEASE FILL OUT THE FOLLOWING - Are the design details well documented - Do the details of the design trace to requirements definitions - Are boundaries and interfaces of the system clearly identified - Is there a process for Configuration Control
If "No" was checked in any of the boxes, please specify a reason
7.3 DOES THE DESIGN INCORPORATE NATIONAL ITS STANDARDS? Yes No If "Yes", please list what ITS Standards are being incorporated
Turbo Architecture "Standards Report" Attached Unavailable 7.4 DOES THE DESIGN INCORPORATE ANY VDOT ENTERPRISE STANDARDS? Yes No If "Yes", please list the VDOT Enterprise Standards being incorporated
SECTION 8 – Implementation
8.1 PROCUREMENT DETAILS (include type of procurement, reason this approach taken, etc.)
8.2 IF USING AN EXISTING CONTRACT VEHICLE, ARE THERE ANY CONTRACT LIMITATIONS SUCH AS PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE, BUDGET CEILINGS, SCOPE OF WORK, ETC.?
☐ Yes ☐ No
If "Yes", please identify the Contract Limitations
8.3 REFERENCE DOCUMENTS (if any)

SECTION 9 – Integration and Test
9.1 IS THERE AN INTEGRATION PLAN?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ To Be Developed
If "Yes", please provide reference
9.2 IS THERE A TEST PLAN?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ To Be Developed
If "Yes", please provide reference
SECTION 10 – System Verification and Acceptance
10.1 IS THERE A SYSTEM VERIFICATION AND ACCEPTANCE PLAN? (verification of the entire system and acceptance
criteria)
Yes No To Be Developed
If "Yes", please provide reference
40.3 IF (VEC), DIFACE FILL OUT THE FOLLOWING
10.2 IF "YES", PLEASE FILL OUT THE FOLLOWING - Is there a clear criteria for completion ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Are there clear performance metrics for system acceptance Yes No
- Will there be adequate system documentation for all users and maintainers
If "No" was checked in any boxes, please provide reason
SECTION 11 – Operations and Maintenance 11.1 WHO WILL MAINTAIN THE SYSTEM?
11.1 WHO WILL MAINTAIN THE STSTEM!
11.2 IS THERE A SCHEDULE FOR UPGRADES/ENHANCEMENTS TO THE SYSTEM?
11.2 IS THERE A SCHEDOLE FOR OFGRADES/ENHANCEINENTS TO THE STSTEIN!
44.2 MAILL THERE BE AN EVALUATION OF THE CYCTEM?
11.3 WILL THERE BE AN EVALUATION OF THE SYSTEM?
11.4 MAILLE TRAINING DE DROWIDED WITH THE NEW SYSTEMS. The
11.4 WILL TRAINING BE PROVIDED WITH THE NEW SYSTEM? Yes No
11.5 WILL THE SYSTEM OPERATING PROCEDURES (SOP) BE LIPDATED? Type Tipo