



APPENDIX A

DOT&PF INTERIM PEL QUESTIONNAIRE



This page intentionally left blank.

DOT&PF Interim Planning and Environmental Linkages Questionnaire

This questionnaire is intended to act as a summary of the early planning processes and ease the transition from planning to a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis. It is consistent with the 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 450 (Planning regulations) and other Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) policy on the Planning and Environmental Linkage (PEL) process. A copy of this PEL Questionnaire is also included as Appendix A for a stand-alone document as needed.

1. Background:

a. Who is the sponsor of the PEL study?

- City of Fairbanks (City)

b. What is the name of the PEL study document and other identifying project information.

- Minnie Street Corridor Study
 - Fairbanks Area Surface Transportation (FAST) Planning 2019-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (Approved 4/17/19): Minnie Street Upgrade, NID 31389, IRS NFWY00274.

c. Who was included on the study team?

- Robert Pristash, P.E., City - Project Manager and City Engineer
- Andrew Ackerman, City- Environmental Lead
- Jackson Fox, Fairbanks Area Surface Transportation Planning – Executive Director
- Ivet Hall, P.E., State of Alaska, Department of Transportation and Public Facilities – Project Manager
- Steve Noble, P.E., PTOE, DOWL – Project Manager
- Gary Jenkins, P.E., DOWL – Project Engineer
- Renee Whitesell, PTP, DOWL – Transportation Planner
- Alexa Greene, DOWL – Public Involvement and Transportation Planner
- Brad Coy, P.E., PTOE, DOWL – Traffic Engineer
- Emily Creely, PWS, DOWL – Environmental Specialist

d. Provide a description of the existing transportation facility within the corridor (if any), including project limits, modes, functional classification, number of lanes, shoulder width, access control and type of surrounding environment (urban vs. rural, residential vs. commercial, etc.).

- Corridor: Minnie Street between Illinois Street and Old Steese Highway
- Project Limits: Role of Minnie Street in the transportation network broadly defined by College Road and Johansen Expressway to the north and west, Old Steese Highway to the east, and the Chena River to the south.
- Modes: Motorized vehicles, pedestrians, bicycles

- Functional Classification: Minor Arterial
 - Number of Lanes: 2
 - Shoulder Width: north side of roadway – 0 ft, south side of roadway - ~4ft.
 - Access Control: At-grade stop-controlled intersections of minor streets, at-grade signal-controlled intersections at Illinois Street and Old Steese Highway.
 - Surrounding Environment: Urban mixed residential and commercial.
- e. Provide a brief chronology of the planning activities (PEL study) including the year(s) the studies were completed.
- Scope of Services: July 2017
 - Project Management Plan (PMP): September 2017
 - Project Kick-Off Meeting: September 2017
 - Public and Agency Involvement Plan: November 2017
 - Public Open House #1: March 2018
 - Concept Development Workshop: May 2018
 - Existing Conditions Summary Report: July 2018
 - Public Open House #2: February 2019
 - Traffic Report: May 2019
 - Concept Development and Evaluation: June 2019
 - Draft (internal) PEL Study Report: June and September 2019
 - Draft (public) PEL Study Report: October 2019
 - Final PEL Study Report: December 2019
- f. Are there recent, current, or near future planning studies or projects in the vicinity? What is the relationship of this project to those studies/projects?

Recent Projects:

- Illinois Street Rehabilitation – STP-F-M-0663(4)/63102: Reconstruct Illinois Street from 2nd Avenue to College Road, including additional lanes, drainage, paving, illumination, signals, utilities, and bridge. Construction began in 2013.
Relationship to Minnie Street Corridor Study (MSCS): Illinois Street is within the study area of the MSCS and the traffic signal at Illinois Street forms the corridor’s western terminus.
- College Road Right Turn Lanes – HHE-0640(10)/77227: Construct right turn lanes in each direction on College Road between Old Steese Highway and Steese Expressway. Construction began in 2016.
Relationship to MSCS: College Road forms the northern extent of the project study area, and Old Steese Highway forms the western extent of the project study area.
- Fairbanks Area Signal Upgrades – Z634810000: Signal modifications at multiple locations throughout the Fairbanks area, including installing signal heads, flashing yellow arrows, and replacing supplemental signal heads. Construction began in 2019.
Relationship to MSCS: Three signals (14. Steese Expressway and College Road; 29. Old Steese Highway and College Road; 30. Crossover Way and College Road; 31. Illinois Street-Bentley Trust Road and College Road) near the north portion of the Minnie Street Corridor Study area.



Appendix A

Minnie Street Corridor Study Planning and Environmental Linkages Study Report

- Johansen Expressway Resurfacing & East Johansen Expressway Upgrades – EAP-0668(15)/ 63917: Resurface the Johansen Expressway between University Avenue and the Steese Highway. Project included the construction of a right turn lane into the Alaska Railroad Fairbanks Depot. Construction to begin in 2015.
Relationship to MSCS: The eastern terminus of the project is the west end of the Minnie Street Corridor.

Current Projects:

- 3rd Street Widening – MGL-M-0670(1)/62541: Reconstruction of 3rd Street between 3rd Street and Hamilton Avenue/Farewell Avenue and improving the Steese Expressway from Chena River to College Road. Work includes widening 3rd Street with through and turn lanes, paving, drainage, illumination, signals, and utilities, and lengthening the Steese Expressway turn lanes and providing a multi-use path. Construction to begin in 2020.
Relationship to MSCS: The western terminus of the 3rd Street widening project is the east end of the Minnie Street Corridor.
- Cushman Street Bridge Rehabilitation – NID38471, Z622070000: Rehabilitate the Cushman Street Bridge and Cushman Street between the First Avenue and Terminal Street intersections. Project work will include bridgework, roadside hardware, ADA sideway and curb ramp improvements. Construction to begin in 2022.
Relationship to MSCS: Cushman Street Bridge crosses the Chena River and connects to Illinois Street, within the study area.
- Johansen Expressway and Danby Street Bike/Ped Path Resurfacing – 00022452/NFHWY00417: Resurface the Johansen Expressway bicycle/pedestrian path between University Avenue and the Steese Expressway, and between the Johansen Expressway and 1,300 feet north of the Johnsen Expressway. Resurface the Danby Street bicycle/pedestrian path between Wembley Avenue and College Road. Construction to begin in 2020.
Relationship to MSCS: The eastern terminus of the project is the west end of the Minnie Street Corridor.
- Old Steese Highway Reconstruction – Z624870000: Reconstruction of Old Steese Highway from 3rd Street to Johansen Expressway, including additional lanes, sidewalks, drainage, paving, illumination, signals, and utilities. Construction to begin in 2022.
Relationship to MSCS: The eastern boundary of the MSCS is the Old Steese Highway.
- Wendell Avenue Bridge – Z632910000: Replace the Wendell Avenue Bridge and rehabilitate Wendell Avenue/ Old Steese Highway between the Clay Street and 3rd Street intersections. In addition, provide pedestrian and bicycle access from the Graehl and Chena Riverwalk Parks to the bridge. Project work will include road share hardware, utilities, drainage, and ADA improvements. Construction to begin in 2020.
Relationship to MSCS: The western terminus of the Wendell Avenue Bridge project is the east end of the Minnie Street Corridor.

Future Projects:

- Minnie Street Upgrade – NID31389, NFWHY00274: Reconstruct Minnie Street from the intersection of Illinois Street west to the Old Steese Highway intersection in accordance with the results of the Planning and Environmental Linkages study and approval of the Policy Board. Improvements may involve improving intersection geometries, upgrading sidewalks to meet ADA standards, storm drain system, utility relocations, and replacement of the Noyes Slough Bridge. Construction to begin after 2024.

Relationship to MSCS: The Minnie Street Upgrade project delivers the highest priority project identified in the MSCS.

2. Methodology:

a. What was the scope of the PEL study and the reason for completing it?

The City, in coordination with the DOT&PF and FHWA, proposed to upgrade Minnie Street with funding from the FAST Planning Transportation Improvement Program. Before the environmental and design phases of the project begin, a PEL Study was desired to define a “vision” for the Minnie Street corridor considering the greater neighborhood circulation patterns. The objectives of the PEL Study were to carry out the public and agency involvement activities, define a draft project-specific purpose and need for projects recommended from the PEL Study, identify preliminary environmental impacts and mitigation strategies, conduct traffic analyses, evaluate project concepts to arrive at a recommended concept/preferred alternative, and document all relevant coordination and decisions therein.

b. Did you use NEPA-like language? Why or why not?

The PEL Study did use NEPA-like language but avoided the use of the terms “purpose” and “need”, and “alternatives” to avoid confusion in the future as the planning product is incorporated into the NEPA process. A draft purpose and need statement was developed for the short-term recommended concept (to be delivered as one project) recommended from the PEL study.

c. What were the actual terms used and how did you define them? (Provide examples or list):

Specific terms used, and the reasons for their use are:

- **Study**: This term includes all planning-level activities conducted in support of the PEL process before the environmental document and design process is initiated for the first project forwarded from the PEL.
- **Vision**: The study vision captures a joint objective of corridor function and operation. It reflects public, agency, stakeholder, City, FAST Planning, and DOT&PF values and input.
- **Goals**: Study goals describe how the corridor vision will be achieved. Goals will reference problems the study intends to address and include non-motorized access, reducing conflicts, improving connectivity, and neighborhood livability.
- **Project (action/no action)**: This term references design, and construction efforts nominated, programmed or funded through the FAST Planning and DOT&PF project development process. One or multiple projects may be forwarded as a result of recommendations from the PEL study.

- **Improvement Concepts:** Proposed projects sharing common operational characteristics, locations, or other features will be grouped together and discussed collectively as improvement concepts in the PEL study report.
- **Screening Criteria:** A two-phase process that guided concept refinement. Phase 1 screening provided a high-level analysis of the initial concepts to determine their ability to meet the corridor vision and goals. It primarily involved qualitative analyses intended to identify fatal flaws early in the concept development process, so those concepts could be eliminated. Phase 2 screening used qualitative (or measurable) screening criteria, intended to identify the concept(s) that best achieve the study's vision of improving Minnie Street mobility and connectivity while enhancing neighborhood livability.
- **Potentially Impacted Resources:** Potentially impacted resources considered include land use and development, right-of-way (ROW) acquisition, socioeconomics, cultural/historic resources, Section 4(f) recreation areas, water bodies, water quality, fish and wildlife, wetlands, air quality, noise, floodplains, utilities, hazardous materials, and invasive species.

d. How do you see these terms being used in NEPA documents?

It is envisioned that subsequent NEPA documents for any project will cite the draft purpose and need statement developed as part of the PEL process and use concept development in the PEL to provide context and background for concepts analysis in accordance with FHWA Final Rule 81 FR 34049. Additionally, information presented in the Environmental Conditions chapter will be used to document affected environment and the environmental consequences portion of subsequent NEPA documents.

e. What were the key steps and coordination points in the PEL decision-making process? Who were the decision-makers and who else participated in those key steps? For example, for the corridor vision, the decision was made by state DOT and the local agency, with buy-in from FHWA, the USACE, and USFWS and other resource/regulatory agencies.

Final Rule 81 34049 eliminated the need for duplicative approval of agencies and replaced it with demonstrating that the planning product was conducted pursuant to Federal law. This PEL process was conducted pursuant to Federal law.

f. How should the PEL information be presented in NEPA?

The PEL can be cited as an appendix or incorporated by reference into an environmental document associated with a project forwarded from the PEL study, particularly in sections outlining draft purpose and need, concepts analysis, and affected environment.

3. Agency Coordination:

a. Provide a synopsis of coordination with Federal, tribal, state and local environmental, regulatory and resource agencies. Describe their level of participation and how you coordinated with them.

An Agency Kick-Off Meeting was held In April 2018 to understand specific resource issues. The meeting was attended by representatives from the City, FAST Planning, DOT&PF, FHWA, Fairbanks North Star Borough, Alaska Railroad Corporation, Fairbanks Historic Preservation Commission, Alaska State Historic Preservation Office, and the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation. Ongoing coordination occurred with specific resource agencies throughout the project. Further information on engagements with agencies is included in Appendix B of the PEL Study Report.

- b. What transportation agencies (e.g. for adjacent jurisdictions) did you coordinate with or were involved during the PEL study?

There are no adjacent transportation agencies.

- c. What steps will need to be taken with each agency during NEPA scoping?

For NEPA project documentation, agencies with jurisdiction over resources will be identified based on the Potentially Impacted Resources section of the PEL Study. Scoping information, including a brief description of the project, purpose and need statement, project limits and identification of resources will be sent to each agency representative. Each agency will have 30 days to provide feedback and, based on the scope of the project, an agency meeting may be held.

4. Public Coordination:

- a. Provide a synopsis of your coordination efforts with the public and stakeholders.

Refer to Chapter 4.0 of the PEL Study Report.

5. Purpose and Need for the PEL Study:

- a. What was the scope of the PEL study and the reason for completing it?

A PEL Study was selected to define a “vision” for the Minnie Street corridor considering the greater neighborhood circulation patterns. The objectives of the PEL Study were to carry out the public and agency involvement activities, define a draft purpose and need statement for project(s) recommended from the PEL study, identify environmental impacts and mitigation strategies, conduct traffic analyses, evaluate project concepts to arrive at a preferred concept, and document all relevant coordination and decisions therein.

- b. Provide the purpose and need statement, or the corridor vision and transportation goals and objectives to realize that vision.

The project vision is “Improve Minnie Street mobility and connectivity while enhancing neighborhood livability.”

The project goals are:

- Improve Non-Motorized Access:
 - Construct enhanced facilities for all users
 - More convenient and comfortable non-motorized connections
- Reduce Conflicts:
 - Reduce or mitigate conflicts at driveways and at major intersections
 - Ease turning movements in the corridor
- Improve Connectivity:
 - Improve connection to the surrounding transportation network.
- Neighborhood Livability:
 - Maintain minor arterial function with the look and feel of a neighborhood street
 - Maintain the historic character of the neighborhood

c. What steps will need to be taken during the NEPA process to make this a project-level purpose and need statement?

A draft project purpose and need statement has been developed for the preferred short-term concept (to be delivered as a single project) within the PEL Study. The draft purpose and need statement aligns with the PEL Study vision and goals. The NEPA process will confirm the project purpose and need.

6. Range of Alternatives (Concepts):

Planning teams need to be cautious during the concept screening process; concept screening should focus on purpose and need/corridor vision, fatal flaw analysis, and possibly mode selection. This may help minimize problems during discussions with resource agencies. Concepts that have fatal flaws or do not meet the purpose and need/corridor vision will not be considered reasonable concepts, even if they reduce impacts to a resource. Detail the range of concepts considered, screening criteria, and screening process, including:

a. What types of alternatives (concepts) were looked at? (Provide a one or two sentence summary and reference document.)

One project, and three additional improvement concepts were considered as part of the PEL. The project was assumed to be part of each of the improvement concepts. The project is identified as:

- Project 1: Minnie Street Improvements.

The three improvement concepts are identified as:

- Concept A: No Build – No Road Network Improvements
- Concept B: Phillips Field Road Connection
- Concept C: Johansen Expressway Connection.

Further details on Project 1 and each of the improvement concepts are provided in Chapter 6.0 of the PEL Study Report.

b. How did you select the screening criteria and screening process?

A two-phase screening process was used, and this was selected to enable concepts that were clearly contrary to the project's vision and goals to be dismissed early, prior to the application of more detailed, quantitative screening criteria.

The purpose of Phase 1 screening was to identify those concepts with the potential to meet the vision and goals of the study. The screening analysis performed during Phase 1 was a high level, pass/fail type analysis intended to eliminate concepts that obviously do not meet the vision and goals of the study. Each of the initial concepts was considered using a range of questions tied to the vision and goals, and a qualitative assessment was made about how well the concept performed in relation to each question.

Phase 2 screening focused on identified deficiencies and needs and included an implementation criterion based on the planning-level cost estimate. The criteria were tied to the study vision and goals, and each concept was scored in relation to how well it performed against each of the evaluation criteria.

Further detail on concept screening and results are in Chapter 6.0 of the PEL Study report.

- c. For alternative(s)/concept(s) that were screened out, briefly summarize the reasons for eliminating the alternative(s)/concept(s). (During the initial screenings, this generally will focus on fatal flaws.)

All concepts passed Phase 1 screening. However, upon further preliminary analysis and to clarify the Phase 2 screening process, several concepts were refined as follows:

- Concept A Refinement: Concept A was divided into Project 1 (to clarify that this improvement would be implemented with all concepts), and Concept A (including Project 1) became the No Build concept.
- Concept B Refinement: Concepts B1 and B2 were combined into a single concept to address traffic operations concerns associated with one of the concepts and recognize the primary purpose of concept B was to eliminate the signal at its existing intersection with Illinois Street.
- Concept C Refinement: Concepts C1 and C4 were largely similar, as were Concepts C2 and C3; their primary difference was alignment. The primary significance of Concepts C1 and C4 was connecting to Illinois Street north of Minnie Street, and the significance of Concept C2 and C3 was providing a connection at the Minnie Street/Illinois Street intersection.

Following the Phase 2 analysis, Concepts A, B, C2, C4, and C5 were dismissed from further analysis. This was because of relatively low performance against the screening criteria and was supported by feedback received from owners, agencies, or the public at the open house and online survey. Further detail on the screening process and reasons why concepts were dismissed is included in Chapter 6.0 of the PEL Study report.

- d. Which alternatives/concepts should be brought forward into NEPA and why?

Project 1 (Minnie Street Improvements) is recommended as a short-term project as it delivers the vision and goals of the PEL Study, is the most viable from a ROW perspective and has the capacity to accommodate traffic operations for the network improvement concepts under consideration.

- e. Did the public, stakeholders, and agencies have an opportunity to comment during this process?

The public, stakeholders and agencies had several opportunities to comment on the concept evaluation process through public meetings and surveys. Further information on comments and how they informed the concept development process is detailed in Chapter 6.0 of the PEL Study report.

- f. Were there unresolved issues with the public, stakeholders, and/or agencies?

There were comments supporting a stronger neighborhood focus and supporting a stronger east/west corridor capacity expansion. For example, some suggested closing Minnie Street with a cul-de-sac; this would have negated the vision of maintaining the mobility and connectivity of Minnie Street. Others recommended additional traffic lanes; this would have required significant ROW and change the neighborhood livability. As such, these suggestions were not adopted.

7. Planning Assumptions and Analytical Methods:

a. What is the forecast year used in the PEL study?

Year 2040

b. What method was used for forecasting traffic volumes?

The Fairbanks Area Surface Transportation (FAST) Planning Traffic Model developed for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan was used as a basis for traffic analysis and supplemented by traffic counts and other traffic data.

c. Are the planning assumptions and the corridor vision/purpose and need statement consistent with each other and with the long-range transportation plan? Are the assumptions still valid?

The corridor vision and goals are consistent with the federal transportation planning factors and the long-range transportation plan.

The highest priority project, Project 1: Minnie Street Improvements, has been identified for implementation in the short-term in the Fairbanks Area Surface Transportation 2019-2023 Transportation Improvement Program and identified as a mid-level project the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

The long-term recommended concept, Concept C: Johansen Expressway Connection, has not yet been identified for funding or identified in the local metropolitan transportation plan.

d. What were the future year policy and/or data assumptions used in the transportation planning process related to land use, economic development, transportation costs, and network expansion?

The corridor study assumed forecast year of 2040. This was to ensure consistency with the Long-Range Transportation Plan and the Fairbanks traffic model. In addition, a population growth rate of 1.1 percent was used, which was developed by FAST Planning's Traffic Consultants and agreed to by the City and DOT&PF. This was based on population and employment forecasts for the Fairbanks North Star Borough.

8. Environmental Resources Reviewed:

For each resource or group of resources reviewed, provide the following:

a. In the PEL study, at what level of detail was the resource reviewed, and what was the method of review?

An existing conditions report was prepared that provided a baseline review to confirm the presence or absence of environmental resources typically assessed under FHWA guidelines. Resources considered were land use and development, ROW, socioeconomics, cultural and historic resources, Section 4(f) resources, water bodies, water quality, fish and wildlife, wetlands, air quality, noise, floodplains, utilities, hazardous waste, and contaminated sites, and invasive species. The concept evaluation process evaluated the potential effects from concepts based on existing conditions. It identified permitting needs and required consultations associated with each concept. The results were summarized in the PEL Study report. The summary is provided in Chapter 7.0 of the PEL Study report.

b. *Is this resource present in the area, and what is the existing environmental condition for this resource?*

Refer to the Existing Conditions Report and Summary of Potentially Impacted Resources in subchapter 8.2 of the PEL Study Report.

c. *What are the issues that need to be considered during NEPA, including potential resource impacts and potential mitigation requirements (if known)?*

The following permits and authorizations require consideration for implementation of proposed concepts:

- A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be required under Municipal Separate Stormwater Systems (MS4) stipulations, and to comply with the Alaska Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (APDES) General Permit for Large or Small Construction Activities for all projects disturbing one acre or more.
- Coordination with Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) to address any land-use restrictions from contaminated sites with institutional controls.
- Water or Wastewater utilities requiring relocation due to the construction of a roadway will require Approval to Construct/Operate permits from ADEC.
- Engineering Plan Review for new stormwater facilities will be required from ADEC for compliance with the MS4.
- Air quality conformity and noise analysis may be required for some concepts.
- A Fairbanks North Star Borough (FNSB) Floodplain Permit is required for work within the floodplain, which is mostly confined to the immediate area around Noyes Slough.
- A United States Coast Guard (USCG) bridge permit and a United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Section 10 permit may be required for reconstruction of the Noyes Slough Bridge.
- Concurrence from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) regarding impacts to historic resources are required.
- A USACE Section 401 Certificate of Reasonable Assurance will also be required.
- A USACE Section 404 and Title 16 Fish Permit from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) are required, and consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) regarding impacts to essential fish habitat may be required for work below the ordinary high-water mark of the Noyes Slough.
- A Section 4(f) applicability determination will be required from DOT&PF's SEO. If it's determined there are Section 4(f) properties within the study area [there are] then a use determination [there is] will be required.
- FNSB Title 18 Highway Transportation Variance.
- Local Planning Approval from the FNSB.
- For Concept C, approval from the Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC) for new railroad crossing(s); a Diagnostic Team evaluation will be required.

d. How will the planning data provided need to be supplemented during NEPA?

Environmental information will require update to address any regulatory changes during the environmental documentation process. It will also need to consider whether environmental conditions have changed on the ground. Once project limits are defined, a more detailed analysis of effects will occur.

9. Listed Environmental Resources:

List environmental resources you are aware of that were not reviewed in the PEL study and why. Indicate whether or not they will need to be reviewed in NEPA and explain why.

The PEL Study considered all environmental resources that are typically assessed under FHWA Guidelines. It is not envisioned that additional environmental resources will need to be reviewed in NEPA.

10. Considered Cumulative Impacts:

Were cumulative impacts considered in the PEL study? If yes, provide the information or reference where the analysis can be found.

A high-level review of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future impacts was completed as part of the PEL Study. A summary of the cumulative impacts review is provided in Chapter 8.0.

11. Mitigation Strategies:

Describe any mitigation strategies discussed at the planning level that should be analyzed during NEPA.

With replacement of the Noyes Slough Bridge, a mitigation strategy that was discussed was using large riprap to discourage people from loitering/living under the bridge to reduce litter from being discharged to Noyes Slough, which is listed as an Impaired Waterbody for Debris (litter).

12. Additional Needs during NEPA Scoping Process:

What needs to be done during NEPA to make information from the PEL study available to the agencies and the public?

The PEL Study will be cited as an Appendix to the NEPA analysis, which will ensure information is available to the agencies and public.

Are there PEL study products which can be used or provided to agencies or the public during the NEPA scoping process?

It is envisioned that NEPA documents for any project forwarded from the PEL Study will use the draft purpose and need statement developed in the PEL Study. The draft purpose and need statement reflects the PEL study vision and goals. It is also anticipated the concept analysis in the PEL study will provide context and background for concepts analysis in accordance with FHWA Final Rule 81 FR 34049. Additionally, information presented in the Potentially Impacted Resources section will be used as a basis for documenting the affected environment and the environmental consequences section of future NEPA documents. The PEL study may be cited as an appendix or incorporated by reference into future environmental documents, particularly in sections outlining draft purpose and need, concept analysis, and affected environment.

13. Other Issues:

Are there any other issues a future project team should be aware of?

No.