

**List of Items for Discussion**  
**Working Session on ABC At-Grade Option for I-90**

February 11, 2016

1. Relative to highway travel lanes and shoulders in the so-called Throat Area ONLY:
  - a. Existing Condition: What is the width of travel lanes and shoulders for Existing Condition?
  - b. Alternative 1 (MassDOT 3K): What is the width of the proposed travel lanes and shoulders. Please specifically describe the width of both the inside and outside shoulders as well as their function.
  - c. Alternative 2 (ABC Alternative): What is the width of travel lanes and shoulders.
  - d. Alternative 3 (Amateur Planner Alternative): What is the width of travel lanes and shoulders.
2. How can the HNTB's proposed staging of the ABC Alternative be modified to reduce or eliminate construction period impacts to the Paul Dudley White trail?
3. How can the HNTB's proposed staging of the ABC Alternative be modified to reduce or eliminate construction period impacts to the Grand Junction?
4. What are the critical dimensions for signage, lighting, snow removal, maintenance, and potential structure for air rights?
5. How can the ABC Alternative be modified to eliminate or reduce changes or impacts to the Charles River, and to improve the relationship of the options to the edge of the river?
6. What are the unconventional drainage system requirements?
7. Are there other ways to provide transportation access and services to Houghton Chemical besides a rail connection that requires raising the profile of the Turnpike mainline and lowering the Worcester Line tracks?
8. Are there other ways to provide motor vehicle access to the proposed MBTA facilities and yards besides a dedicated at-grade road that requires raising the profile of the Turnpike mainline, among others?
9. Are there other ways to reduce the difficulty and cost to relocation of the existing pump station and electrical substation? And how does this vary among the three alternatives?
10. How challenging a permitting process should we expect, demonstrating the least harm feasible and prudent alternative and the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative? And how does "cost", including both construction period and Lifecycle costs, factor into the determination of Least Harm?
11. We agree that our objective should be to develop all alternatives to the same level of detail so that the impacts can be compared evenly.