



## **Forth Replacement Crossing South Community Forum Minutes**

**Meeting Location:** FRC Contact and Education Centre, South Queensferry  
**Meeting Date/Time:** 28 May 2014 – 7pm  
**Subject:** South Community Forum

**Participants:** **Community Representatives**

Tim Beesley (TB), Newton Community Council  
Tommy Cook, LMRA  
Les Chapman (LC), BRIGS  
Keith Giblett (KG), Queensferry & District Community Council  
Bert Scott (BS), BRIGS, Cramond & Barnton Community Council  
Grant Sangster (GS), Queensferry & District Community Council  
Doug Tait (DT), BRIGS  
Janet Thornton (JT), Newton Community Council

**Transport Scotland – Employers Delivery Team (EDT)**

Lawrence Shackman (LS), Chair and Project Manager  
Alan Shirley (AS), Head of Policy, Governance and Stakeholder Liaison  
Katrina McDonald (KM), Policy Manager

**Forth Crossing Bridge Constructors (FCBC)**

David Gough (DG), Commercial Director  
Ewen Macdonell (EM), Community Liaison Officer  
Katrina Bruce (KB), Assistant Community Liaison Officer

**City of Edinburgh Council**

Darren Wraight (DW)

**Observer**

2 Observers

**Apologies**

Terry Airlie (TA), Queensferry & District Community Council  
David Buchanan (DB), Kirkliston Community Council

Graham Porteous (GP), Head of Special Projects, Transport  
Scotland  
Doug Ross. LMRA & BRIGS

<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome and Introductions</b>	
1.1	<p>Meeting chaired by Lawrence Shackman (LS)</p> <p>LS noted apologies received (as above) for this evening's meeting and welcomed 3 local residents attending in an observer capacity.</p> <p>LS noted that a number of Community Issues raised for discussion at this evening's meeting have already been/could be dealt with through the Project's established enquiries and complaints process, and urged members to encourage their groups to use this process as a way of raising day to day issues in a timely manner, negating the need to wait for the item to be raised at quarterly meetings.</p>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Review of Minutes and Outstanding Actions</b>	
2.1	<p>No comments had been received on the draft minutes of the meeting held on 26 February, members agreed for the draft minutes to be finalised and uploaded to the TS website.</p> <p>The meeting noted that Eveyln Woollen had now stepped down from her position as Secretary of Newton Community Council. It is the intention that Janet Thornton or Tim Beesky will attend future forum meetings on behalf of the Council.</p> <p>LS recorded his thanks to Evelyn Woollen for her contribution to forum meetings and discussions to date.</p>	
2.2	<p><b>Responses to the action points raised at the last meeting issued to forum members on 25 April.</b> (see Annex A)</p> <p>Comments were raised in regard to the response given to action point SCF260214/6.7b:</p> <p><b>Action SCF260214/6.7b</b> LC informed LS that he understood that earthwork stockpiles/bunds that had stood for more than one season should be seeded, and that this was not being done. LS agreed that this point would be considered further in conjunction with EDT and FCBC.</p> <p><b>Response provided:</b> Seeding works will be progressed, subject to seasonal constraints and weather, for all areas to be seeded as soon as possible after they are topsoiled and completed, such</p>	

	<p>that they will not be subject to damage by ongoing construction works in the vicinity. This intention is in accordance with CoCP 6.9 and 13.3.1.</p> <p>The seeding of subsoil bunds, i.e those which are incomplete or temporary e.g. eastside of the new M90 in Echline field, is not practical as the germination of grass on the subsoil bunds, without the presence of topsoil, which be severely limited.</p> <p>LC was not happy with this response, and stated dust was still an ongoing issue and believed that the project was not compliant with section 6.6.1 of the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) that “the contractor will cover long-term stockpiles, which give rise to a risk of dust or air pollution, with appropriate sheeting or will stabilise the surfaces of the stockpiles”.</p> <p>EM informed members that measures used to stabilise the bunds and prevent dust from migrating from the site (as per the requirements and CoCP) included smoothing the surface of the bunds with a bucket and water suppression. He also added that he didn’t think that dust was coming from the stockpiles, but from the works. Dust monitors are also in agreed positions and results are within the acceptable thresholds of the project.</p> <p>LC did not believe that measures taken by the contractor to stabilise the surface of the bunds were adequate. Further, LC stated that previous assurance had been given that the bunds would be seeded before now and that this should remain the case (and that no mention was given that topsoiling was required before this could happen).</p> <p>DT expressed the view that mitigation employed should be proactive, and believed that the contractor often reacted only once complaints had been received. EM disagreed with this comment but acknowledged that on occasion the contractor could be quicker to react.</p>	
3	<b>Employer’s Delivery team (EDT) – Update</b>	
3.1	<p><b>ICI Committee update</b></p> <p>LS informed members that on the 6 May 2014, three members of the Scottish Parliament’s Infrastructure and Capital Investment Committee visited the FRC project for a site tour. Those in attendance were</p>	

	<p>Maureen Watt (Convener), Alex Johnstone and Mary Fee as well as staff members from the Committee office.</p> <p>Committee members were taken to see the works at the North Abutment area, as well as the South Abutment where discussions focussed on the progress of works to date. The Committee has also published pictures from their visit onto their Facebook page.</p> <p>It is expected that the Committee will next call on the project to give an oral update on progress in October 2014.</p>	
3.2	<p><b>Steel Deliveries</b></p> <p>LS informed members that on Monday 19 May 2014, FCBC received its first major consignment of deck steel from China and that members may have witnessed themselves the consignment travelling up the Forth Estuary on the Zhen Hua 23 which is 250m long.</p> <p>LS also informed members that the Minister for Transport and Veterans also visited Rosyth Docks on 19 May to see where the steel would arrive and met with workers onsite along with media. STV also did a live broadcast from North Queensferry for the early evening edition of the news that contained an interview with the Minister and David Climie, Project Director.</p>	
3.3	<p><b>Ferrytoll Briefings</b></p> <p>LS informed members that a number of briefing/exhibitions sessions will now take place during the first two weeks in August, to coincide with the development of the works around Ferrytoll. The purpose of these sessions will be to show the main phases of the of the temporary traffic management that will be required to construct the redesigned Ferrytoll junction.</p> <p>Briefings will be held at venues in Inverkeithing, North Queensferry and Rosyth with a further session also to be held at the CEC during the same two week period. Information supplied at these briefing/exhibition sessions will also be made available at the CEC commencing from 9 August for the remainder of the month and members will be notified when dates have been confirmed.</p>	EDT

SCF28052014/3.3

	<p>LS confirmed that leaflets showing the various phases of works around Ferrytoll would be produced to coincide with the Ferrytoll Briefing/Exhibitions. Members could be reassured that external signage and the FRC website would be regularly updated to reflect any changes.</p>	
<p>3.4</p>	<p><b>Contact and Education Centre (CEC)</b>  Following the recommencement of the open days each Saturday since the 29 March 2014, the CEC has welcomed 675 visitors. Last Saturday 154 people attended. Over the nine open days that have been held at the CEC in 2014, an average of 75 visitors have visited per open day.</p> <p>Interest in the project remains high. Over 3,000 members of the public have visited the CEC and over 3,000 school pupils have attended the CEC to undertake educational activities.</p> <p>On 22 April, the Contact and Education Centre hosted a VIP visit for 12 S3 school pupils from Madras College, one of the two schools who won 'Name the Bridge' Schools competition. The pupils also received a tour of the site.</p> <p>Today (28 May 2014), the second winner, Cleish Primary visited with 26 pupils and again was given the same tour.</p>	
<p>3.5</p>	<p><b>Technical Presentations</b>  Commencing Friday 30 May 2014, a technical presentation series will be held at the CEC and will continue to take place on the last Friday of every month. The purpose of these presentations is to provide the public with additional, specialised presentations on the various aspects of the Forth Replacement Crossing.</p> <p>LS advised that the programme for the 30 May 2014 would be as follows:</p> <p><b>1000</b> – The History of Crossing the Forth  <b>1130</b> – Forth Replacement Crossing Project Overview and Update  <b>1300</b> – Forth Replacement Crossing Geotechnical Engineering  <b>1430</b> – Forth Replacement Crossing Marine Operations</p>	

	<p>Each talk and presentation will last approximately 45 minutes with an opportunity for an interactive question and answer session. LS also advised that future presentations will be advertised on the FRC website.</p>	
3.6	<p><b>Bellyeoman PSA Sponsored Bridge Walk</b>  On Sunday (18 May 2014), the CEC was opened to support a sponsored bridge walk by Bellyeoman Primary School that is situated in Dunfermline. On the day 159 people came into the CEC to use the facilities and take part in a quiz.</p> <p>LS also informed members that FCBC also generously provided a keepsake for those taking part in the sponsored walk – a Queensferry Crossing emblazoned water bottle.</p>	
3.7	<p><b>Quarterly Project Update</b>  The latest quarterly project update was published earlier this month and has been distributed to the usual outlets (Forum members were emailed a copy of the update on 14 May 2014)</p>	
3.8	<p><b>Website Update</b>  The new layout of the TS website has been launched (Friday 16 May). We are aware that some of the links are broken as a result of the refresh, and are currently working with the web team to sort this.</p> <p>Members may be interested to note that the new Forth Bridges website has been launched. The website primarily focusses on promoting the location of the bridges in addition to their educational, engineering and touristic elements. The newly expanded site contains information on all 3 bridges, and can be accessed at <a href="http://www.forth-bridges.co.uk">www.forth-bridges.co.uk</a>.</p> <p>The Traffic Survey Annual report for 2012-13 will be available on the website shortly, and members will be notified when this is available.</p>	EDT
SCF28052014/3.8		
3.9	<p><b>Compensation claims</b>  LS updated members on claims received:</p> <p>134 claims have been received from the 316 owners/occupiers/lessees in relation to the FRC General Vesting Declaration's carried out in April and June 2011. That is an increase of 1 claim since the</p>	

	<p>update provided at the last meeting.</p> <p>28 claims have now been settled in full (an increase of 4 since the last update)</p> <p>27 claims have received 90% part payments. (The part payments are as a result of advance payment requests from the claimants.) This is an increase of 1 since reported at the last forum.</p>	
3.10	<p><b>Engaging with Communities</b> A draft version of the updated 'Engaging with Communities' document has now been shared with forum members by email (sent on 21 May), and we have requested any comments by 5pm on 30 May.</p> <p><b><u>Post Meeting Note</u></b> No comments were received from South Community Forum members and publication of the refreshed Engaging with Communities document will now be finalised.</p>	
3.11  SCF28052014/3.11	<p><b>South abutment access track layout and footpath</b> As part of the EDT update, the Forum were shown a plan of the South abutment access track and footpath/cycleway. This reflected the swap of the access track from the east side of the approach road to the west, and vice versa for the footpath/cycleway.</p> <p>DT requested that a soft copy of this plan be provided to Forum members.</p> <p>LS also showed a general plan of cycleway/ footpath provision in the vicinity of the new Queensferry Junction to provide context for the above.</p> <p>LS confirmed that the final route of the footpath/ cycleway east of the approach road would follow the adjacent landscape bund profile. The final bund profile and height is dependent on the availability of surplus materials but FCBC hoped to make it higher than the minimum specified. The final profile and position of both features would be determined later in the construction process</p> <p>In response to a question raised, LS confirmed that the road design for the B924 was currently being finalised.</p>	EDT



	<p><u>Post Meeting Note</u>  PDF copy of the South abutment access track and footpath/cycleway issued with the draft minutes on 11 June 2014.</p>	
<p>3.12</p> <p>SCF28052014/3.12</p>	<p>In response to a question regarding an ongoing enquiry relating to how the driveways at Echline connect to the realigned A904, EM confirmed that these hadn't yet been finalised, but gave assurance that the information would be available the week after the meeting.</p>	<p>FCBC</p>
<p>3.13</p> <p>SCF28052014/3.13</p>	<p>DT enquired about whether discussions had been held regarding the potential pathway west from Springfield, an issue which had been raised by a number of residents and previously at the Parliamentary Bill stage.</p> <p>DW informed the meeting that he had spoken to residents at Springfield, and at this time it is not a path that City of Edinburgh Council would adopt. DW was unaware of the full details but would pick up the matter in future discussions.</p> <p>DT impressed the fact that the path, due to its proposed location would have to meet the requirements of residents.</p> <p>KG confirmed that this was an issue on the QDCC agenda to be discussed in due course.</p> <p>LS said that the project would appreciate timely resolution as to whether this pathway is to go ahead, in order that it could be factored into the construction programme. He again confirmed that the Act Commitments and Undertakings required the project to provide this path should agreement be reached by the relevant parties.</p>	<p>DW/KG</p>
<p>4</p>	<p><b>Forth Bridges Operating Company (FBOC) – Update</b></p>	
<p>4.1</p>	<p>LS provided a short update supplied by GP in his absence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arrangements for the Forth Bridges Operating Company Contract remain on schedule. The Contract is due to be awarded in December 2014, with the successful Operating Company due to commence provision of services in June 2015. It will be responsible for the Forth Road Bridge, the</li> </ul>	

	<p>adjacent trunk road network, and the new Queensferry Crossing when it opens.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport Scotland and other Forth Bridges Forum Representatives will again update local Community Groups on its work at an evening meeting on Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> June, at the Contact and Education Centre. Another Forum representative is scheduled to provide an update on either the Forth Bridge World Heritage Site Nomination, or the Forth Bridges Tourism Project, initiatives being led by Historic Scotland and Visit Scotland respectively.</li> <li>• A new Forth Bridges Forum Tourism Project Group, with local Community Group representation, has begun to consider how “the Forth Bridges location” can be best served by potential forthcoming tourist attractions.</li> <li>• The Forth Bridges Forum heard on 21<sup>st</sup> May proposals from Network Rail for its Forth Bridge Experience. Network Rail is consulting on its proposals with local community Groups, and individuals. Additionally, the Forum approved, subject to the successful outcome of the Scoping stage, a Traffic Management, Parking &amp; Traffic Impact Study. This Study will assess the estimated impact North and South of the Estuary of proposals for Forth Bridge World Heritage Status, and a “Forth Bridge Experience” on the capacity of the trunk road and local road network. The impact on other infrastructure and facilities in the area will also be considered, with the precise area needing to be defined.</li> </ul>	
5	<b>Forth Crossing Bridge Constructors (Principal Contractors) – Update</b>	
5.1	<p>EM provided a slide presentation to forum members that included photos of the work currently on-going, progressing from south to north.</p> <p>Points noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Earthmoving opposite Dundas Home Farm well advanced.</li> <li>• Earthworks for Southbound bus link substantially complete. The southbound bus link is due to be surfaced late in 2015 and will be used in the switching of traffic to construct the tie-in of the</li> </ul>	

	<p>M90 to A90 in 2016.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service protection works are on-going and early works for the B800 replacement bridge are progressing well, the north abutment being substantially complete and south abutment works well underway. Traffic switching to the replacement B800 bridge due in spring 2015.</li> <li>• Earthmoving well advanced between Dundas and Echline. Road works including drainage, sub-base, kerbing and blacktop will be progressed in 2014.</li> <li>• Queensferry Junction bridges are now complete to deck level including waterproofing. Traffic switch to the new Queensferry Gyrotory is targeted for end July 2014.</li> <li>• Approach Viaduct South pier construction is on-going ahead of the launching activity. Four launches have been carried out to date from the south abutment. The launches will continue through to Spring 2015 at which time the launching equipment will be moved to the north abutment and will be engaged in launching activities there through to the end of 2015.</li> <li>• Foundation works are on-going on piers S3 and S2.</li> <li>• Society Road improvements are complete.</li> <li>• South, Central and North Towers are at respective heights 21m, 52m and 40m. Target completion dates for the towers are spring and early summer 2015.</li> <li>• The first delivery of steel deck sections plus temporary steel support sections and staging arrived from Shanghai on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> May and has now been off loaded.</li> <li>• On the North side, the Approach Viaduct North launch area is largely complete and the B981 realignment is now blacktopped with final surfacing to follow. Switching of traffic to this road is targeted for summer 2014.</li> <li>• Works have started (off-line) at the King Malcolm Drive/Ferrytoll Road junction.</li> <li>• Ferrytoll Road is due to be closed for a period of 6 weeks between start July 2014 and mid-August 2014 to accommodate road widening works on the approach to the new junction with the B981. Traffic management will be placed on King Malcolm Drive and Ferrytoll Road for a period of four months also to facilitate the junction works.</li> <li>• Ground improvement works are now commencing in the vicinity of the old A90 northbound merge</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<p>and, once these are completed, the new northbound merge construction will proceed in that area. In due course the temporary northbound slip road near Dunfermline Wynd will be removed and a temporary link will be introduced from the realigned Castlandhill Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some site clearance works have progressed in the vicinity of Hillwood Terrace adjacent to the A90 northbound carriageway and towards the end of 2014 earthworks will follow in preparation for the realignment of the existing A90 northbound carriageway and introduction of a hard shoulder to form what will become the M90.</li> <li>• Preparatory works for a new gantry on the Admiralty northbound off slip are imminent.</li> <li>• A time lapse video was shown to members of the steel arriving at Rosyth and being unloaded.</li> </ul>	
5.2	<p>In response to a query about when the reconfigured B800 overbridge will be open to traffic, EM said that it was scheduled to open to traffic in the Spring of next year.</p> <p>EM confirmed that the existing B800 would never be fully closed during the new construction, though it would have temporary traffic management when connecting the new bridge into the existing road network.</p> <p>Demolition of the old bridge would be undertaken over the course of a number of weekends.</p>	
5.3	<p>KG enquired as to when the Ferrymuir site (land temporarily acquired for the works via the Forth Crossing Act) would be handed back to the owners. This was of particular interest to QDCC as they were keen for development proposals in this area to progress.</p> <p>EM stated that this land was needed for construction of the eastbound public transport link which would also be used for temporary traffic diversion use during construction. No specific date for handing back this land can currently be given but KG's aspirations for timely release were noted.</p>	
5.4	<p>It was noted that a number of residents at Dundas had seen various construction activities in the area and were interested to find out more information.</p>	

SCF28052014/5.4	<p>EM thought that this was a subject that could be discussed in his monthly presentations.</p> <p>LS said that the project team were happy to keep residents updated on progress and answer any queries they may have.</p> <p>EM confirmed that piling works around the Dundas area would be finished within the next 2-3 days.</p>	FCBC
5.5	<p>LS informed members that it was currently proposed that beams for the new B800 bridge would be placed over the A90 in mid-September. This was expected to entail 3 night time closures in both directions (likely duration of approx. 4 hours at a time from 12:00-04:00). This would be widely advertised.</p> <p>DW stated that the Traffic Management Working Group was looking at the detailed arrangements for this work.</p> <p>EM stated that FCBC are also currently looking at likely traffic levels in relation to this work to inform diversions and timings etc.</p>	
6	<b>Community Issues</b>	
6.1	<p><b>Lack of mitigation in place for dust leaving the construction site at Echline Corner causing a health issue.</b></p> <p>DT said that this item was brought up at the recent BRIGS AGM, and was not the first time that someone had complained of itchy eyes when dust was leaving the site. DT said that multiple complaints have been raised on the issue of dust.</p> <p>DT also referred to a complaint he had made through the enquiries and complaints process on 17 May regarding dust leaving the site, and lack of mitigation in place. He disputed the reply given that dust was not leaving the site, and believed it to be caused by diggers travelling up and down the site.</p> <p>EM mentioned in the response given that dust suppression measures were deployed on 17 May when required. DT again disputed this, and thought that the bowser should have been activated earlier.</p> <p>EM had stated in a later response to DT that monitor and internet records showed that the direction of the wind was blowing North. Websites that DT had</p>	

<p>SCF28052014/6.1</p>	<p>viewed suggested that it was South.</p> <p>EM agreed to look further at this point and indicate the web source used to establish the above point.</p> <p>LS agreed that best practicable means need to be implemented which would negate the need for residents to raise complaints. EM agreed that this was an issue that requires continuing monitoring and assessment.</p> <p>AS explained that if DT remained unhappy with the response to any complaint raised, the option exists for the complainant to escalate the concern to Transport Scotland (TS) for review.</p> <p>DT indicated that all complaints he raises are copied to TS.</p> <p><b><u>Post Meeting Note</u></b> EM emailed DT on 5 May to clarify that DTs assertion of the direction of the wind was correct, and apologised for this error. EDT inspectors present on site on 17 May were satisfied that dust suppression measures were deployed at the correct time. This was backed up with monitoring information from the time in question.</p>	<p>FCBC</p>
<p>6.2</p>	<p><b>Vibration at Echline Corner caused by construction activities.</b> This item was first raised in a phone call to EM on 16 May 2014, regarding vibration from a roller working intermittently on the A904 realignment at Echline Corner.</p> <p>EM had visited DT and LC and arranged for a monitoring trial to record the level being experienced. Results showed that no thresholds were exceeded.</p> <p>DT stated that the cause of the vibration may have been to do with hard rock, and a suggestion was made that a smaller roller could be used to lessen the vibration being experienced.</p> <p>EM stated that a smaller roller meant that work would take longer to complete. This situation would improve within weeks when the new A904 road was due to be complete.</p> <p>EM made the point that the contract had set much</p>	

	<p>lower limits in relation to acceptable threshold limits for noise and vibration than it could have. The vibration experienced would not harm properties and was well below the contract threshold levels.</p> <p>DT pointed out that many complaints had been passed to BRIGS in relation to the construction. He was aware of the threshold levels, but this did not negate from the fact that the levels that were being experienced by local residents were unpleasant and disturbing.</p> <p>EM acknowledged the above point.</p>	
6.3	<p><b>Construction vehicles travelling on Society Road contrary to regulations.</b></p> <p>DT explained that complaints in regards to this issue have been on-going since 2009, was raised at the time of the Bill and despite being given assurance in the Commitments and Undertakings that no construction traffic would travel along Society Road, this is an on-going issue.</p> <p>DT said that raised levels of traffic travelling along Society road were continuing to cause problems for residents.</p> <p>DT said that residents understood that the commitment given at the time of the Bill related to <b>all</b> vehicles associated with the project (and didn't differentiate between those vehicles used as part of the construction and those being used in a private capacity such as travelling to and from site) as has been deemed permissible in response to complaints raised on this item in the past.</p> <p>DT, TC and observers present understood that all vehicles relating to the project would use the haul road and believes that this would provide a suitable solution.</p> <p>AS stated that regarding travel along Society Road, the Contractor is not permitted to use any part of Society Road to undertake construction activities out with the Act limits or as an access route for construction vehicles.</p> <p>AS tabled a copy of a notice that the contractor had issued on 24 April 2014 to all staff, as a reminder of their responsibilities in the correct use of Society</p>	

<p>SCF28052014/6.3(a)</p>	<p>Road.</p> <p>AS said that the project does take any breach of the contract by the contractor on the use of Society Road seriously, and remedial action will be taken when and where necessary.</p> <p>LS explained that the current location of the site access road is different from that which was originally envisaged at the time of consultation and consideration of objections at Stage 2 of the Bill. It was assumed at that time, that the site access road would be located east of the new works and incorporate 300 metres of Society Road before entering the Barracks area. Its actual location is west of the works and crosses directly over Society Road. The chosen location helped limit the effect of traffic on adjacent residents by minimising the interface between the public and site traffic.</p> <p>LS said that the use of Port Edgar Barracks was also not anticipated at the time of the Bill, and that vehicles travelling along Society Road to the car park at the Barracks are not classed as construction vehicles.</p> <p>LS said that an increase in the number of cars along this road was also down to the fact that flats at Inchgarvie House had been let after being unoccupied for about one year.</p> <p>LS stressed that the project wants to ensure that the number of private vehicles using this road is kept to a minimum.</p> <p>LS and EM stated that the volume of traffic travelling along Society Road would lessen as the project progresses. For instance many of those workers using the barracks are currently working on the land/shore-based piers, which are due to be completed shortly on the South side.</p> <p>EM undertook to provide an outline of when it was expected that the number of vehicles who were permitted to travel along Society Road relating to the project would go down to zero.</p> <p>KG told the forum that QDCC has undertaken a lot of work and effort to reduce the volume of vehicles along Society Road, including the fact that Hopetoun House had given alternative routes for HGV's.</p>	<p>FCBC</p>
---------------------------	---	-------------



	<p>KG stated his disappointment that TS had changed proposals for traffic movement without due consultation, and in his opinion not in accordance with the CoCP. He urged the Project to consider the current position further.</p> <p>AS highlighted that this hadn't been the case, and that the project takes the use of Society Road seriously.</p> <p>LC enquired as to whether planning permission had been obtained for change of use at Port Edgar Barracks.</p> <p>AS stated the use of Port Edgar barracks for designated car parking had been agreed by the Traffic Management Working Group.</p> <p>LC said that assurances were given at an early stage of the project that all project related vehicles would be clearly identifiable. LS/EM agreed with this point..</p> <p>LS confirmed that the contractor is permitted to allow vehicles to travel along the road, as AS described above, and this remains within the limits of the ACT and CoCP. It would be up to the contractor to take the traffic away from the road.</p> <p>EM agreed to consider the comments on this issue further.</p>	
SCF28052014/6.3(b)		FCBC
6.4	<p><b>Un-sheeted loads on the A904 (Builyeon Road).</b></p> <p>DT said that is item was first raised 2 years ago, but is happening again, and would like restated assurance that loads will be sheeted, in accordance to the CoCP.</p>	
SCF28052014/6.4	<p>EM agreed that that loads should be covered when travelling, and suggested that toolbox talks on this subject should be undertaken to restate this requirement.</p>	FCBC
6.5	<p><b>Lack of wheel-washing facilities on construction sites.</b></p> <p>LC highlighted that dirt on the road was still an issue and mitigation measure were not operating efficiently. LC provided a photo of a lorry that had just gone through the wheel wash at the Echline site, but the</p>	

SCF28052014/6.5	<p>front wheels had been untouched by the wash.</p> <p>EM suggested that there may have been an issue with this facility.</p> <p>AS agreed that this point would be taken away to be addressed.</p>	FCBC
6.6	<p><b>Unacceptable road surface repairs performed on the A904 (Builyeon Road).</b></p> <p>As highlighted that this issue had been raised on 9 May and dealt with under the enquiries and complaints procedure. It related to noise caused by the temporary road reinstatement of a Scottish Gas Networks duct installation across the A904 adjacent to Echline Farm House.</p> <p>LC highlighted that despite this issue now being resolved, it was still disappointing that action wasn't taken sooner despite members of the project being aware of the issue themselves when driving over the duct. He felt that it shouldn't have taken a complaint for action to be taken</p> <p>EM stated that the existing A904 was in a poor state of repair, this was a temporary reinstatement. LS added that the new road would replace the existing road in the Summer.</p>	
6.7	<p><b>Non-compliance with prescribed working hours.</b></p> <p>DT stated that although an old issue, which had previously been raised and replied to at past forum meetings and through the enquiries and complaints system, was starting to happen again. DT acknowledged that this was a rare occurrence.</p>	
6.8	<p><b>Log book records kept at construction sites by the contractor.</b></p> <p>LC felt that this measure should remain in the Dust and Air Quality Management Plan, despite the Contractor stating that this item would be removed from the plan forthwith. LC said that this would enable the cleanliness of vehicles to be recorded.</p> <p>EM stated that the plans remain live documents and are subject to change. The item had now been removed from the current plan.</p> <p>LS stated that he understood that FCBC placed this requirement by error in the Dust and Air Quality and</p>	

SCF28052014/6.8	<p>Dust Management Plan.</p> <p>DT asked what the rationale was for accepting this measure and the change in this regard to the plan.</p>	EDT
6.9	<p><b>Piling noise and vibration arising from construction activities at Scotstoun and Dundas Farm homes areas.</b></p> <p>DT was content for this issue to be closed due to assurance earlier in the meeting that work in this area, and the associated vibration would cease over the course of the next 3 days.</p> <p>EM said that piling would still be undertaken, but that this would not cause a high level of noise.</p>	
6.10  SCF28052014/6.10	<p><b>Lack of information available regarding height and location of overhead gantries to be erected.</b></p> <p>DT stated that this issue had been raised at the recent BRIGS AGM.</p> <p>LS said that the project would be happy to provide specific information once further details of the request were known.</p> <p>Meantime, plans could be provided of the location of the gantries and schematics of each one.</p>	EDT
6.11	<p><b>Lack of information regarding the replacement bridge taking the B800 over the A90.</b></p> <p>DT stated that this issue had been raised at the recent BRIGS AGM.</p> <p>LS said that the project would be happy to provide specific information once further details of the request were known.</p> <p>General information could also be highlighted through presentation delivered at the CEC each month.</p> <p>LS stated that recent images had been shown at the last public briefing sessions.</p>	
6.12	<p><b>Inadequate signage and lack of stringent enforcement of the 30 mph speed limit on the A904.</b></p> <p>LC stated that speed on Builyeon Road was still an issue, and that a number of speed limit signs on the road had been removed.</p>	

	DW confirmed that enforcement was not within the gift of the Local Authority, but was a matter for Police Scotland. The road at the moment was legally compliant in terms of signage.	
6.13  SCF28052014/6.13	<p><b>Post-construction street lighting plans for South Queensferry.</b></p> <p>LC said that this enquiry related to the proposed LED lighting for the approach road.</p> <p>He asked whether Transport Scotland (TS) were aware of published articles on the effects of this lighting, and what research TS have undertaken in this respect.</p> <p>AS stated that this point was currently being requested by some local residents, and the response would be shared with the forum.</p>	EDT
6.14  SCF28052014/6.14	<p><b>Health and Safety issue on Society Road.</b></p> <p>DT stated that a request from BRIGS had been made for this item to be raised, to highlight that the issue of rats along Society Road were perceived as still being a problem, despite having raised this concern previously. DT stated residents were now taking matters into their own hands.</p> <p><u>Post Meeting Note</u> EDT will issue a response to this item as a post meeting note, to issue ahead of the next meeting of the South Community Forum.</p>	EDT
6.15	<p><b>Lack of clarity on compensation process to be followed by local residents for adverse impacts resulting from construction activities.</b></p> <p>DT explained that given the fact the project had decided to bring forward the timings for submitting claims for the M9 Junction 1A and Fife ITS part of the project, residents were keen to know what the position was on submitting part 1 claims for the Queensferry Crossing.</p> <p>DT was aware of previous guidance issued, but felt that this was confusing to a lot of residents.</p> <p>LS said that we could reconfirm the information a guidance document previously issued (Forth</p>	

SCF28052014/6.15	<p>Replacement Crossing – Guidance on the Parliamentary Process, Compulsory Purchase Process and Compensation July 2009). Claimants would not be able to apply until 1 year after the Principal contract is completed.</p> <p>It was agreed that an information session at the CEC could be organised to address this issue and a post meeting note issued outlining the current position on claims.</p> <p><u>Post Meeting Note</u> The publication mentioned above can be found at the following link (section 5 “Compensation where no property has been taken” refers):</p> <p><a href="http://www.transportscotland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/rrd_reports/uploaded_reports/j11012/j11012.pdf">www.transportscotland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/rrd_reports/uploaded_reports/j11012/j11012.pdf</a></p> <p>Notification inviting claims under Part 1 for the Queensferry Crossing will also be advertised in local newspapers and on the TS website, as has been the case for Part 1 claims for the Fife ITS and M9 Junction 1A contracts.</p>	EDT
6.16	<p><b>Continuing noise and air pollution throughout the construction area.</b></p> <p>DT asked the forum to note that most complaints that had been raised by BRIGS members at the recent AGM were on the subject of Noise and air pollution, in particular dust.</p>	
6.17	<p><b>Smashing of cast iron pipes with digger alongside Builyeon Road.</b></p> <p>LC was unhappy with the reply received regarding a complaint on this matter he had received, LC had requested to see the risk assessment. The request had been declined in the reply issued by EM for the reason that it was not normal procedure to share this unless work was being carried out on private property.</p> <p>In relation to a question raised by LC on whether this work had been approved by the Traffic Management Working Group, EM stated that this was carried out under site clearance, and the contractor was satisfied that this work had been carried out safely.</p>	

SCF28052014/6.17	<p>LS said that he hadn't realised that the works were as bad as was being stated, and apologised if that had been the case.</p> <p>EM agreed to check the appropriate noise monitors near where the work was being carried out and revert.</p>	FCBC
6.18	<p>LS thanked the residents that had decided to observe and those who had raised issues affecting them at the Forum meeting. LS emphasised that he appreciated the work to construct the project was taking place in close proximity to a number of residents properties and thanks them for their patience during construction.</p> <p>LS said that works at Echline on the A904 were getting to a stage where there would be less disruption with this and associated roads being black topped in the Summer.</p>	
6.19  SCF28052014/6.19	<p><b>Hogweed growing on the A904</b></p> <p>LC brought the issue of giant hogweed on the north verge of the A904 adjacent to the footpath to attention of the Forum, and asked what measures the project was taking to address this. The issue had also been raised in an email from LC to FCBC prior to the Community Forum Meeting. LC showed forum members a photo of what he suspected was giant hogweed.</p> <p>EM agreed to look at this further.</p>	FCBC
<b>7</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
7.1  SCF28052014/7.1	<p>A resident had raised an issue regarding the absence of Stop/Go boards along Society Road and lack of operatives when plant exit the site onto the road.</p> <p>EM undertook to look into this issue.</p>	FCBC
7.2  SCF28052014/7.2	<p><b>Seeding on the U221</b></p> <p>BRIGS raised the point that despite an undertaking being given that the U221 would be seeded, this has still not been actioned.</p> <p>LC showed the forum a photo of the U221 clearly showing weeds present.</p> <p>LS understood that this area had been weed killed and seeded and agreed to check on the progress of this action.</p>	EDT

	<p>LS confirmed that the grass at Echline field has recently been cut.</p> <p><u>Post Meeting Note</u></p> <p>The U221 has been weed killed and cultivated. Seeding is currently scheduled to be undertaken week commencing 9 June 2014.</p>	
7.3	<p>DG informed the group that there are over 900 people currently working on the site, who put a lot of positive effort into the project and engaging with the community. He acknowledged that, while there have been issues, on the whole the experience of the project for those working on site and residents have been positive. Community engagement on this project is of a high standard, and is being used as a model for other projects.</p> <p>DG said that the project's communication channels to deal with enquiries and complaints could also be used to communicate any positive experiences of the project. These would be gratefully received and he would like to encourage members and their communities to do so.</p> <p>KG highlighted that as the project becomes even more visible, increased interest in the project is being seen, and highlighted support for the education and outreach activities being undertaken by the project.</p> <p>As the project becomes more visible, the project increases the profit and benefits to South Queensferry.</p> <p>DG stated that some of the incidents witnessed and brought to the attention of the forum are not always common occurrence, and on the whole the community is positive about the project.</p> <p>Regarding safety on the project, EM highlighted that of the 5.5 million man hours worked so far on the project, there have been only 7 lost time accidents (i.e. injured persons of work for more than 3 days).</p>	
7.4  SCF28052014/7.4	<p><b>Future site visit</b></p> <p>LS said that the project would be happy to host a site visit for the Forum that would build on that which was undertaken by forum members last year.</p>	EDT

8	Date of Next meetings	
8.1	<p>The next meetings of the Community Forums will take place at the Contact and Education Centre on the following date:</p> <p>North Community Forum – Wednesday 20 August 2014</p> <p><b>South Community Forum – Wednesday 27 August 2014</b></p>	

Annex A

Post meeting note on outstanding actions of meeting held on 26 February 2014.

**Action Point: SCF260214/2.2 - Discussion with Roads Commissioner regarding Gas Board Works.**

LS was not aware whether the 14 day notice period applied to third parties carrying out work as part of the project, but that this would be looked into.

Post Meeting Note

The control of utilities is the responsibility of the contractor (FCBC) to manage and we would expect the required notice period to be given by FCBC in the normal manner, where these works may have an impact on residents.

However, Investigatory works carried out by utility companies on private land are a matter for the utility company to progress with the landowner concerned.

**Action Point: SCF260214/3.3 - Website update**

LS stated that FCBC needed to address the issue of ensuring that amendments to documents were adequately highlighted within the revised documents, and that this had not been consistent to date.

Post Meeting Note

Going forward, revised plans will include an ‘amendments’ page to highlight the changes made to amended documents.

**Action Point: SCF260214/3.5 - FRC update presentation  
Potential spent oil shale deliveries through Kirkliston**

DG agreed to discuss with EM a future strategy in relation to the above.

Post Meeting Note

With regard to future oil shale deliveries, if there are issues to be discussed, the project will ensure appropriate representation at local community council meetings.

**Action Point: SCF260214/6.1 Community Issues - To discuss the difference between the scope of the legal obligations contained in the CoCP and the Forth Crossing Act 2011 and the scope of the Employer's Requirements**



**i.e. contractual obligations between the Scottish Ministers and the Contractors, FCBC.**

DR said that he had witnessed 2 white vans using Society road. LS stated that if construction vehicles were found to be incorrectly using this road, TS would view this as a serious matter, and would take appropriate action. DG agreed to look into this matter further.

Post Meeting Note

The project team has reviewed this matter, the EDT and FCBC have reinforced to all of their staff the requirement for them to adhere to the Code of Construction Practice regarding the non-trafficking of Society Road by construction traffic, and the appropriate use of this road in the case of private (commuting) vehicles plus occasional supervisory vehicles.

**Action Point: SCF260214/6.3 - CoCP specific requirements for vehicle wheel-washing facilities at all construction sites.**

DG agreed to look further into the provision of cleaning facilities in the vicinity of the A904.

Post Meeting Note

FCBC will undertake to clean footpaths during periods when hauling earth moving materials along the A904. This will include periodic cleaning once every fortnight.

Existing measures currently in place to prevent dirt depositing on the road include a wet wheel wash at the exit of the main access to the North of the A904. Haulage vehicles use this prior to exiting out onto the main road.

A road brush is also on site permanently cleaning all routes as required.

There is also a focus on vehicles using stretches of un-trafficked blacktop prior to exit such as the service road at access 02 (opposite McDonald's) and the old U221 at access 07. Vehicles deposit any 'picked up' debris on these stretches and the brush focuses on ensuring these areas are kept clean to prevent drag onto the public routes.

Implementation of one way systems within the site also aims to limit likelihood of deposit on the public roads.

Further to comments made at the Forum meeting, all drivers of vehicles entering/exiting the site have been reminded of their personal responsibility to ensure the cleanliness of their vehicle.

**Action Point: SCF260214/6.4 - EMP requirements for the maintenance of log books at all construction sites.**

DG agreed to look at this further as he believed that banksmen were appropriately employed across the site.

Post Meeting Note

Ewen Macdonell and David Gough met with Les Chapman on Friday 21 March to discuss matters including air quality and banksmen. The Contractor considers that

banksmen are appropriately employed across the site.

**Action point: SCF260214/6.5 - CoCP specified notice period to locally impacted residents of planned construction works.**

LS acknowledged that there were instances where FCBC had not provided the full 14 day notice period required and agreed to look into this further.

Post Meeting Note

The contractor makes every effort to convey the correct information to affected parties when issuing notifications. In instances where the 14 day notice period is not achieved, this is primarily a function of acquiring surety of information, which, with the complex and changing nature of many site activities is not always readily achievable. However, the contractor has reiterated to his team the need to ensure that the 14 day notice period is met. EDT will continue to monitor this requirement.

**Action Point: SCF260214/6.6a - Pollution increase on the A904 footpath and bus shelter areas.**

In view of comments received by members, and the fact that oil shale deliveries will recommence, DG undertook to revisit the cleaning regime.

Post Meeting Note

In conjunction with the proactive measures outlined at action point SCF260214/6.3, the cleaning regime will vary depending on the frequency of earth moving activities. Monitoring by site staff is undertaken on an on-going basis and cleaning will be varied to suit circumstances.

**Action Point: SCF260214/6.6b - DG agreed that if oil shale deliveries were being resumed along the A904, cleaning should also resume. However, it was recognised by LS and AS that the Forum members concern was not limited to the condition of the A904 due to spent oil shale deliveries. DG agreed that FCBC should access the wider issue of the cleanliness of the A904.**

Post Meeting Note

Action will be undertaken, as set out in the responses to action points SCF260214/6.3 and SCF260214/6.6a.

**Action Point: SCF260214/6.7b - LC informed LS that he understood that earthwork stockpiles/bunds that had stood for more than one season should be seeded, and that this was not being done. LS agreed that this point would be considered further in conjunction with EDT and FCBC.**

Post Meeting Note

Seeding works will be progressed, subject to seasonal constraints and weather, for all areas to be seeded as soon as possible after they are topsoiled and completed, such that they will not be subject to damage by ongoing construction works in the vicinity. This intention is in accordance with CoCP 6.9 and 13.3.1.

The seeding of subsoil bunds, i.e. those which are incomplete or temporary e.g. eastside of the new M90 in Echline field, is not practical as the germination of grass on the subsoil bunds, without the presence of topsoil, would be severely limited.

**Action Point: SCF260214/6.8 - FRC Project website information status.**

LS stated that EDT was working with FCBC to ensure a more consistent approach was adopted, and that the TS website would be updated accordingly.

Post Meeting Note

Refer to response in action **SCF260214/3.3**

**Action Point: SCF260214/7.2 - A904 Works**

LC informed the meeting of an instance at the crossing where Scottish Water was running a pump and generator without screening until 5am. During this time, there were several instances of shouting from workers communicating with their colleagues. DG agreed to take the noise issue forward.

Post Meeting Note

FCBC has discussed this matter with the utility company and we do not expect a recurrence of this behaviour.