



# Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (South) Minutes

**Meeting Location:** Dakota Hotel, South Queensferry

**Meeting Date / Time:** 2 November 2011

**Subject:** Community Forum South

**Participants:**

**Community Representatives**

Martin Gallagher (QDCC)  
Keith Giblett (QDCC)  
Terry Airlie (QDCC)  
Doug Ross (QDCC)  
Evelyn Woollen (Newton CC)  
Bill Boggon (Newton CC)  
Dr. Rupert Ormond (Newton CC)  
Les Chapman (BRIGS)  
Doug Tait (BRIGS)

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

Lawrence Shackman  
John Watt  
Andrew Pope  
Allan Buchan (c/o BIG partnership)

**Forth Crossing Bridge Constructors (FCBC)**

Derek Chambers  
Ewen MacDonell

**John Graham (Dromore) Ltd**

Richard Docherty

**John Sisk and Roadbridge**

Elaine Barrie

**Observers**

One observer

Continued

Page 2 of 14

	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Meeting chaired by Lawrence Shackman</b>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Review of minutes and outstanding actions South Community Forum 23 August 2011</b>	
<b>2.2</b>	LS suggested and Forum members agreed that the current and future post meeting notes should not be incorporated within minutes and that appendices are referred to as 'associated papers'.	Noted
<b>2.3</b>	<p>EW highlighted two clarifications sought regarding the minutes:</p> <p><b>(8.2) Procedure for community review and feedback on plans</b> Minute should be updated to reflect that it was agreed that CLOs would respond to Community Councils regarding the comments provided on the Environmental Management Plans (EMPs) and provide copy of EMPs that went forward for approval. LS agreed.</p> <p><b>(8.7) Working Groups / non compliance with CoCP</b> Minute should be updated to reflect that TS undertook to highlight to Forum members any approved variations against plans/standards – e.g. working outside agreed hours. LS agreed.</p> <p>EW to forward note for TS outlining the type of information on variations required..</p> <p>DT asked that in the 'Associated Papers' (7.2) AOB "compensation" should be replaced with "Relaxation of Listed Building Conditions". LS agreed.</p> <p>Forum agreed that if these requests were reflected, the minutes would be accepted and could be posted on the FRC web without the need for recirculation for approval.</p>	<p>CLOs</p> <p>TS</p> <p>EW</p> <p>TS</p> <p>TS</p>
<b>2.4</b>	A separate Outstanding Actions paper was presented – EW asked that this be circulated by TS in advance of the meetings. LS agreed.	TS
<b>2.5</b>	<b>Further items from the Outstanding Actions paper were discussed:</b>	
	<b>(1.1 – 4.2) Reporting mechanism for outstanding commitments</b> LS confirmed the report has been published on the TS website and will be updated on a monthly basis.	Noted
	<b>(1.1) Ground Water Report</b> EM confirmed report will be forwarded when complete, but this is likely to take a further month. LS confirmed that comments from Paul Mellon (TS) and Les Chapman in his recent e-mail will be considered in finalising the report which Jim Watson (FCBC) was undertaking.	FCBC

Continued

	LS agreed this would remain on the action list until resolved. See also 7.1 Flooding.	TS
	<b>(1.1 - 7.2) Relaxation of Listed Building Conditions</b> LS confirmed written response was provided.  DT explained that previous night's meeting of BRIGS had highlighted further possible claimants. DT to check and advise TS.  All agreed to mark as complete as a Forum discussion item and re-open as appropriate if advised.	Complete  BRIGS  Complete
	<b>(1.1) Title Documentation</b> LS confirmed written response was provided.  LS confirmed that of 316 potential claimants, 65 have been received. These are being progressed by the District Valuer and one claim has been settled. The others are ongoing and experience suggests the process may take some time to complete.	Complete  Noted
	<b>(1.1 – 7.4) AOB – Port Edgar Marina</b> EM to re-issue minutes.	FCBC
	<b>(2.2) EMP Fife ITS comments</b> Copies of the EMP were made available by RD who requested comments by 5pm Tuesday 30 <sup>th</sup> August.	Complete
	<b>(2.2 and 3.2) 3 Month Look Ahead publication</b>  LS confirmed these have been published and would be updated monthly on the FRC website.  LS confirmed that an email update would be issued to Forum members by TS shortly before meetings to confirm when plans have been updated on the website.	Complete  Noted
	<b>(4.2) Air Quality</b> Covered under item 7.3 Pollution Monitoring.	Complete
	<b>(4.2) Pre cast works</b> DCh confirmed that some precast works for the south approach viaduct will take place south of the Estuary.	Noted
	<b>(4.2) A904 access points</b> EM confirmed discussions had taken place with NCC.	Complete
	<b>(4.3) Construction programme</b> Presentation provided.	Complete

Continued

Page 4 of 14

	<b>(4.3) Structural surveys</b> Covered under item 7.2 Property Condition Surveys	Complete
	<b>(4.3) Society Road Surveys</b> (EM) discussed with M McLaren and advised that no properties on Society Road required to be surveyed.	Complete
	<b>(4.3) Social housing development</b> EM confirmed meeting had been held and temporary land will be made available to social housing developer if alternative site access can be secured adjacent to Dakota Hotel. Closed as Forum agenda item although discussions are ongoing between EM and QDCC.	Complete
	<b>(5) Terms of Reference</b> LS confirmed update was issued by RH. TS was awaiting feedback from NCC. EW stated that NCC had provided feedback, and was awaiting TS response to email of 1 November 2011. Agreed to close as Forum agenda item and finalise approval by correspondence. DT confirmed BRIGS is happy with the amendments.	Complete  Noted
	<b>(6) EwC feedback</b> LS confirmed document has been published on web.	Complete
	<b>(6) A5 Flyer re contacts</b> EM confirmed flyer has been published and electronic version was issued to Forum members. LS highlighted that scheme boards with contact details are in the process of being erected.	Complete  Noted
	<b>(6) Complaints procedure</b> EW agreed that this should be removed as an agenda item, but it may be raised again in the future.	Complete
	<b>(7.1 – 7.2) Meet the contractor</b>	Complete
	<b>(8.2) EMP community feedback</b>	Complete
	<b>(8.5) Bo'ness Crossing</b> LS confirmed discussions with CEC are ongoing..	TS
	<b>(8.6) FRC Website</b> LS confirmed RH is to meet with EW/NCC re website revision.  LS requested feedback from other forum members.  TS will seek to make "quick fixes" in advance of a more substantial update	TS/NCC  Community representatives Noted

	<p><b>(8.8) Monitoring equipment</b></p> <p>LS confirmed that discussions are taking place to develop a user friendly format for presentation of the data and TS is seeking to publish data from August by the end of November.</p> <p>EW asked that Forum members be shown proposed format for comment prior to finalisation. LS agreed.</p>	<p>TS</p> <p>TS</p>
<b>3</b>	<b>Principal Contract, Programme Overview</b>	
	<p>EM presented an overview of the programme based on the current project management plan – key aspects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The majority of work will begin in spring 2012</li> <li>- While the project completion date will remain as 2016, programme element dates will continue to be revised throughout the construction</li> <li>- Traffic management – traffic disruption will be minimised as a considerable amount of the new roads will be built “off line” and will not interfere with existing roads. The nature of existing road configurations must be maintained – i.e. if currently there are two lanes in each direction, two lanes must be maintained/provided. Some traffic light controls will be necessary – e.g. Castleland Hill Road.</li> <li>- Key structures in the north include Ferrytoll gyratory</li> <li>- Key structures in the south include Queensferry gyratory, B800 bridge, Dalmeny railway bridge and the eight approach piers. Verges and retaining walls are also scheduled in the programme.</li> <li>- Piling for the South Piers will begin in spring 2012 along with four guidance piles for the caissons.</li> </ul> <p>LS confirmed that the programme would not be issued in the format displayed as a presenter was required to explain the content, but a simplified version would be developed for the website with a caveat that timings may change.</p> <p><b>Q</b> KG asked if FCBC is liaising with FETA to avoid clashes of Traffic management with FRB works.  <b>A</b> LS confirmed there is close liaison.</p> <p><b>Q</b> EW asked if a CGI model was still being developed by FCBC?  <b>A</b> DCh advised that this was being produced but he could not confirm the delivery date – DCh to update members re progress at next Forum.</p> <p>Discussion took place re content of 3 month look ahead plans. LS confirmed TS and contractors were developing formats that would be more user friendly. This includes linking content to simplified maps to show locations of proposed works (e.g. G1 as Gantry 1 on map). Terminology used is also to be reviewed to avoid jargon.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>TS/FCBC</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>FCBC</p> <p>TS/Contractors</p>

	<p>Discussion took place re traffic management measures described by the contractors which were likely to be implemented but are not featured on the 3 month plans as they had not been approved.</p> <p>LS highlighted such information would be included in the 3 month look ahead when approved and that a number of methods were used to communicate upcoming traffic management measures including the FRC website, press releases, advertising, yellow traffic signs etc.</p> <p>LS suggested that TS/FCBC could provide advice on the FRC web to alert people (e.g. slip road closure) even if date unknown and update information when the date is approved. TS to consider.</p> <p>AP highlighted potential to create link between FRC and Traffic Scotland websites – AP to investigate and advise community groups regarding appropriate links they could publicise online.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>TS</p> <p>TS</p>
<b>4</b>	<b>John Graham (Dromore) Ltd (Fife ITS Contract)</b>	
<b>4.1</b>	<p><b>Progress update and 3 month look ahead</b></p> <p>3 month look ahead plan was presented, further items discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pavement testing has concluded</li> <li>- Current works include site clearance at gantry sites, fibre optic communications and ducting installation for linking gantry sites and drainage</li> <li>- Mine consolidation works will start soon, subject to approvals.</li> </ul>	Noted
<b>4.2</b>	<p><b>Traffic management</b></p> <p>RD confirmed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- traffic management equipment was installed on 23 Sept and work commenced on 26<sup>th</sup> Sept.</li> <li>- average speed cameras were installed on 30<sup>th</sup> September</li> <li>- the 40mph speed limit will remain for the duration of the works</li> <li>- the traffic management configuration will alter during the programme to accommodate different works</li> <li>- an application has been made to close the M90 northbound on slip road at Admiralty for a 5 day period and is awaiting approval (likely closure early December).</li> </ul> <p>LS stressed that once a 40mph limit is in place it must be observed.</p> <p><b>Q</b> KG asked who was in charge of the average speed cameras and if the number of offenders was known.</p> <p><b>A</b> LS confirmed these were operated by Fife Safety Camera Partnership and TS does not have figures, but feedback suggests the level of compliance to date has been very good.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

<b>5</b>	<b>John Sisk and Roadbridge (M9 Junction 1a Contract)</b>	
<b>5.1</b>	<p><b>Progress update and 3 month look ahead</b>  3 month look ahead plan was presented, further items discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- overall programme is on schedule</li> <li>- haul roads are 40% complete</li> <li>- earthworks on south side of M9 will complete in next few weeks</li> <li>- trail piling will begin on 7<sup>th</sup> Nov</li> <li>- compound at Kirkliston is 95% complete and tarmac for its carpark/access to B9080 is being laid on 3<sup>rd</sup> Nov.</li> </ul>	Noted
<b>5.2</b>	<p><b>Traffic management</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Delivery of 4 steel gantries for M9 spur to the compound is likely on 16<sup>th</sup> January. As these are oversized loads requiring escorts, a traffic management plan to minimise disruption will be confirmed nearer the time and advice issued – e.g. evening delivery is likely.</li> </ul> <p><b>Q</b> EW asked who gives permission for such a variation – i.e. evening delivery?  <b>A</b> LS confirmed this would be the Traffic Management Working Group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders (TTROs) have been approved by City of Edinburgh Council for the B9080 and B800</li> <li>- TTROs for M9 and M9 spur will be in place from 3rd Nov and works will start next week. Temporary traffic management measures will involve reduced speed limits of 40mph with two lanes in each direction maintained and average speed cameras introduced from mid-Nov. LS highlighted that a press release has been issued and is available on the FRC website. Traffic management measures will take a week to implement and include the hard shoulders being coned off. For safety reasons the single lane sections of the M9 spur will be extended northwards.</li> </ul> <p><b>Q</b> MG asked where the 40mph limit will begin?  <b>A</b> LS confirmed the 40mph limit will begin on the A90 south of the Forth Road Bridge in the vicinity of the Scotstoun Junction. LS emphasised that the police and relevant local authorities have been involved in the discussions and decision making process.</p> <p><b>Q</b> DT asked if 21 day complaints period for TTROs had been removed?  <b>A</b> LS confirmed these did not apply as they were temporary rather than permanent orders.</p> <p><b>Q</b> DT asked if there were any permanent ones?</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

Continued

	<p><b>A</b> LS confirmed that permanent orders were required for the variable speed limits, hardshoulder bus lanes plus some local road speed limit amendments and temporary orders are used for period of up to 18 months.</p> <p>DT highlighted Kirkliston CC had raised a number of issues at BRIGS meeting the previous night. LS asked that DT email these to Elaine Barrie to allow preparation of responses in advance of the following week's Junction 1a Community Forum.</p>	BRIGS
<b>6</b>	<b>Forth Crossing Bridge Constructors (Principal Contract)</b>	
<b>6.1</b>	<p><b>Progress update and 3 month look ahead</b> 3 month look ahead plan was circulated, further items discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- EM confirmed that the Access Track refers to Haul Road</li> <li>- Trial blast of beamer rock will take place w/c 21 Nov with the lighthouse removal next year. There will be four rock blasts with excavation complete by April next year.</li> </ul> <p><b>Q</b> Will structural surveys be complete before blasting? <b>A</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Q</b> How much of the access track will be covered in tarmac, including any temporary parts? <b>A</b> EM confirmed that the length of temporary haul road to be covered in tarmac had still to be confirmed. LS confirmed that the haul road had to have at least 200m of black top from its junction with Society Road although he understood that FCBC were considering lengthening this, and the junction will be kept clean from mud.</p> <p><b>Q</b> KG asked for clarification that the compound planned for Echline was for up to 70 people and when the workforce would peak? <b>A</b> EM confirmed it was and that the workforce there would peak from Spring 2012.</p> <p><b>Q</b> Has Dundas Home Farm residents been made aware of developments? <b>A</b> EM said they had been leafleted some weeks back. LS suggested FCBC meet with residents to advise them before bund works begin.</p> <p>EW requested that all flyers be published on the FRC web. LS agreed.</p> <p>Concerns were raised by QDCC re possible lack of awareness of FRC amongst some parts of the local community and low turnout to a recent FRC presentation promoted by QDCC. LS emphasised TS and contractors would continue to use various channels to communicate, but that they could not force people to engage.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>FCBC</p> <p>TS/Contractors</p> <p>Noted</p>

Continued

<p><b>6.2</b></p>	<p><b>Traffic management</b> - No further issues were discussed</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>7 Community Issues</b></p>		
<p><b>7.1</b></p>	<p><b>Flooding on A904 and B924</b> EM highlighted previous discussions with BRIGS in July and a further discussion two weeks ago, and that FCBC was keen to be part of the solution. LC explained that sand bags were used recently to stop flood water encroaching, that this had now happened three times and this had not been an issue until after site investigation/borehole works. LS emphasised TS was keen to work with FCBC to resolve the issue. QDCC highlighted discussions with City of Edinburgh Council regarding drainage problems near the McDonald's Restaurant. The Council had cleared the drains which again blocked with grit during the winter. Contact at City of Edinburgh Council is Murray Black.  TS and FCBC to discuss, liaise with City of Edinburgh Council and Traffic Management Working Group, and advise BRIGS. <b>(See Associated Papers)</b>  EM to record contact from BRIGS as a formal complaint.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>TS/FCBC</p> <p>EM</p>
<p><b>7.2</b></p>	<p><b>Property Condition Surveys</b> EM updated Forum that of 86 surveys identified, 74 had been undertaken by 4<sup>th</sup> October and 54 reports have been issued. Those not completed are a result of access issues – e.g. residents cancelling or not agreeing dates. LS indicated residents of properties where surveys were outstanding have been written to and advised that if they do not agree a date within the next month, TS will assume they do not wish a property survey. DT queried why these were still ongoing and were they valid based on what was agreed at the Assessor's Hearing? LS outlined that those residents offered structural surveys would be provided with one.  Update Forum on developments.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>TS/FCBC</p>
<p><b>7.3</b></p>	<p><b>Pollution Monitoring</b> EM outlined locations of installed and potential sites at Dundas Home Farm, Echline, Newton, Springfield, Clufflat, Inchgarvie Lodge, Linmill, the Barracks and Port Edgar. EM confirmed that TS and the local authorities are, in general, in agreement with the strategy.  EM to provide update, once agreement from hosts confirmed.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>FCBC</p>

Continued

	<p><b>Q</b> EW said her understanding from a local authority officer was that the type of equipment and method for air quality control had still to be agreed?</p> <p><b>A</b> EM confirmed there is agreement on the strategy but that discussions were taking place on the type of light scatter meters. FCBC is committed to monitoring PM10 as a minimum standard.</p> <p><b>Q</b> EW asked if all aspects of air quality will be monitored – not just dust?</p> <p><b>A</b> DCh confirmed that this had been discussed at the Environmental Liaison Working Group and separate meetings have been organised to discuss matters.</p> <p>Update to be provided to Forum members.</p> <p><b>Q</b> DT asked when the first results would be known?</p> <p><b>A</b> LS confirmed that the publication target for backdated results from August was by end of November.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>FCBC/TS</p> <p>Noted</p>
<b>7.4</b>	<p><b>Ground water reports</b> Discussed previously – see 2.5</p>	
<b>7.5</b>	<p><b>Meet the contractor event</b> LS confirmed that around 200 people in total attended the two events and feedback had been positive.</p> <p>Feedback from Forum members included</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- evening session would have benefitted from more time for questions</li> <li>- it was very useful to have FCBC specialists at the event</li> <li>- EW suggested the presentation was a possible missed opportunity to communicate positive messages – e.g. reduced noise due to piling methods adopted.</li> <li>- Concerns that audience, particularly at evening event, was already quite knowledgeable – while community groups had done their best to promote the events, attendance may have been higher if advertising was more prominent.</li> </ul> <p>TS/Contractors to consider feedback when developing future events</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
<b>8</b>	<b>A.O.B</b>	
<b>8.1</b>	<p><b>Environmental Management Plans (EMPs)</b></p> <p>EM explained that an email from TS had been received the previous week advising that the EMPs had been posted on the FRC website. No feedback had been received on NCC's comments to all three other than to acknowledge receipt. EW expressed concern that communities had no opportunity to review the revised/agreed versions. In the comments originally supplied, it was</p>	<p>Noted</p>

## Continued

Page 11 of 14

	<p>emphasised by NCC that some aspects in those draft versions were insufficiently detailed for NCC to provide a view.</p> <p><b>Q</b> EW asked if the EMPs had been accepted by TS as the Employer's Representative to allow construction works to proceed?  <b>A</b> LS explained that the EMPs on the website were iterations of evolving documents. The EMPs have been accepted in their current form to enable progress as they are sufficiently developed to allow the immediate works to proceed. Some information – e.g. on protected species – has been redacted due to confidentiality requirements. Various iterations of comments have been provided by TS and other consultees through the development of the plans and in the case of FCBC's EMP further comments have recently been made and an updated version will be published soon.</p> <p><b>Q</b> EW requested details of the type of activities that were allowed to proceed under the current EMPs?  <b>A</b> LS highlighted works such as site clearance, prior to the main construction. In addition, the Marine Management Plan will be updated and detailed method statements will be developed which take the EMPs into account.          LS to supply note to Forum members of the type of activities that are allowed to progress based on the current EMPs. <b>(See Associated Papers)</b></p> <p><b>Q</b> EW asked when these would be available to community groups?  <b>A</b> LS to check status.</p> <p><b>Q</b> EW asked why feedback regarding EMPs had not been provided to community groups?  <b>A</b> DCh explained that the EMP is part of the Quality Plan. FCBC has received recently further feedback from TS on the EMP and Quality Plan which are currently being incorporated in updated drafts. FCBC's Environmental Manager is in the process of developing a response to community groups which takes into account the feedback from TS. This will enable a clearer response.</p> <p>FCBC to provide feedback re community groups' comments.</p> <p>EW expressed concern that despite a commitment to engage with community groups, the plans had already been agreed.          LS explained that FCBC is duty bound to provide a plan and that NCC has been involved as one of many consultees. FCBC has considered feedback and has to decide which elements it can and cannot incorporate in the plan.</p> <p>EW reiterated that the CoCP provides an opportunity for community groups to put concerns re the final draft of the EMPs to the Employer's Representative and that this opportunity has not been provided. LS indicated that NCC could still comment on the</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>TS</p> <p>TS</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>FCBC</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	---	--

## Continued

Page 12 of 14

	<p>evolving versions. LS also highlighted that no similar objection had been received from any other consultees.</p> <p>To enable further comments, EW and DT requested a paper copy of all three EMPs. EW requested a paper copy of both the current web version and FCBC updated version, when available. EW also requested that updates be highlighted on revised versions.</p> <p>LS asked if EW would like a representative from the Employer's Team to meet NCC to discuss the EMPs? EW said she was grateful for the offer and would consider this once there had been an opportunity to review the updated EMPs.</p> <p>RD emphasised that due to the timescales involved, the Fife ITS programme was proceeding based on the approved EMP. This does not have a significant environmental impact.</p>	<p>Contractors</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
<b>8.2</b>	<p><b>Construction process</b></p> <p>DCh emphasised FCBC were happy to arrange experts to describe the construction process should community groups require this. LS said members of the Working Groups would also be happy to attend future meetings to explain their role. EW suggested this would be better as separate meetings rather than part of Forum meetings.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
<b>8.3</b>	<p><b>Afternoon meetings</b></p> <p>LC/EW asked if it would be possible to arrange some meetings in the afternoon – e.g. to allow representatives with family commitments to attend during school hours? AP believed previous discussion or correspondence had indicated this was not suitable for all community groups. AP to check and advise Forum members.</p>	<p>TS</p>
<b>8.4</b>	<p><b>Date changes</b></p> <p>EW asked that all Forum members be notified by email if a meeting date is changed. AP to check process for advising re the change of date for junction 1a meeting (now 10<sup>th</sup> of November instead of 8<sup>th</sup>) and ensure future updates are emailed. <b>(See Associated Papers)</b></p>	<p>TS</p>
<b>9</b>	<b>Next Community Forums</b>	
<b>9.1</b>	<p>Dates were confirmed as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 24 January 2012, South Community forum</li> <li>- 25 January 2012; North Community forum</li> <li>- 01 February 2012; Junction 1a Community Forum</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p>
<b>9.2</b>	LS thanked attendees.	<p>Noted</p>

## Associated Papers

### 7. Community Issues

#### 7.1 Flooding on A904 and B924

##### **Transport Scotland Written Response [sent 24 November 2011]:**

Thank you for informing us at the Forum of the issue regarding flooding at the A904 and B924 junction. We understand that this is a historical issue concerning the land on the south side of the A904 that was purchased by Scottish Ministers earlier this year for the FRC and which now forms part of the Contractor's (FCBC) site.

Transport Scotland have subsequently approached the Local Roads Authority, the City of Edinburgh Council, to assist in the investigation of this matter. They have agreed to provide us with information regarding this issue and FCBC, along with ourselves, will consider further what mitigation may be possible to assist City of Edinburgh Council, until such time that the road layout in this area is rearranged as a consequence of the Principal Contract construction works.

The Employer's team have looked at the area on site and determined that there is no practicable solution possible at this time due to the topography and the nature of the underlying soil. However, we anticipate that the early earthworks activities for the junction should assist in alleviating this problem before the completion of the works.

Any query regarding the A904/B924 in this location, as local roads, should firstly be addressed to City of Edinburgh Council as the relevant Roads Authority, until such time that the major construction works commence in the area.

The Forth Replacement Crossing dedicated 24 hour hotline (0800 078 6910) will also be available throughout the Christmas period for project related enquiries.

We will update you on the mitigation works once the investigations are complete.

### 8.AOB

#### 8.1 Environmental Management Plans (EMP)

##### **Transport Scotland Written Response [sent 30 November 2011]:**

The Employers Delivery Team can confirm that the following activities (South of the Forth only) can proceed under the EMP:

##### **Principal Contract**

- Vegetation clearance
- Ecological mitigation works
- Fencing
- Site compound and satellite compound installation
- Beamer Rock – lighthouse removal, trial blasting, blasting, installation of navigation lights.
- Ground investigation including Marine
- Landscape and habitat replacement planting

## Continued

Page 14 of 14

### **M9 Junction 1a Contract**

- Site clearance and earthworks
- Ecological mitigation works
- Site compound installation
- Fencing
- Temporary haul roads
- Piling and sheet piling
- Culvert demolition and construction
- Utility protection works
- Wingwall demolition
- Gantry erection
- Temporary Swine Burn diversion works

## **8. AOB**

### **8.4 Date Changes**

#### **Transport Scotland Written Response [sent 24 November 2011]:**

The members of the Junction 1a forum were notified that the date of the forum had been rescheduled from the 8<sup>th</sup> November to 10<sup>th</sup> November 2011 and subsequently the website was immediately updated with the revised date on 5 October. Going forward we will ensure that all forum members are notified by email of any changes to forthcoming Community Forums.