



## Forth Replacement Crossing South Community Forum

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

**Meeting Date/Time:** 21 August 2012 – 7pm

**Subject:** Community Forum South

**Participants:**

**Community Representatives**

Terry Airlie (QDCC)  
Doug Ross (QDCC and BRIGS)  
Grant Sangster (QDCC)  
Bert Scott (BRIGS)  
Les Chapman (BRIGS)  
Doug Tait (BRIGS)  
Maggie Quayle (BRIGS)  
Evelyn Woolen (Newton CC)

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

Lawrence Shackman  
John Watt  
Keavy O'Neill  
Allan Buchan (c/o BIG Partnership)

**City of Edinburgh Council (CEC)**

Darren Wraight

**Forth Crossing Bridge Constructors (FCBC)**

Ewen Macdonell  
Derek Chambers  
Sally Chambers

**John Graham (Dromore) Ltd**

Richard Docherty

**John Sisk and Roadbridge (SRB)**

Elaine Barrie

**Observers**

1 observer

**Apologies**

Keith Giblett (QDCC)

Continued

Page 2 of 16

	Notes	Action
<b>1</b>	<b>Meeting chaired by Lawrence Shackman</b>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Review of minutes and outstanding actions South Community Forum 25 April 2012</b>	
<b>2.1</b>	LS reiterated the purpose of Forum meetings – including that: In the first instance, individual issues should be dealt with by CLOs or through correspondence / email. Observers are welcome to attend, but should not participate in the meeting.	Noted
<b>2.2</b>	Minutes were approved for EDT to post on website	Noted
<b>2.4</b>	<b>Outstanding actions paper</b> Circulated in advance of meeting	
<b>SCF230811/ 8.2</b>	<b>Community review and feedback on Environmental Management Plans (EMPs)</b> Covered under agenda item 7.4	Noted
<b>SCF230811/ 8.7</b>	<b>CoCP Variations</b> EW to forward notes to EDT.	EW
<b>SCF310112/ 2.3b</b>	<b>South Approach/Access Roads</b> Covered under agenda item 7.7	Noted
<b>SCF230811/ 1.1</b>	<b>(2.5/1.1) Ground Water Report</b> EM confirmed that report is complete and copies had been hand delivered to those that had requested a copy.	Noted
<b>SCF230811/ 7.2</b>	<b>(2.5 / 7.2) Compensation</b> DT asked to be removed from action as it was not appropriate for him to forward details of other claimants.	Noted
<b>SCF011111/ 3a</b>	<b>(3) CGI Model</b> EM confirmed model is complete – due to file size this has not been posted on the FRC website at present, but will be available to view at CEC when it opens. DCh confirmed that model shows progression of works through to completion based on a timeline.  EM to arrange presentation of CGI model at South Community Forum in the new year.	Noted  FCBC
<b>SCF011111/ 3b</b>	<b>(3) FRC Traffic alerts</b> Link from the FRC to Traffic Scotland website has been provided.	Complete
<b>SCF011111/ 7.2a</b>	<b>(7.2) Property condition surveys</b> Information re structural surveys supplied as post-meeting	Complete

Continued

<p><b>SCF011111/ 7.2b</b></p>	<p>note.  EM confirmed that property condition surveys have been offered to all relevant households and those that accepted have been completed. After the project is complete these will be used as a baseline and the properties will be re-surveyed.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>SCF011111/ 7.3</b></p>	<p><b>(7.3) Pollution monitoring</b> EM and EW confirmed issue of location of Frisbee guage at Dudington Crescent had been resolved.</p>	<p>Complete</p>
<p><b>SCF011111/ 7.3c</b></p>	<p>EW queried if TEOM (automatic air quality monitor) at Main Street, Newton is listed as a location in the pollution monitoring documents? EM to check and advise EW.</p>	<p>FCBC</p>
<p><b>SCF011111/ 7.3d</b></p>	<p>EW asked, if historical data is available, will it be reported and also asked if monitoring figures will be provided monthly? LS said that TS publish the data on the FRC website frequently and would check the current status with the Environmental Team.</p>	<p>EDT</p>
<p><b>SCF011111/ 7.3a</b></p>	<p>EM confirmed that automatic scatter meter was still at Echline Corner but confusion might have arisen if it was being serviced off site.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>SCF011111/ 7.3b</b></p>	<p>Clarification of J1a monitoring locations provided in minutes dated 31 January 2012.</p>	<p>Complete</p>
<p><b>SCF310112/ 3.2</b></p>	<p><b>Bus hard shoulder running/variable speed limits</b> LS confirmed that the Traffic Regulation Orders which are required to implement the mandatory variable speed limits and introduce bus hard shoulder running are being progressed as follows. For Fife ITS a consultation report in respect of the Order was published on the FRC website with the Order coming into force on 1 September 2012 at the earliest. For M9 J1a a similar Order is being progressed and is currently at the consultation stage which ends on 5 Nov.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>SCF310112/ 3.3</b></p>	<p><b>General Vesting Declaration / CPOs</b> LS confirmed that as of 20 August, 84 claims had been received from a potential 316 owners/occupiers. Three claims have been settled in full, 10 in part and negotiations are ongoing with a number of others.  EDT to provide update at next meeting.</p>	<p>Noted  EDT</p>
<p><b>SCF310112/ 7.1a</b></p>	<p><b>Notice Board Locations</b> EM/EW confirmed notice board has been installed in</p>	<p>Complete</p>

Continued

Page 4 of 16

	Newton.	
<b>SCF310112/7.1b</b>	<p><b>Temporary Footpath</b> EM confirmed the path was being used by local residents and note had been sent to Newton CC.</p> <p>LC asked FCBC to consider adding gravel to the path. EM Noted.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
<b>SCF250412/3.1</b>	<p><b>Community Forum presentations</b> April presentations were made available to Forum Members as would future presentations.</p> <p><b>Post Meeting Note:</b> Unfortunately due to Government accessibility standards presentations are unable to be published on the FRC website. However, copies are available on request.</p>	Noted
<b>SCF250412/7.2a</b>	<p><b>Signage on West Lothian approach</b> LS confirmed this was reviewed by the Traffic Management Working Group (TMWG) including the local authorities and the police, but not considered appropriate/necessary. However, additional, larger speed limit signs were installed along the A904 to reinforce the 30mph limit and the police confirmed they would monitor the situation. DW confirmed vehicle activation signs were deployed by CEC for 4 weeks and these will be switched to the B800 near Dundas Home Farm to address speeding issues at that location.</p> <p><b>Post Meeting Note:</b> Police with hand held speed cameras were noted operating on the A904 west of Echline roundabout on 22 August.</p>	Noted
<b>SCF210812/2.4</b>	<p><b>Q</b> Query if speed checks could be implemented on the A904 West Lothian approach using Automatic Traffic Counters (ATCs)?</p> <p><b>A</b> DW to check if speed data can be sourced from ATCs and, if available, forward data to TMWG to analyse if there is an issue that needs to be addressed. LS to advise TMWG that the existing vehicle activated signs are going to be removed from the A904.</p>	CEC/EDT
<b>SCF250412/8.1</b>	<p><b>FRC Website</b> LS confirmed that the website had been updated and would be updated on an on-going basis.</p>	Complete
<b>SCF250412/8.2</b>	<p><b>Bo'ness Road Land</b> LS confirmed that placement of the sign was a legal requirement before TS takes possession of the land where the landowner is unknown.</p>	Noted

<b>SCF250412/ 8.3</b>	<b>Road Surface between 1&amp;2 Echline and B924</b> LS confirmed a new surface has been laid and the situation will be monitored.	Noted
<b>SCF250412/8.4</b>	<b>M9 J1a Community Forum</b> LS confirmed that the meeting had not taken place in May due to the resignation of Kirkliston CC's representative, but a meeting was planned for 22 August.	Noted
<b>3</b>	<b>Update from Employers Delivery Team (EDT)</b>	
<b>3.1</b>	<b>General</b> LS provided EDT update presentation.	Noted
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Contact &amp; Education Centre</b> LS emphasised that the Contact and Education Centre will be open later this year. A facility will be provided for organisations and schools to book visits. The Traffic Control Centre section will start a phased entry from late this year to be operational in early 2013.	Noted
<b>4</b>	<b>John Graham (Dromore) Ltd (Fife ITS Contract)</b>	
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Progress update and 3 month look ahead</b>  RD provided presentation of works progress with project overview and look ahead – including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- photos showing extent of works</li> <li>- on-site works are largely complete</li> <li>- south bound carriageway resurfacing is complete</li> <li>- one cantilever gantry has been installed</li> <li>- the remaining gantry beams are being fitted out and tested, 5 will be installed at the end of August and then commissioned, the remainder (12) will be installed during September.</li> <li>- LS advised the bus lane will be operational when the gantry installation is complete.</li> </ul>	Noted
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Traffic management</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Traffic management measures on M90 were removed during July and August</li> <li>- August/September will see night time rolling road closures while the gantry beams are installed, this will take place during Monday to Friday and no major disruptions are anticipated.</li> </ul> <p><b>Q</b> How will public find out about the traffic management measures during August/September? <b>A</b> Measures will be discussed with the TMWG and are likely to follow the same protocols as the M9 J1a gantry installations e.g. information on Traffic Scotland and FRC websites and variable message signs. LS emphasised that</p>	Noted  Noted

SCF210812/ 4.2	the impacts are relatively minor as the maximum night time delay is 30 mins.  RD to forward Fife ITS traffic management information to Community Councils when available.	John Graham Construction
<b>5</b>	<b>John Sisk and Roadbridge (M9 Junction 1a Contract)</b>	
5.1	<p><b>Progress update and 3 month look ahead</b></p> <p>EB provided presentation of works progress with project overview and look ahead – including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- photos showing extent of works (as at 3 July) with verbal update on significant progress since then</li> <li>- eastbound diverge – embankments complete, road surface to be applied shortly</li> <li>- westbound merge – almost complete, pavement laid, safety barriers to be introduced soon</li> <li>- new part of loop – road surfacing nearly complete; barriers, signs and road lines to be progressed soon</li> <li>- southbound merge – part complete with noise barriers to be erected by end of August (weather dependant)</li> <li>- M9 overbridge – 10 to 12 weeks for full completion (i.e. end of November)</li> <li>- Overton Road Bridge – bridge element to be complete in 2 weeks, followed by road surfacing</li> <li>- Newmains Bridge – formwork/wall on south side is in place, began pouring concrete for north wall yesterday, final pour on Monday, complete works by November</li> <li>- Community liaison – further tidy-up works have been undertaken at Kirkliston Primary School and in supporting the environmental access improvements by Pikes Pool volunteer group.</li> </ul> <p>EB confirmed there had been a reduction in enquiries as the project nears completion.</p>	Noted
5.2	<p><b>Traffic Management</b></p> <p>EB provided presentation of traffic management measures including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- M9 overbridge – some intermittent overnight closures required</li> <li>- Overton Road Bridge – aiming to re-open road by mid-September</li> <li>- Newmains Bridge – very short road closures (holding traffic for 10 to 15 mins – maximum of 30 mins) required on 30 (also possibly 31) August to allow lifting of beams, between 9.30am and 3.30pm</li> </ul>	Noted

SCF210812/ 5.2	<p>and possibly after 7pm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Hard shoulder running to be retained until end of September</li> <li>- Echelon paving (resurfacing) works are planned for whole of M9 and M9 spur area from end of September for 8 consecutive weekends, this will involve overnight closures. LS emphasised this will be major works and advanced publicity/advertising will be undertaken and will encourage people to avoid the area and use alternative routes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Post Meeting Note:</b> The M9 and M9 Spur resurfacing works are now due to commence over 4 to 6 weekends commencing 5 Oct and will include overnight works during the week.</p> <p><b>Q</b> Query if alternative route to airport had been considered?  <b>A</b> LS confirmed that all routes will have been considered by the TMWG and diversions will be included in the plans.</p> <p><b>Q</b> Query if traffic management information will be included on Edinburgh Airport website?  <b>A</b> EB confirmed Edinburgh Airport is consulted. EB to check if notifications will/can be added to Edinburgh Airport website.</p>	Noted  SRB
6	<b>Forth Crossing Bridge Constructors (Principal Contract)</b>	
6.1	<p><b>Progress update and 3 month look ahead</b></p> <p>EM provided presentation of works progress with project overview and look ahead including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- photos showing extent of works</li> <li>- scope of works - main crossing</li> <li>- project summary</li> <li>- foundations – including caissons installation process (the temporary parts of caissons are to be added over next few weeks), beamer rock, excavation and dredging to continue until Christmas, concrete pouring anticipated to begin October/November</li> <li>- connecting roads north and south – including new Ferrytoll alignment</li> <li>- south compound offices are complete</li> <li>- Scottish Power and Scottish Water diversions are near complete</li> <li>- testing of the cables is taking place</li> <li>- Work at Linn Mill SUDS pond to begin soon for approximately 6 weeks</li> </ul>	Noted

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Construction of noise bunds at Dundas Home Farm are to begin soon</li> <li>- Soil stripping is to begin for 2 to 3 months working towards Echline from the A904 and also for the southbound bus link.</li> </ul> <p><b>Q</b> Query re where stripped soil around the Queensferry junction area is taken to?</p> <p><b>A</b> EM confirmed that topsoil is stored on site and used for re-soiling later in the works whilst other earthworks materials are used for construction e.g. for noise bunds and the A904 west embankment.</p> <p>EM confirmed in addition to the new newsletter, a flyer with details of upcoming works will be issued shortly.</p> <p><b>Q</b> Are the marine works on schedule as there was suggested external feedback that they were not?</p> <p><b>A</b> EM confirmed they are very much on schedule.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
6.2	<p><b>Traffic management</b> EM presentation covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- On-going rock blasting (fortnightly) at Whinny Hill will continue for 2 months and will require a nighttime rolling road block on A90 (up to 30 minutes) along with Castlandhill Road closures for 1 hour and stopping traffic on B980 for 30 mins.</li> <li>- Closure of the B981 is required for 10 mins to accommodate further rock blasts at St Margaret's Hope (complete in 2 weeks)</li> <li>- In September, Ferrytoll Road utility works will require temp traffic lights with single lane running.</li> </ul>	Noted
7	<b>Community Issues</b>	
7.1	<p><b>HGVs parking at Ferrymuir/HGV movements throughout Queensferry</b></p> <p>TA indicated there had been a number of residents approaching QDCC re trucks holding up traffic and concerns re the general increase in traffic movements through the burgh as a result of construction. QDCC are seeking reassurance that plans are in place and contractors are aware of what is and is not allowed. EM emphasised that firms are briefed but this needs to be a continual process to prevent lapses.</p> <p><b>Q</b> Do you have a policy re restricted routes?</p> <p><b>A</b> EM confirmed all orders to sub-contractors are issued with route restrictions and that they must sign up to meet them.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

Continued

<p><b>SCF210812/ 7.1a</b></p>	<p>The application to increase the number of loads from Niddry Bing from 100 to 200 per day was noted. LC believed this was considerably in excess of the number quoted at the Assessor hearing.</p> <p><b>Q</b> LC asked if all the increased trips related to the FRC project and EW asked if agreed thresholds would be breached?  <b>A</b> EM to liaise with LS, check figures and provide response.</p> <p>EW confirmed that Newton CC will seek to discuss this issue with the planning authority and FCBC.</p> <p>DW confirmed CEC is still to negotiate re this issue with FCBC and discussions with West Lothian Council are also required.</p> <p>LS emphasised that when M9J1a opens there is the potential to encourage vehicles to avoid the A904 area and this could offset an increase in HGV numbers from Niddry.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>FCBC / EDT</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p><b>SCF210812/ 7.1b</b></p>	<p><b>Q</b> EW asked if information re contractors, routes, voluntary speed restrictions, constraints etc could be made available?  <b>A</b> EM confirmed FCBC will make this information available along with other information relevant to the discussion.</p>	<p>FCBC</p>
<p><b>SCF210812/ 7.1c</b></p>	<p>EW highlighted potential problems with vehicles standing/waiting in advance of time constraints and creating queue or blind spots.</p> <p><b>Q</b> DT highlighted newspaper article re potential contractor from Lesley, Fife, delivering rock and requiring to travel across the FRB. He asked if this was accurate?  <b>A</b> EM was not aware of this - EM to check and add post minute note.</p> <p><b>Post Meeting Note:</b> The supplier in question supplies concrete for the north network connections and has no order to supply rock or earthworks materials.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>FCBC</p>
<p><b>7.2</b></p>	<p><b>Flooding at Echline, Springfield and Society Road</b>          LS recognised that the flooding on the 18 July had been a major event in both South Queensferry and elsewhere in the eastern central belt and empathized with the residents who had been affected by the flooding. LS confirmed that a copy of the projects report together with an action plan had been issued to a range of interested parties. LS highlighted that the drainage measures installed were</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<p><b>SCF210812/7.2a</b></p>	<p>designed for 'normal' rainfall events and that the sustained levels of rainfall which had saturated the ground over the weeks leading up to the 18 July, followed by the intense rainfall event on the day itself had overwhelmed the drainage system. The action plan measures will significantly reduce the effect of rainfall under similar circumstances in the future.</p> <p><b>Q</b> DR asked when there would be a permanent solution?  <b>A</b> LS stated that the completed project (in the Queensferry Junction area) would be based on a cutting and would incorporate modern road drainage – the national design standards (DMRB) used for this project were modified some 6 or 7 years ago to take into account climate change i.e. greater capacity through increased pipe sizes (by 20% compared with the previous standards).</p> <p>LC said that the area had been flooded nine times and he had yet to see a TS representative on site. LS stated that, for example, a rep from TS together with other members of the EDT had been on site on the 18 July. EM also confirmed EDT representatives had been on site.</p> <p>LS confirmed he and JW had visited two householders who had registered complaints with TS in relation to the flooding on 18 July. DT queried why TS had not visited more who had complained - LS stated that no other complaints had been received and that it was inappropriate to visit a household without being contacted by them.</p> <p><b>Q</b> LC asked when the 300 metre pipe laid across the road as an emergency measure had been planned?  <b>A</b> LS/EM confirmed this was after the event on the 4 July.</p> <p><b>Q</b> LC asked if there had been no prior plans to take site drainage across the A904?  <b>A</b> LS said he was unable to confirm this as the relevant experts were not at this meeting. FCBC to provide post meeting note</p> <p><b>Post Meeting Note:</b> Detailed planning on site evolves with the project as the work progresses. The plan to install a pipe across the A904 was conceived at the appropriate time and actioned when required.</p> <p><b>Q</b> LC asked if it was Transport Scotland's responsibility to provide records of existing drainage to their contractor?  <b>A</b> LS explained that all available records were supplied at tender stage but that there were elements of the existing</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>FCBC</p> <p>Noted</p>
------------------------------	---	---

	<p>drainage recently discovered that TS was not aware of.</p> <p><b>Q</b> DT asked if the report was a final version?  <b>A</b> LS confirmed that, whilst the report is currently stated as interim, if nothing else is found or changes, the report is likely to be final.</p> <p><b>Q</b> DT asked if the Ground Water or Surface Management Plan has been approved by TS?  <b>A</b> LS stated that he understood that the revised version was close to being completed.</p> <p>DT emphasised that the EMP and COCP indicated a clear requirement from the contractor to supply a Risk Mitigation Plan to minimise flooding and that concerns re flooding had been raised at the Assessor's hearing in 2010 and at the Community Forum. DT was concerned that the report quotes "minor" flooding at U221/A904 junction which does not do justice to seriousness of the issue. Photographs are available if required.</p> <p><b>Q</b> LC/DT asked, given the contractor's responsibility and TS role in overseeing the contractor, who is responsible for this issue?  <b>A</b> LS/EM emphasised that the report is a project report (FCBC and EDT/TS in consultation with CEC) and confirms the stance of the project team – i.e. measures/drainage should have catered for normal flooding, but these were exceptional circumstances. LS again emphasised that many areas in the central belt were also flooded.</p> <p><b>Q</b> DT indicated that as far back as the Independent Assessors Hearings (see minutes) EDT representative, Mr Mellon, had recorded water was flowing from land that had been hard packed as a result of project activities.  <b>A</b> LS emphasised that the project report contained the project stance on the matter.</p> <p><b>Q</b> DT asked if the report was approved by CEC?  <b>A</b> DW confirmed that CEC had not completed their Flood Report and were still in discussion with EDT and had yet to comment on final report. DW emphasised that the mitigation measures put in place were second to none and he was confident there would not be a similar incident. LS confirmed that the report was sufficient for household insurance purposes.</p> <p><b>Q</b> DT asked how should flooded householders contact the project?  <b>A</b> LS confirmed that normal project contact number and</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	---	--

	<p>email should be used.</p> <p><b>Q</b> TA said QDCC had received one complaint re flooding on west side of South Queensferry whilst they had received a number of complaints from the Scotstoun area. TA asked how many people had contacted BRIGS? <b>A</b> DT said 11 had been in contact.</p> <p><b>Q</b> DT asked who was responsible for the flooding at Echline / Springfield, as the flood report does not state this? <b>A</b> LS replied that 'the Report says what it says' and he refused to add any further comments to this question.</p> <p><b>Q</b> EW asked if road drainage responsibilities were shared by CEC and Scottish Water. <b>A</b> DW explained that CEC has responsibility for some sections. For the permanent design, CEC is responsible for local roads and TS the trunk roads. Any measures require consultation with Scottish Water.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
7.3	<p><b>Emergency complaints procedures and summary of complaints and actions taken</b> LC highlighted that there had been an issue with a lack of a suitable response from the FRC project helpline on 18 July, the night of the flooding. LS stated that FCBC had reinforced their contact protocols to deal effectively with future contacts and provided assurances to EDT that the issue described would not occur in the future. DW confirmed that CEC has placed Echline on a priority response list.</p> <p><b>Q</b> Query if emergency response plan exists and appropriate people from project can be reached? <b>A</b> EM confirmed those manning the hotline out of hours have all the appropriate contact numbers, but these would not be published as they contain personal information.</p> <p>LC/DT hoped that the project helpline would respond as quickly and effectively as CEC.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
7.4 SCF210812/ 7.4a	<p><b>Environmental Management Plan (EMP) and outstanding response to feedback submitted by BRIGS</b> LS confirmed various part of the revised EMP are now on the website as an updated draft. Comments have been requested by 7 September.</p> <p>LS confirmed that a few more sections have to be added, but for these there would be an extended deadline for responses. DCh confirmed the deadline for FCBC for</p>	<p>Community Reps</p> <p>Noted</p>

Continued

<p><b>SCF210812/ 7.4b</b></p> <p><b>SCF210812/ 7.4c</b></p>	<p>supplying final draft versions was 24 August and these would be posted on the website soon after.</p> <p>FCBC agreed to provide paper copies on request.</p> <p>LS/DCh confirmed that a session was to be organised for Newton CC for the project team to feedback on their comments – this to follow consideration of the next set of comments. DCh agreed this can be extended to BRIGS if required.</p> <p>LS emphasised these are live documents and may be subject to further change.</p>	<p>FCBC/Community Reps</p> <p>EDT/FCBC/ Community Reps</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p><b>7.5</b></p> <p><b>SCF210812/ 7.5</b></p>	<p><b>Status of Echline gyratory and A904 re-alignment plans</b> LS proposed that a public meeting be organised when detailed plans are available to brief the public on proposed sequence of works and traffic management measures for the new Queensferry Junction. This is likely to take place Oct/Nov. The format could include afternoon and evening presentations. EDT/FCBC to organise.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note:</b> This event will be held in early 2013.</p>	<p>EDT/FCBC</p>
<p><b>7.6</b></p> <p><b>SCF210812/ 7.6</b></p>	<p><b>Status of Hydro-geological Ground Water Table Investigation Report</b> EDT/FCBC agreed to publish report on FRC website.</p>	<p>EDT</p>
<p><b>7.7</b></p>	<p><b>Traffic flow statistics between M9 Spur and A904</b> LS provided analysis of traffic flows recorded at the counter near to the A904 Newton layby which showed that between July 2011 and July 2012 they have remained broadly similar (accounting for seasonal peaks and troughs). Like the rest of the UK, LS noted this indicates vehicle growth has not increased at levels originally predicted, possibly due to the economic downturn.</p> <p>LS also provided a best estimate of traffic flows on the A904 between Echline Corner and Echline Junction (no actual counter exists for this length of A904). LS confirmed EDT would be happy to consider a traffic count on this length at a later date to confirm the actual flows.</p> <p>LS emphasised that it would be difficult to compare figures in the Environmental Statement (ES) with the actual flows as these were based on there being a larger compound in the south and a different strategy on building the FRC bridge.</p> <p>There was a discussion re location of counters and where</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

<p><b>SCF210812/7.7a</b> <b>SCF210812/7.7b</b></p>	<p>counter information could be sourced – e.g. TS or CEC websites.</p> <p>CEC to check historical data for A904.</p> <p>CEC and EDT to cross reference information including M9 Spur and, if available, HGV data. EDT to supply update – including clarity re the A904 traffic flow of 16,500 previously quoted by TS and figure of 13,500 quoted by CEC.</p> <p>EW emphasised that Newton CC would like the raw data on which the original traffic predictions were based in order to understand and comment on the base assumptions and the projections after scheme opening (i.e. 2005 model and 2016).</p> <p><b>Post-meeting Note:</b> Historical traffic count data is available at:</p> <p><a href="http://www.transportscotland.gov.uk/road/technology/traffic-count/map-application">http://www.transportscotland.gov.uk/road/technology/traffic-count/map-application</a>.</p> <p>Details of the transport model used in the assessment of the project can be found in the DMRB Stage 3 Scheme Assessment Report; Part 2: Engineering, Traffic and Economic Assessment, with particular reference to sections 5 &amp; 6. This report can be found at:</p> <p><a href="http://www.transportscotland.gov.uk/strategy-and-research/publications-and-consultations/j11352-00.htm">http://www.transportscotland.gov.uk/strategy-and-research/publications-and-consultations/j11352-00.htm</a></p>	<p>CEC</p> <p>CEC/EDT</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p><b>SCF210812/7.7c</b></p>	<p>EW also asked if there was any available data for predicted traffic movements during construction? EDT to check.</p> <p><b>Post Meeting Note:</b> Estimates of the predicted traffic movements during construction are provided in the Environmental Statement, with particular reference to Appendix A4.1. This report can be found at:</p> <p><a href="http://www.transportscotland.gov.uk/strategy-and-research/publications-and-consultations/j11223-033.htm">http://www.transportscotland.gov.uk/strategy-and-research/publications-and-consultations/j11223-033.htm</a></p> <p><b>Q</b> Query re recent appointment by TS of consultants to undertake modeling and provide stats, and if they would provide updated FRC figures?</p> <p><b>A</b> LS explained these tended to focus on overall effects on the road network and would not provide detailed FRC project specific information.</p>	<p>EDT</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p><b>8</b></p>	<p><b>Next Community Forums (proposed)</b></p>	

Continued

8.1	<p>North Community Forum - 20 November 2012</p> <p>M9 Junction 1a Community Forum - 21 November 2012</p> <p>South Community Forum - 28 November 2012</p>	Noted
9	<b>AoB</b>	
<p>9.1</p> <p><b>SCF210812/</b></p> <p>9.1</p>	<p><b>Society Road</b></p> <p><b>Q</b> Query re responsibility for addressing large hole on Society Road?</p> <p><b>A</b> EM/DW to check.</p> <p>DW and EM agreed to meet at Society Road the following day to investigate. LS emphasised that there was provision in the contract to reconstruct the length of Society Road in the vicinity of the FRC bridge and added that the project would look at the possibility of undertaking these works at an early stage.</p> <p><b>Post Meeting Note:</b> CEC mobilised resource to fill pothole on 22 August 2012.</p>	<p>FCBC/CEC</p> <p>Noted</p>
9.2	<p><b>Scottish Water Diversion Works on B800</b></p> <p>LS emphasised that phased works will take place from Sept for 10 weeks and that letters have been issued to households. Phase 2 will take place in February 2013.</p> <p><b>Q</b> DT asked if a press release will be issued?</p> <p><b>A</b> LS confirmed this was unlikely as it will be minor off peak works and no road closures are planned. Scottish Water, however, will notify residents if there are any planned disruptions to the water the supply.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p>9.3</p> <p><b>SCF210812/</b></p> <p>9.3</p>	<p><b>Newton Traffic calming measures</b></p> <p>LS indicated that there had been one objection but that West Lothian Council had still indicated that work should be able to start by the end of October.</p> <p>EW indicated that legal advice indicated that this start date was very unlikely and it may go to PLI unless the objector withdraws by 22 August.</p> <p>LS to add a post meeting note following update on objector position.</p> <p><b>Post Meeting Note:</b> One objection has been registered and will require to be taken through the relevant processes These works will be progressed following resolution of this objection.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>EDT</p>
9.4	<b>B924 Pedestrian Crossing</b>	

Continued

Page 16 of 16

	LS confirmed no objections have been received and work is scheduled to being in May next year.	Noted
<b>9.5</b>	<b>ITS/Bus hard shoulder running</b> LS confirmed leaflets are being prepared as part of education campaign for public and bus drivers.	Noted
<b>9.6</b>	<b>FRC Newsletter</b> LS confirmed new project newsletter is due to be published on Fri 24 August.	Noted
<b>9.7</b>	<b>Meeting with Linn Mill residents</b> LS confirmed meeting is planned on 5 September re noise mitigation and representatives from the Noise Liaison Working Group will attend.	Noted