



# Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (South) Minutes

**Meeting  
Location**

Dakota Hotel

**Meeting  
Date/Time**

16 June 2011 - 7pm

Our Ref

**Subject**

Community Forum (South)

Your Ref

**Participants**

**Community Representatives**

Evelyn Woollen (Newton CC)  
Doug Tait (BRIGS)  
Doug Ross (QDCC)  
Bert Scott (BRIGS)  
Murray McLaren (BRIGS)  
Henryk Zukowski (Kirkliston CC)

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

Lawrence Shackman  
Ross Hornsey  
Andrew Pope  
Keavy O'Neill  
Allan Buchan (c/o Big Partnership)

**Forth Crossing Bridge  
Constructors (FCBC)**

Carlo Germani  
Ewen Macdonell  
Derek Chambers  
Scott Chalmers

**Observers**

Two South Queensferry Residents

**Cc**

**Date** of 24 August 2011  
**Distribution**

## Continued

Page 2 of 18

Notes		Action
	Meeting chaired by Lawrence Shackman	
1	<b>Project Overview</b>	
1.1	<p><b>Contract award updates</b></p> <p>LS outlined that the main purpose of first Community Forum was to introduce representatives from the Forth Crossing Bridge Constructors (FCBC), the consortium awarded the Principal Contract on 18th April.</p> <p>Regarding the additional contracts LS confirmed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fife ITS - John Graham had been awarded the contract on 10 June and would attend the next meeting</li> <li>- Junction 1a - Transport Scotland was currently assessing 4 tenders and is on-schedule to award this contract in July</li> </ul> <p>LS confirmed that formal meetings of other liaison groups – Traffic Management, Noise, Marine and Environment would have their agendas published and minutes published as agreed under the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>TS</p>
1.2	<p><b>Contact &amp; Education Centre (C&amp;EC)</b></p> <p>LS confirmed that the tender documents for construction of the C&amp;EC will be issued on 17<sup>th</sup> June to five companies following a prequalification competition.. A temporary C&amp;EC will be opened at FETA's offices in early July to deal initially with pre-construction preparatory works. The Community Liaison Officers (CLOs) for each contract will be based there until the new facility is built – this is scheduled for completion by August 2012 with fitting out completed approximately one month later.</p>	Noted

2	<b>Introduction to FCBC</b>	
2.1	<p><b>Overview of programme works</b></p> <p>Carlo Germani (CG), FCBC Project Director, outlined the background to FCBC.</p> <p>The consortium consists of four companies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dragados,</li> <li>- Hochtief,</li> <li>- American Bridge International and</li> <li>- Morrison Construction.</li> </ul> <p>CG explained that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it was a fantastic opportunity and privilege to be involved in the FRC project.</li> <li>- the consortium would act as one group rather than four separate companies – i.e. people from each company would be seconded to the consortium</li> <li>- the current focus for work is on progressing the detailed designs before construction can commence. The design work is being carried out in Copenhagen and is progressing well. Detailed design work is expected to be completed Oct / Nov 2011.</li> <li>- FCBC has moved into temporary offices in Rosyth and is currently mobilising staff</li> </ul> <p>LS explained that the FRC Employer’s Team from Transport Scotland and its joint venture, Jacobs Arup, would be co-located in these offices from 1 August 2011. The temporary office will be used until late autumn as, by early winter, a larger office would be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a focus for the next few months will be fitting the temporary offices, mobilising staff and reviewing the potential locations for the permanent offices and construction compound facilities. There are various options under review, for example, there may be potential for greater use of the north-side in the port area of Rosyth, however this has not yet been finalised.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

## Continued

2.2	<p>Following Questions from the forum, CG confirmed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The potential to locate on the north side of the Forth is one option being reviewed. Even if site installations were located in the north there would still need to be sites in the south, although this would likely be smaller. A firm view on this will be available by the August Community Forum meeting.</li> <li>• Jacobs Arup (on behalf of Transport Scotland) produced the conceptual design to promote the scheme. We then develop this in compliance with the Forth Crossing Act and Environmental Statement etc, any changes will be very minor. The overall configuration must be within the constraints of the Act.</li> <li>• The final designs will not be published as the project is based on the contract requirements.</li> <li>• Several different scale models will be produced. These will be produced after the detailed design is completed and will be placed in the C&amp;EC.</li> <li>• FCBC is also committed to produce a computer generated animation which will show progress through the various construction phases and is anticipated to be available in 6 to 8 months depending on design development.</li> <li>• CG emphasised that, as an international group of companies, they would seek to not just engage with but integrate with the community to be part of it - particularly as staff would be relocating, many with families, to the area.</li> <li>• FCBC estimate to have a maximum office staff of around 180 people at the peak. In addition, the workforce will range from 500 to 1,000 employees, many of whom will be recruited locally.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
version 2.0 – date of issue: 24 August 2011 – minutes of meeting – south forum 16 June 2011		

## Continued

Page 5 of 18

2.3	<b>FCBC Introductions</b>  The other members of the FCBC team present introduced themselves: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- <b>Ewen Macdonell</b> - Community Liaison Team.</li><li>- <b>Derek Chambers</b> – FCBC Corporate Social Responsibility Manager from Morrison Construction. This role brings together project elements such as health &amp; safety, environmental issues, quality management, training and community relations.</li><li>- <b>Scott Chalmers</b> is FCBC Commercial Director and has worked for Morrison Construction since 2003.</li></ul>	Noted
-----	--	-------

## Continued

2.4	<p>Following further questions from the forum, the following was confirmed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FCBC are yet to fully consider the commitments made to the local communities as the project is at an early stage. FCBC are not presuming anything as every project is different. We want to find out about your concerns and find out how to address them.</li> <li>• The Employer's Team will share the same offices as FCBC through the duration of the project. Transport Scotland will be involved in ensuring your expectations, as laid out in the Act and CoCP, are met.</li> <li>• The Employers Team have shared relevant issues and information with the contractor through the tender process and this will continue through construction.</li> <li>• FCBC believe we will only have a successful relationship with the client if we have a successful relationship with the community. A major part of the organisation will be focused on working with the community.</li> <li>• FCBC will seek to take into account local needs, but we might get to the point where we can't accommodate them. If we can't it is important we explain the reasons why – if people understand, they are generally accepting.</li> <li>• A separate Community Forum for J1a will be established once the contractor is on board and FCBC is aware of the other project impacting on Kirkliston. It was suggested that as the Dalmeny Cord project progresses it may be appropriate that representatives of Network Rail join the Junction 1a forum.</li> <li>• Autumn 2013 is a backstop date for completion of the J1a works, but the Employer wants to get J1a built as soon as possible. The timing of the south approach roads for the main crossing are to be confirmed by FCBC in its project programme – and they will try to bring this to the next meeting.</li> <li>• FCBC need to provide detailed construction plans to the Employer 28 days after commencement. FCBC should have comments back and should be able to present an indicative timeline by the next meeting. CG offered once detailed plans were available an open workshop with FCBC planners could be arranged to go through the plans in detail if there was community inter</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>TS/FCBC</p> <p>TS/FCBC</p> <p>TS/FCBC</p> <p>Noted</p>
version 2.0 – date of issue: 24 August 2011 – minutes of meeting – south forum 16 June 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The intention is to bring to each Community Forum a forward plan for the next three months showing the split of activities between the three contractors.</li> <li>• High level programme information will be made available to the Community Forums. This will give</li> </ul>	

## Continued

Page 7 of 18

	<p>a high level of community interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• TS can provide a six month overall plan but some things may change due to, for example, the weather. The intention is to bring a detailed three month look ahead plan to these meetings. This will help in identifying what, when and how we need to communicate to the wider community and co-ordinate press activity / maildrops etc.</li></ul>	TS/FCBC
2.5	<p><b>Enquiries and complaints procedure</b></p> <p><i>NB discussed as part of item 4.</i></p>	Noted

## Continued

3	Approval of Terms of Reference	
3.1	<p>LS explained that these had been redrafted based on comments from the last meeting. LS highlighted that, at the previous night's meeting, the three community councils from the North were happy to approve the document for publication.</p> <p>LS asked if the representatives from the south were content to approve these for publication?</p> <p>EW highlighted points Newton would like updated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Re point 3a – Newton requested that “throughout construction period” be added to ensure site made good/reinstatement period is covered in construction period.</li> </ul> <p>LS emphasised that, the Community Forum meetings would continue post bridge opening to ensure all issues are resolved. This could also include maintenance issues. This needs to be clarified in the ToR's.</p> <p>HZ highlighted example that, despite repeated requests, part of the Morrison's site compound for M9 spur had still not been removed and was creating issues with travelers using the site.</p> <p>EM to investigate and report back.</p> <p>CG highlighted key difference with joint venture is that all facilities and equipment are priced for this contract and are logged on an asset register. Given these assets are valued and included in the results, there is an incentive to remove these and reinstate the land as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>TS</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>FCBC Noted</p>

## Continued

	<p>- Re point 4.11 – Newton CC would like the text amended to avoid discouraging membership by other community organisations. Newton CC would prefer if extracts from code were used - e.g. the four principles. Newton CC felt the full code is inappropriate as members would be expected to declare a “vested interest” and remove themselves from discussion when the whole point is to represent vested interests. Suggested amending point to say that community councils are expected to reflect their own code of conduct, if extant.</p> <p>DT asked that BRIGS own code of conduct be recognised because, as a non-statutory organisation, it cannot comply with the Community Council Code. DT highlighted discrepancy in previous workshop minutes in that community members believed it was agreed that its code would be applicable. DT asked that the wording be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>RH emphasised that the Terms and Code were intended to encapsulate the general principles of respect to prevent conflict at these meetings. The intention was not to get members to draft a code or sign up to a code.</p> <p>TS to review wording to highlight the key principles and that primacy is given to each organisation’s own code of practice.</p> <p>DT asked that the Terms be amended to explain how to introduce new members.</p> <p>RH emphasise that while there is no intention of excluding anyone from the Forum, it would not be productive or manageable if they became, in effect, public meetings.</p> <p>EW felt it would be appropriate to clarify the wording for adding and removing members to avoid this issue becoming contentious later.</p> <p>HZ agreed, highlighting that residents may want to be kept informed of key points.</p> <p>LS highlighted that the Forum was developed as a means of liaising with Community Councils and recognised groups in order to help identify what broader communications is required – i.e. how, when and by what means to communicate to the wider public.</p> <p>RH explained that TS hoped to avoid creating barriers to join the Forum and that was why the wording focused on “other local established groups considered appropriate by the Forum”.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>TS</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p>version 2.0 – date of issue: 24 August 2011 – minutes of meeting – south forum 16 June 2011</p>		

## Continued

Page 10 of 18

	<p>RH to redraft Terms to indicate that groups are invited to apply to join and the Forum members will take a view on the appropriateness of applications.</p> <p>These changes to be recirculated and highlighted to north representatives for re-approval.</p> <p>Re point 2.1 – DT asked that “BRIGS” be added after “Newton CC</p> <p>Q (EW) Asked if the Terms of Reference need be common to all three Forums? A (RH) The intention is to have consistency and transparency but, at a later stage if there is substantial differences, they can be amended.</p> <p>MM suggested adding membership lists and joining details as an appendix RH to consider in redraft. It is the intention to finalise the ToR’s at the next forum.</p>	<p>TS</p> <p>TS</p> <p>TS</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>TS</p>
--	--	--



## Continued

Page 12 of 18

4.2	<p><b>Complaints procedure</b></p> <p>RH outlined that complaints procedures are in preparation.</p> <p><b>Q (EW)</b> Asked for clarification that this (EWC) was not the full complaints procedure?</p> <p><b>A (RH)</b> A formal detailed complaints procedure is being prepared – a clear summary will also be produced.</p> <p><b>Q (EW)</b> This is a requirement from the assessor, when will it be available?</p> <p><b>A (RH)</b> The Employer has to liaise with FCBC to develop procedures that reflect the CoCP plus other commitments and ensure they can be executed practically. While we won't have the final draft we will have a well developed draft version for our next meeting.</p> <p>DR requested electronic version of Engaging with Communities.KON to forward copy.</p> <p>HZ highlighted importance of communicating this process to the public, otherwise the Community Councils will be first point of contact and it will place a significant administrative burden on them.</p> <p>RH explained there will be a single enquiry number with touch tone options for reaching CLOs and their teams on each of the three contracts. RH clarified that individual complaints will be resolved by the CLOs and that the Community Forums are not intended to be a review of each complaint, but that the process is working effectively.</p> <p><b>Q (EW)</b> Do you plan to introduce a specific reporting mechanism to highlight performance against the registration of commitments?</p> <p><b>A (LS)</b> On a traditional project there is no such schedule – a number of such commitments will be based on individual agreements with landowners.</p> <p><b>Q (EW)</b> Would you consider one for public commitments to allow us to identify gaps or if one raised by a group is appropriate to the others?</p> <p><b>A (LS)</b> The Employer will consider if and how it can do this.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>TS</p> <p>TS</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>TS</p>
-----	--	--

## Continued

Page 13 of 18

	<p>LS highlighted that the currently proposed Contact and Education Centre opening hours are a starting point. As the project progresses we may have to amend/extend the opening hours.</p> <p>RH added that accessibility must be balanced against resources. There will be the 24hr hotline for enquiries and complaints. During periods of high activity we will make resources available.</p> <p>RH noted the Employer is aiming to have the 24 hour hotline live when the temporary C&amp;EC is opened. The Hotline number will be communicated through all the current project communications media including newsletters, the project website, eZines and featuring it on all correspondence. TS will also pass this to the Community Councils for distribution.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>TS</p>
<b>5</b>	<b>Meet the Contractor event</b>	
5.1	<p><b>Local communities event</b></p> <p>RH outlined that a meet the Contractor event for local communities and stakeholders was being planned for w/c 29<sup>th</sup> August or w/c 5<sup>th</sup> September. An update on the latest progress would be provided and the public could discuss any issues one-to-one with representatives of the Employer and the Contractors. One event in the north and one in the south were being considered.</p> <p>LS highlighted that community representatives from the north had suggested there would be benefits in an afternoon/evening exhibition culminating in a public meeting. AP noted the suggestion FETA HQ could be used for one of the events and agreed to investigate.</p> <p><b>Q</b> (EW) Would it be possible for Community Councils' to solicit questions in advance.  <b>A</b> (RH) Yes, we would welcome advance notice as we can build answers into the presentation.            Community councils to consider how questions can be sourced – e.g. QDCC Twitter and Facebook pages.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Community reps</p>
	<p>Based on feedback, TS to consider appropriate dates and venues. TS to share plans as soon as is possible to allow representatives to provide feedback from Community Councils regarding format and proposed dates. LS suggested a note regarding these plans is included for comment when draft minutes are circulated.</p>	<p>TS</p>

## Continued

Page 14 of 18

5.2	<p><b>Meet the buyer event</b></p> <p>RH indicated that a separate event would be arranged for businesses. This was intended as a follow-up to the business event in January and would also involve local business representative groups (e.g. Chambers of Commerce) and Public Contracts Scotland.</p> <p>TS to consider appropriate venue.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>TS</p>
6	<p><b>Specific community issues</b></p>	
6.1	<p><b>General</b></p> <p>RH asked that if there were any issues the community representatives would like to raise at Forum meetings, please let Transport Scotland know as soon as possible in advance to allow TS to bring appropriate information and, if required, experts.</p>	<p>Community reps</p>
6.2	<p><b>Amendments required to draft minutes of the Community Forum Workshop (31/3/11)</b></p> <p>The issue of BRIGS complying with its own code of conduct was discussed under amendments to Terms of Reference.</p> <p>DT explained that Les Chapman wanted to clarify that workshop minutes implied that he suggested that TS was exceeding the 20 day limit for responses. LC would like the minutes reworded to avoid this inference.</p> <p>RH to highlight notes in published minutes and to circulate process for agreeing minutes to include notes and objections.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>TS</p>
6.3	<p><b>The purpose of minutes of meetings</b></p> <p>The group agreed these were discussed as part of the Terms of Reference and the above amendments 6.2.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
6.4	<p><b>Code of Conduct compliance</b></p> <p>The group agreed these were discussed as part of Terms of Reference.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

## Continued

Page 15 of 18

6.5	<p><b>Details of structural surveys to be conducted prior to commencement of construction as agreed by Scottish ministers</b></p> <p>CG confirmed that these would be undertaken just prior to construction</p> <p>Q (DT) Asked how communities will be informed – e.g. through this Forum? A (RH) Advised that it will be through direct correspondence.</p> <p>DT advised that ECCA had an extra three names to advise TS.</p> <p>DR advised that responses had been received from all but one of those approached following discussion with Frazer Henderson (of TS) – non-respondent tbc by QDCC.</p> <p>Post meeting note: Within the Employers Requirements 3 additional properties at Echline are identified. The Employer will consult with ECCA to establish which 3 properties will have structural surveys undertaken.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>DT</p> <p>QDCC</p>
6.6	<p><b>Details of air noise and vibration pollution monitoring equipment installation and recording at locations agreed with Scottish Ministers</b></p> <p>Q (EW) When will the monitoring equipment be going in to set a baseline? A (CG) We will undertake pollution and noise control monitoring as early as possible. DC confirmed discussions are currently taking place with the Employer.</p> <p>EW highlighted that Community Councils can work with Council District Officers to provide input on this, but they need to know about plans - therefore was concerned that information from FRC working groups is made available. DR emphasised it was essential there were regular updates.</p> <p>LS and DC to check status and provide update.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>TS</p>

## Continued

Page 16 of 18

7	<b>AOB</b>	
7.1	<p><b>Ground Water Report</b></p> <p><b>Q</b> DT highlighted that during discussions on the Ground Water Report re subsidence it was suggested additional boreholes would be undertaken south and west of South Queensferry. Has this been raised with FCBC?</p> <p><b>A</b> LS was aware that Paul Mellon had supplied report but would have to check and clarify the current status of this CG confirmed that the full complement of boreholes suggested by the Employer (in relation to the main crossing) will be undertaken.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>TS/FCBC</p>
7.2	<p><b>Compensation</b></p> <p><b>Q</b> (DT) Will there be relaxation on compensation for people in listed buildings who cannot fit double glazing? This had been raised with TS who had planned to follow up with Historic Scotland.</p> <p><b>A</b> LS to check status and advise.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>TS</p>
7.3	<p><b>CPOs</b></p> <p>DT explained that since 16 May he was still awaiting a servitude right in writing confirming rights of access to property had been granted.</p> <p>HZ referred to Kirkliston residents that have been advised by TS that they are due compensation, but the residents' solicitors have advised them that they don't own the land. These mistakes are costing people money in solicitor costs to ensure titles are not affected – if they accept, their chance to challenge is lost.</p> <p>DT is aware of similar issues at Clufflatts.</p> <p>TS to confirm status and update. It was suggested that a separate session on CPO's should be held.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>TS</p>

## Continued

Page 17 of 18

7.4	<p><b>Port Edgar Marina</b></p> <p><b>Q</b> DR highlighted that Edinburgh Leisure was withdrawing from Port Edgar giving as a key reason the impact FRC will have. What is FRC's response?</p> <p><b>A (RH)</b> We have been in discussions with Edinburgh Leisure, but they have not shared their plans with us. Before appointment of the Contractor, they were made aware of the scheme and did not object to the scheme. There is no change, however, in terms of impacts from when David Climie/RH presented in March 2011 and we do not envisage a huge disruption. We are happy to share concerns of the Forum at a meeting with Edinburgh Leisure. FCBC to arrange a meeting with Port Edgar Marina as soon as possible.</p> <p>DR said QDCC would like to see planning benefit from FRC scheme. This is not a good start.</p> <p>RH said planning gain and planning benefit is outwith the remit of TS as the Employer.</p> <p>DR – there are 350 berths and the possibility of a community buy out of the site. Can you help advance that?</p> <p>A (RH) We will meet with Edinburgh Leisure and can then speak to berth holders.</p>	Noted Noted FCBC Noted Noted Noted TS
-----	---	---

