



Forth Replacement Crossing Community Forum (Junction 1a) Minutes

Meeting Location: Kirkliston Community Centre
Meeting Date / Time: 10 November 2011 – 7pm
Subject: Community Forum Junction 1a
Participants:

Community Representatives
Henryk Zukowski

Transport Scotland – Employers Delivery Team (EDT)

Lawrence Shackman
Ross Hornsey
Andy Pope
Allan Buchan (c/o BIG partnership)

Forth Crossing Bridge Constructors (FCBC)

Ewen MacDonell

John Sisk and Roadbridge

Roland Tarrant
Elaine Barrie

Observers

1 observer Mr Wood

Apologies

Richard Docherty (John Graham (Dromore) Ltd)

Notes

Action

Continued

Page 2 of 9

1	Meeting chaired by Lawrence Shackman	
2	Review of minutes and outstanding actions Junction 1A Community Forum 1 September 2011	
2.1	LS reiterated 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
2.2	Minutes were approved for EDT to post on the FRC website. LS confirmed that for clarity, post meeting notes will be included in appendices rather than incorporated within minutes.	Noted Noted
2.3	Further items from the Outstanding Actions paper presented were discussed:	
	(4.1) Publication of presentation	Complete
	(4.3) Copy of Environmental Report Vol 1 and 5	Complete
	(4.3) Noise receptor locations and frequency levels Written response issued to HZ. EDT confirmed that once HZ had reviewed this, further meeting or discussion with Andy Mackay could be arranged. HZ to confirm if required. See also 6.3	Complete KCC
	(4.3) Construction traffic levels HZ confirmed KCC were pleased with arrangements for delivery of site compound materials during the night and that no complaints had been received.	Complete
	(4.3) Kirkliston Primary School EB confirmed contact had been made and a meeting was being arranged.	Complete
	(4.3) Environmental Management Plan (EMP) feedback LS confirmed EMP for Junction 1a had been published on FRC website and was a “live” document that can be updated if required.	Complete
	(4.3) Land titles Written response provided by EDT on 20 Oct 2011. HZ confirmed that some issues were still being considered and clarification was being sought from the Registers of Scotland re four sets of titles. Kirkliston CC will reply to letter at later date.	Complete KCC
	(5) Terms of Reference LS highlighted issue from South Community Forum which is	Complete

Continued

Page 3 of 9

	confirmed in minute of meeting from 2 Nov 2011.	
	(6) Engaging with Communities LS confirmed this has been published on the FRC website.	Complete
	(7.3) Advance notification of questions	Complete
	(10.3) Building warrant for site offices LS confirmed this was not required as covered by Forth Crossing Act, but that buildings must comply with all relevant regulations.	Complete
3	John Graham (Dromore) Ltd (Fife ITS Contract)	
3.1	<p>Progress update and 3 month look ahead LS apologised on behalf of Richard Docherty who was unable to attend the meeting.</p> <p>LS advised that the 3 month look ahead plan was available on the FRC website and provided an overview of key developments: Current works include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - top soil stripping as part of site clearance at gantry locations - installation of ducting for fibre optic communications linking gantry sites - drainage installation - construction of piling platforms - mine consolidation works. <p>LS confirmed EDT and contractors were developing a format for the 3 month look ahead that would be more user friendly. This includes linking content to simplified maps to show locations of proposed works.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
3.2	<p>Traffic management LS highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the 40mph speed limit will remain for the duration of the works - Average speed cameras are operational - two lanes of traffic in each direction will be maintained at all times - configuration of the traffic management will change as required – e.g. to accommodate works in the central reserve. This will include use of the northbound hard shoulder (which will be resurfaced shortly) as a trafficked lane when required. - for safety reasons, the M90 northbound on-slip at Admiralty Junction will be closed for 5 days at the beginning of December. This is to allow safe access to construct Gantry 1. Diversion routes will be put in place and advance notification will be provided. 	Noted

Continued

Page 5 of 9

	EM confirmed that a more user friendly version of the programme displayed, based on the version produced for the 'Meet the Contractor' events, would be developed and published on the FRC website.	FCBC/EDT
4.2	Traffic management Highlighted as part of programme overview (see 4.1)	Noted
5	John Sisk and Roadbridge (Junction 1a Contract)	
5.1	Progress update and 3 month look ahead EB/RT provided overview, key items discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - overall programme is on schedule - Swineburn temporary diversion is in place - haul roads are 40% complete - earthworks on south side of M9 have commenced - trial piling is likely to begin w/c 14 Nov - the compound at Kirkliston is near complete, signage has been erected and earthwork bunds for screening are near complete. 	Noted
5.2	<p>Traffic management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Temporary traffic management measures have been put in place on the B9080 and B800 - Delivery of 4 steel ITS gantries for the M9 spur to the site compound for storage is likely around 16 Jan 2012. As these are oversized loads requiring escorts, a traffic management plan to minimise disruption will be confirmed nearer the time and advice issued –It was noted that delivery of the gantries would be through Kirkliston however the abnormal load delivery would take place at night in order to minimise any disruption to the public. <p>Q HZ enquired if the large area set aside in the site compound was for these gantries?</p> <p>A LS confirmed it was as they will be tested on site before installation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LS confirmed temporary traffic management for M9/M9 spur is now being implemented with average speed cameras to enforce the 40mph limit, - once the ITS gantries are installed in the spring, they will support traffic management. <p>HZ requested a copy of the draft traffic management plan to inform the local community.</p> <p>LS and RT emphasised the plans were detailed and complex and that various means of communication were used to inform the communities of the measures.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

Continued

Page 6 of 9

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic management measures will involve reduced speed limits of 40mph with two lanes in each direction maintained - To enable sufficient workspace, the single lane sections of the spur will be extended northwards. HZ highlighted this and that the 40mph speed limit should help reduce noise levels experienced in Kirkliston from the M9 spur. <p>HZ requested that flyers being sent or delivered by all three contractors are copied to Kirkliston CC in advance so they can advise other local people as appropriate or respond if asked. RH confirmed all flyers will be published on the web and an email copy will be issued to Forum members.</p> <p>HZ advised that, because of past experience of other projects, Kirkliston residents are more likely to address any concerns to the Community Council than use the FRC hotline – e.g. recent cleaning of roads. RT highlighted the importance of understanding local concerns in order remedial action can be planned. HZ to forward relevant complaints received direct by Kirkliston CC.</p> <p>HZ suggested FRC be included as agenda item at monthly Kirkliston CC meeting. EB agreed to attend to provide 3 month look ahead and answer questions. HZ to confirm dates (last Tuesday of every month).</p> <p>HZ highlighted complaints to the KCC from Gateside/Builirigg residents re noise. RT emphasised letter drop had been made to all frontline houses re rock breaking activities with freephone details included, but no calls had been received. HZ to supply contact details of the factors responsible for managing the estate And SRB will make contact to discuss how they can support notifying residents. RT confirmed discussions have taken place with the Housing Association and a noise monitor has been located at back of the estate. HZ to advise SRB if residents association is re-established.</p>	<p>EDT</p> <p>KCC</p> <p>KCC/SRB</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>KCC</p> <p>SRB</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>KCC</p>
6	AOB	
6.1	<p>Dust on roads and speeding</p> <p>HZ highlighted the previous commitments to keep local roads clean but, despite contractor efforts to date, he regarded the problem of dust on local roads, in particular the B9080, as very bad. HZ suggested one sweeper may not be sufficient. He understood sweepers owned by City of Edinburgh Council were at Kirkliston today and the Council might bill SRB.</p> <p>RT explained that road sweeping by SRB was now taking place all day and that he understood the roads were free of debris. RT to</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>SRB</p>

Continued

Page 7 of 9

	<p>double check status and effectiveness and advise KCC.</p> <p>HZ highlighted shale on the road as a particular problem and there was a need to sweep the roads from the bings, not just the works access points. HZ also highlighted that the issue of covers over loads had been raised with EDT.</p> <p>HZ said it was difficult to notify SRB of offending speeding vehicles, as their registration numbers were obscured by dust.</p> <p>SRB emphasised speeding would not be tolerated and emphasised that it may be able to identify offending drivers if KCC or local people can confirm the time and location of the incident. SRB did explain that this could only apply if the vehicle trips were related to the FRC project.</p> <p>SRB to discuss with sub-contractor and, if required, West Lothian Council and advise KCC.</p> <p>SRB to consider means of identifying lorries if number plates are obscured or ensuring number plates are visible.</p> <p>LS emphasised it was illegal to drive with a number plate obscured.</p> <p>HZ enquired if wheel axle washing could be undertaken.</p> <p>SRB emphasised that sweepers were more effective as washing can create greater hazards by bringing water and dirt onto the roads that then freezes.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>SRB</p> <p>SRB</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p>6.2</p>	<p>Haul Roads</p> <p>HZ enquired if tarmac could be applied to limit dust?</p> <p>RT confirmed that SRB were looking at potential materials but that tarmac might not be the best solution.</p> <p>RT to confirm selected material.</p>	<p>SRB</p>
<p>6.3</p>	<p>Dust and noise receptors</p> <p>Q HZ asked if the Junction 1a EMP has been approved?</p> <p>A LS confirmed that relevant parts have been approved and published to enable required works to progress on schedule – e.g. earthworks. These are subject to scrutiny by relevant liaison groups and the minutes of these groups are published on the FRC website.</p> <p>EDT to confirm status of M9 Junction 1a noise and vibration plan as it does not appear to be published on the website.</p> <p>PMN – The plan was published 11 November.</p> <p>AP confirmed that EDT is reviewing how best to provide summaries of website updates to community forum members.</p> <p>RH is also reviewing the TS website to help make accessing information easier.</p>	<p>EDT</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

Continued

Page 8 of 9

	<p>HZ emphasised that he would like to confirm noise receptor locations within 300 metres to check that the baseline levels are realistic as levels seem higher.</p> <p>RT emphasised that best practicable means were being applied – e.g. use of silent pumps. Readings to date have been lower than predicted and considerably lower than the thresholds allowed.</p> <p>Q HZ suggested the noise from rock breaking had been very bad. He asked how this was monitored and if further information could be supplied?</p> <p>A LS explained that EDT and the contractors were currently examining how all data being collected could be compiled into a user friendly format with the aim being to publish by the end of November and then update monthly.</p> <p>HZ highlighted that previous removal of trees had increased noise levels in Kirkliston from the M9 and although the proposed 40mph speed limit would provide some mitigation, KCC were keen such noise levels are monitored.</p>	<p>EDT</p> <p>Noted</p>
6.4	<p>Information and complaints</p> <p>HZ emphasised that KCC would prefer simple “Yes/No” answers to questions raised, rather than referral to existing documents/clauses. If further details were required they would ask.</p> <p>HZ also emphasised that problems may be resolved by an initial meeting or discussion before they had to be escalated to an official complaint.</p> <p>AP confirmed that EDT and the contractors were to meet w/c 14 Nov to clarify the definition of, and the process for, handling both enquiries and complaints.</p> <p>RH emphasised that it is important local people understand that they can deal with CLOs direct and that the freephone line is manned by locally-based staff, not people in a remote call centre. KCC to emphasise this point in its communications.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>KCC</p>
6.5	<p>Temporary traffic lights</p> <p>Q HZ enquired if temporary traffic lights could be placed on the B800 to slow traffic and further reduce noise?</p> <p>A LS to ask Traffic Management Working Group to consider.</p>	<p>EDT</p>
6.6	<p>Working hours</p> <p>HZ highlighted that rock breaking works began before 8am on Saturday 5 Nov.</p> <p>RT to check with contractor and, if required, take action to prevent reoccurrence.</p>	<p>SRB</p>
7	Next Community Forums	
7.1	<p>Dates were confirmed as:</p> <p>- 24 January 2012, South Community forum</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Continued

Page 9 of 9

	- 25 January 2012; North Community forum - 01 February 2012; Junction 1a Community Forum	
7.2	LS thanked attendees.	Noted