



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

**Meeting location:** Contact & Education Centre, Queensferry

**Meeting Date/Time:** 6 March 2013 – 7pm

**Subject:** Community Forum South

**Participants:**

**Community Representatives**

Terry Airlie (Queensferry & District Community Council)  
Doug Ross (Queensferry & District Community Council)  
Keith Giblett (Queensferry & District Community Council)  
Grant Sangster (Queensferry & District Community Council)  
Bert Scott (Cramond & Barnton Community Council)  
Janet Thornton (Newton Community Council)  
Steve Lee (Kirkliston Community Council)  
Les Chapman (BRIGS)  
Doug Tait (BRIGS)

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

Lawrence Shackman  
Andrew Mackay  
Andrew Pope  
Keavy O'Neill  
Allan Buchan (c/o BIG Partnership)

**Forth Crossing Bridge Constructors (FCBC)**

Scott Chalmers  
Ewen Macdonell  
Sally Chambers

**John Sisk and Roadbridge (SRB)**

Seamus O'Brien

**Observers**

2 observers

**Apologies**

Darren Wraight (City of Edinburgh Council)  
Evelyn Woollen (Newton Community Council)

Continued

Page 2 of 14

	Notes	Action
<b>1</b>	<b>Meeting chaired by Lawrence Shackman</b>	
<b>1.1</b>	<p>LS reiterated the purpose of Forum meetings – including that: in the first instance, day to day issues should be raised with the Community Liaison Officers or through correspondence / email.</p> <p>Observers are welcome to attend, but should not participate in the meeting.</p>	Noted
<b>2</b>	<b>Review of minutes and outstanding actions South Community Forum 28 November 2012</b>	
<b>2.1</b>	<p><b>Minutes</b> KON confirmed that the draft minutes had been circulated and subsequently updated where appropriate to reflect comments received.</p> <p>The updated minutes were approved – subject to one further change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SCF210812/2.4a should read VAS (Vehicle Activated Signs), not ATC.</li> </ul>	Noted
<b>2.3</b>	<b>Outstanding actions paper</b> (Circulated in advance of meeting)	
<b>SCF230811/ 8.7</b>	<b>CoCP Variations</b> EW to forward comments.	EW
<b>SCF011111/ 7.3d</b>	<b>Pollution &amp; Vibration Monitoring</b> LS confirmed figures were included in a post meeting note and that monitoring reports on the website were up to date, subject to the most recent reports which were about to be published.	Noted
<b>SCF31012/ 3.3</b>	<p><b>General Vesting Declaration/CPOs</b> LS confirmed that of the 316 potential claims which could be made by owners/occupiers/lessees there have been 98 claims to date, an increase of 2 since the previous meeting. Of these:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 5 claims have been settled</li> <li>- 16 have received 90% part payment</li> </ul> <p>Of the remaining 77:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 43 involve common ownership issues</li> <li>- 34 are being processed by the District Valuer.</li> </ul> <p>LS confirmed that the 98 claims accounted for £11.7million of the estimated £13million total (as published in the Financial Memorandum). Of this £11.7million, £5.2 million has been settled and £6.5million is associated with claims under discussion.</p>	Noted

Continued

Page 3 of 14

<p><b>SCF060313/ 2.3a</b></p>	<p><b>Q</b> DT asked if any claims had been fully or partly paid under Part 1 of the Land Compensations Act 1973 for disturbance under blight? <b>A</b> LS confirmed that Part 1 claims can only be made one year after the project opens (as specified in the Forth Crossing Act). However, LS confirmed that discussions are taking place with the Scottish Government legal advisors to check if claims relating to M9J1a and Fife ITS can be settled one year after their respective opening dates rather than waiting for one year after the overall project opens.</p> <p>LS to provide update on current status at the next meeting.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>EDT</p>
<p><b>SCF210812/ 2.4a</b></p> <p><b>SCF210812/ 2.4b</b></p> <p><b>SCF060313/ 2.3b</b></p>	<p><b>Speed checks</b> LS confirmed that traffic speed data from the VAS previously installed on the A904 was available. However, as this is City of Edinburgh Council (CofEC) information it would be for them to issue. EDT to contact DW to request report be released to forum members.</p> <p>EDT issued a note (during the Forum) with traffic/speed data for the A904 counter situated east of Newton as requested.</p> <p><b>Q</b> Query re exact location of the monitor east of Newton? <b>A</b> LS believed it was near the lay-by outside Newton.</p>	<p>EDT</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p><b>SCF210812/ 7.2c</b></p>	<p><b>EMP feedback session</b> LS confirmed no requests for a feedback session have been received, but asked the item remain as an action point on the minute.</p>	<p>Community representatives</p>
<p><b>SCF210812/ 7.5</b></p>	<p><b>Status of Echline Gyratory and A904 re-alignment plans</b> LS confirmed this had been covered in the community presentations on the 30/31 January 2013.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>SCF210812/ 7.7b</b></p>	<p><b>Traffic flow statistics between M9 Spur and A904</b> EDT issued a note (during the Forum) containing traffic data for the M9 Spur (now the M90) as requested.</p> <p>LS confirmed that some data for M9 Spur north-bound contained in the note is currently being retrieved. EDT to update the data when available and re circulate note.</p> <p><b>Q</b> LC asked if figures would be available for the new M9J1a slip roads? <b>A</b> LS confirmed figures will be supplied when available.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>EDT</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p><b>SCF281112/ 3.2a</b></p>	<p><b>SRB Traffic Management</b> Post meeting note supplied in minutes of 28 November 2012.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Continued

Page 4 of 14

<b>SCF281112/ 3.2a</b>	Post meeting note supplied in minutes of 28 November 2012. LS emphasised that the Traffic Management Working Group arrangements had been designed to avoid congestion in Kirkliston.	Noted
<b>SCF281112/ 4.1a</b>	<b>FCBC – Progress Update and 3 Month Look Ahead</b> LC confirmed he was not asking for the spoil already excavated (in the vicinity of the proposed Queensferry Junction) to be moved, but that any future excavated spoil be placed to the east. EM confirmed that FCBC had no plans to locate spoil to the east, as the current pecking/excavation works are nearly complete. However, FCBC undertook to consider this as an option for future works in the area concerned.	Noted
<b>SCF28/11/1/ 4.1b</b>	<b>Noise Liaison Group</b> LS confirmed Andrew Mackay would provide a presentation on the NLG as part of this Forum's agenda.	Noted
<b>SCF281112/ 4.2</b>	<b>FCBC Traffic Management (TM)</b> EM confirmed TM information from previous presentation was issued. DT explained that it was not always easy to find TM info on the website. EM to issue TM slide to Forum members after each meeting.	FCBC
<b>SCF281112/ 7.1</b>	<b>Queensferry Gyrotory</b> AP confirmed a simplified version of the presentation slides (i.e. so that they can be understood without a person presenting) will be added to the Project website.	EDT
<b>SCF281112/ 7.2</b>	<b>Noise &amp; Vibration – Echline Field</b> EM confirmed monitors are removed occasionally for recharging.	Noted
<b>SCF281112/ 7.5</b>	<b>Hand-held monitoring</b> EM confirmed there was an issue re power to monitors and, as a result, hand held monitoring was undertaken in Jul/Aug 2012. DT confirmed the information previously provided did not include details for Echline. EM to check and issue results.  <b>Post meeting note:</b> See Annex A.	FCBC
<b>SCF281112/ 7.6</b>	<b>HGVs A904</b> EM confirmed he had met with Hunter Demolition (HD) re its voluntary code and discussed issues around speeding and bunching of HGVs on the A904. EM emphasised that only some of HD's vehicles were delivering to the FCBC site and that the HGVs did not leave in convoys – e.g. bunching can be caused by issues such as traffic signals. SL highlighted	Noted

Continued

<p><b>SCF060313/ 2.3c</b></p>	<p>there were reports that drivers did wait for others to catch up which resulted in bunching.</p> <p>EM explained he had monitored a sample of three vehicles and, as none were meeting the voluntary 20mph village speed limits requested by FCBC, they would be issuing regular reminders in addition to adhering to the national speed limits</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>SCF281112/ 7.9</b></p>	<p><b>Pollution caused by construction vehicles</b> EM outlined the efforts by FCBC and HD to keep A904/Buleyon Rd and the adjacent pavements clean. EM emphasised that agreement had been reached for both FCBC and HD to undertake one clean-up each month (i.e. two per month in total). This would include bus shelters.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>SCF060313/ 2.3d</b></p>	<p>EM confirmed that further discussions would take place with CofEC re their support for cleaning given other vehicles contribute to the issue. EM noted (CofEC) had undertaken a clean up the previous week. EM to update community representatives.</p>	<p>FCBC</p>
<p><b>SCF060313/ 2.3e</b></p>	<p>LS confirmed CofEC was planning major works on the A904 to address issues such as drainage and the road surface, and that the aim would be to align these with FCBC's planned works in the Echline area so as to minimise disruption.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>SCF060313/ 2.3e</b></p>	<p>LC highlighted problems of dirt from red shale. EM recognised problem, but emphasised that not all dirt was caused by the red shale.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>SCF060313/ 2.3e</b></p>	<p>KG suggested a mini forum was organised, involving CofEC, to discuss the above plans (including Bullyeon Rd) so that local communities could be informed of the activities and their timing etc. EDT and FCBC agreed that keeping the community informed was essential and would take this forward in conjunction with CofEC.</p> <p>AM confirmed the requirement for contractors to clean roads was part of the Roads (Scotland) Act 1984.</p>	<p>EDT/FCBC/ CofEC</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p><b>SCF060313/ 2.3f</b></p>	<p><b>Pecking works near Echline</b> <b>Q</b> DT asked for clarification re update at previous Forum that pecking would be complete by end of January 2013? LC highlighted that pecking was still taking place the previous day (5 March 2013)</p> <p><b>A</b> EM confirmed that at the public meetings held 30/31 Jan 2013 FCBC had highlighted that pecking should be</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	complete by end of February and that it was now very near complete.	
<b>3</b>	<b>Update from Employer's Delivery Team</b>	
<b>3.1</b>	<p><b>Fife ITS Contract</b> LS confirmed that the contract was completed in December. Variable Speed Limits are operating most morning peak hours and that, on average, 5 to 10 buses are using the bus lane each day.</p> <p>LS explained the system was proving effective in slowing traffic and that refinements are being considered to further improve traffic flow – e.g. reducing the length over which lower speed limits are deployed in advance of congestion.</p> <p>LS added that the hard shoulder/bus lane would continue to be monitored to review the potential for maintaining this as a permanent feature.</p>	Noted
<b>3.2</b>	<p><b>B924 Pedestrian Crossing</b> LS stated that he understood that these works, which are being undertaken on behalf of the Project by CofEC, would be complete by the end of March. KG noted that QDCC had been contacted by local residents as the signs had said works would take place from the 14 February for 4 weeks. LS was unable to provide further details as CofEC was unable to attend the meeting.</p> <p><b>Post Meeting Note:</b> GS advised that works were advertised as starting on 4 February.</p>	Noted
<b>3.3</b>	<p><b>Traffic calming measures at Newton</b> LS confirmed there had been one objection to the proposals and that the EDT was awaiting the reporter's response – if positive, West Lothian Council will undertake the works on behalf of the Project this year.</p>	Noted
<b>3.4</b>	<p><b>Contact &amp; Education Centre</b> LS confirmed this had been officially opened in January and approx 200 people attended the public and stakeholder meetings held on 30/31 January 2013.</p>	Noted
<b>SCF060313/ 3.4</b>	<p>LS highlighted open days for the public are planned for Fri 5 and Sat 6 April and Fri 26 and Sat 27 April between 10am and 4pm. LS confirmed that community representatives could publicise these dates to the local public and that further open days will be organised throughout the year based on demand.</p> <p>LS also confirmed the CEC was available to take group</p>	Community representatives  Noted

	<p>bookings for educational visits/presentations.</p> <p><b>Q</b> JT asked if corrections to the exhibition boards previously noted had been made?</p> <p><b>A</b> LS confirmed they had and emphasised that the boards will be updated on a regular basis to reflect project progress.</p>	Noted
<b>3.5</b>	<p><b>Noise Liaison Group (NLG)</b></p> <p>AM gave presentation on NLG – including its influence on planning of construction works, reviewing construction works, monitoring results and enquiries/complaints.</p> <p>AM highlighted that information on the latest activities could be found in the NLG minutes published on the website.</p> <p><b>Q</b> What does a threshold mean?</p> <p><b>A</b> AM confirmed this refers to a maximum noise levels thresholds set out in the Code of Construction practice, which if exceeded leads to an investigation by the contractor and review by the NLG.</p> <p>AM showed tables detailing maximum noise level exceedances on the south side of the Forth. Various exceedances were illustrated but over half were recorded at Butlaw Fisheries (on the south shore). AM explained that this was no longer publicly owned but that monitoring was being implemented as an additional “first line” check on noise levels on the south side of the Forth and to support early investigations to identify whether any potentially significant noise issues could arise from the marine works.</p> <p><b>Q</b> Does the NLG deal with residents directly?</p> <p><b>A</b> Yes – e.g. Members from the EDT representatives to the NLG visited Linn Mill residents in Sept 2012 following concerns being raised regarding dredging works.</p> <p><b>Q</b> Queries regarding noise levels related to day-time pecking and other activities – e.g. fuel tractors on A904, tippers dropping materials for bunds and crusher machinery – these do not exceed thresholds, but can be very annoying and create vibration?</p> <p><b>A</b> AM confirmed the NLG view was that if pecking has to be done this is better overall for residents if undertaken during the day. However, if there are specific local circumstances – e.g. people working night shift that require to sleep during the day – these issues can be considered and this is allowed for in the Code of Construction Practice. AM also confirmed vibration is measured and that thresholds are set in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

<p><b>SCF060313/3.5a</b></p>	<p><b>Q</b> Queries regarding work planning – e.g. if starting at 8am why can't workers minimise the noise by starting from the bottom of an excavation (to minimise early morning noise) and working up rather than the opposite, as they do now?  <b>A</b> FCBC to review and consider.</p> <p><b>Q</b> Query if echo from pecking was measured and considered?  <b>A</b> AM confirmed this is considered as part of the façade effect in the assessments undertaken by the contractors.</p> <p>AM emphasised that all noise disturbance complaints are investigated and that they do not require an exceedance to occur for an investigation to be undertaken.</p> <p>AM also emphasised that while there may be construction related noises in the background, they are often not the reason for exceedances – i.e. investigation often highlighted noises from e.g. wind, birds and water lapping in close proximity to the monitor.</p>	<p>FCBC</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p><b>SCF060313/3.5b</b></p>	<p><b>Q</b> Query how noises are identified on recordings – e.g. differences between HGV and regular traffic?  <b>A</b> AM explained that most noises are distinguishable on the recordings, but this is a question best answered by the investigators at FCBC. EM to check and supply response.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note:</b> See Annex A.</p> <p><b>Q</b> Query re why FCBC had insisted that concrete floors should be available for vibration monitors to be installed at local residents' properties, while on the construction site they are located on earth?  <b>A</b> AM confirmed the best place would have been the concrete floor of the building, but if this was not available the monitor could be sited outside and a transfer function could be applied to the data to account for this.</p>	<p>FCBC</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>John Sisk and Roadbridge (M9 Junction 1a Contract)</b></p>	
<p><b>4.1</b></p>	<p><b>Progress update and look ahead</b>  SO'B confirmed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The first new slip road (towards Stirling) was opened on 14 December and the project was formally opened on 1 February when the east bound diverge (from Stirling) was opened – this was six weeks ahead of schedule.</li> <li>- There are some small snagging and fencing works to be undertaken and the compound area reinstated. SRB expect to fully decamp and grass the area within 6 to 8 weeks.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p>



<p><b>SCF060313/4.1</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Landscaping and tree planting is ongoing and should be complete by the end of March.</li> <li>- New signage and the ITS system are in place.</li> </ul> <p><b>Q</b> Query, given signs have been changed on the motorway, when will other signs be updated?  <b>A</b> LS confirmed some will be changed in line with the A904, B800 and Newton traffic calming works. Phasing of signage updates and appropriate timing is considered by the Traffic Management Working Group (TMWG). LS confirmed the aim is to encourage relevant traffic to use the trunk road system rather than local roads through villages.</p> <p><b>Q</b> Query re how many apprentices were employed and if they had completed their apprenticeships?  <b>A</b> SO'B confirmed that 5 apprentices had been employed but they had been paid off as there was no further SRB work in the local area.</p> <p><b>Q</b> KG asked if FCBC could take on the apprentices?  <b>A</b> SC noted that FCBC were currently exceeding contract targets for apprenticeships, but would take a note of the apprentice names/contacts from SRB and see what could be considered.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>SRB/FCBC</p>
<p><b>4.2</b>  <b>SCF060313/4.2</b></p>	<p><b>Traffic management</b>  Gantry painting was scheduled for warmer weather and is planned for w/c 18 March. This will involve some lane closures – SO'B will circulate dates when confirmed.</p>	<p>SRB</p>
<p><b>4.3</b></p>	<p><b>Community engagement</b>  Members of the public will still be able to reach JS&amp;R through regular contact channels if they have any issues.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>Forth Crossing Bridge Constructors (Principal Contract)</b></p>	
<p><b>5.1</b></p>	<p><b>Progress update and 3 month look ahead</b>  EM provided presentation of works progress with project overview and look ahead including photos/progress on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Southbound bus way - works are ongoing</li> <li>- U221 – diversion planned during spring i.e. will be realigned and tied into A904 removing existing part of A904 and U221</li> <li>- Noise bunds and embankment at Dundas Home farm – works progressing</li> <li>- Queensferry Junction - pecking works are coming to an end, structures works will start in next 2 weeks and continue through to Christmas.</li> <li>- South Launch area – concrete pouring for the bridge</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p>

	<p>abutment will take place soon, further excavation work will continue with a few more weeks of rough pecking required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Piers S6, S7, S8 – rock breaking is taking place</li> <li>- Jet grouting – moved from north tower to south tower during previous week, further excavation at north tower will take place from Monday</li> <li>- Centre Tower – will start to appear from the summer</li> <li>- Winnyhill – last blast took place on Friday. NB SC explained that the requirement for further blasting will not be known until excavation works are progressed</li> <li>- Ferrytoll – rail bridge structure works are ongoing, CMC piling is planned as part of embankment works</li> <li>- B981 – works are progressing on realignment</li> <li>- Embankment on north side – HGV traffic movements for material supply have been reduced from 200 to 150 per day and are likely to remain at this level until later in the year.</li> </ul>	
<b>SQF060313/5.1a</b>	<p><b>Q</b> LC asked the maximum depth FCBC will reach during South Queensferry gyratory works?  <b>A</b> EM to check and clarify.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note:</b> See Annex A.</p>	FCBC
<b>SQF060313/5.1b</b>	<p><b>Q</b> KG asked for clarification re numbers of former unemployed and apprentices currently working for FCBC?  <b>A</b> EM to check and confirm as post meeting note.</p>	FCBC
<b>5.2 SCF060313/5.2</b>	<p><b>Traffic management (TM)</b>  EM confirmed TM will be required when U221 is closed for utility diversions and surfacing works – these are likely mid-March, although plans are still being finalised. EM to clarify dates when confirmed.</p>	FCBC
<b>6</b>	<b>Community issues</b>	
<b>6.1 SCF060313/6.1</b>	<p><b>Bus routes to use Dundas bus slip</b></p> <p>LS stated that there are approx 10 services that will use the route, but this may increase when Halbeath Park &amp; Ride opens. EDT to issue service information.</p> <p><b>Post Meeting Note:</b> All buses will have the opportunity to utilise the new bus slips and include the following services: 53, X53, X59, M90, M92, X54, 55, X57, X58, M60, M91, 50 and X61. However, it should be noted that ultimately it will be a matter for the operators to decide which route their services will take.</p>	EDT

Continued

Page 11 of 14

	<p><b>Q</b> DT asked re number using bus lane at J1a?  <b>A</b> LS confirmed 5 to 10 buses were using this each day, coming from both the M9 spur and M9 east.</p>	Noted
6.2	<p><b>Datum points to monitor ground movements</b>  EM confirmed that datum points will not be used and that pre condition property surveys have been undertaken as the benchmark. Post condition property surveys will be completed following the project to help identify any changes and as the basis for assessing the reasons for these. Site boundary levels have also been surveyed.</p>	Noted
6.3	<p><b>Society Road works</b>  EM explained that FCBC is aiming for the reconstruction/improvement works to begin at the end of March, but design is ongoing and dates will be confirmed once the work plan is confirmed.</p>	Noted
SCF060313/ 6.3	<p><b>Q</b> Query re the 100 metres of road from Linn Mill Burn to the Junction that is not included in the works. Will TS support QDCC in approaching CofEC to introduce a pedestrian pavement on this stretch to improve safety?  <b>A</b> LS confirmed the area is outside the project boundary. In addition, CofEC originally said they were not responsible for that section of road but EDT has subsequently shown CofEC do own the road and they have accepted this. LS emphasised that QDCC should approach CofEC in the first instance, but that the EDT will also talk to them regarding the issue.</p>	QDCC/ EDT
6.4	<p><b>Condition of Bullyeon Road</b>  Covered previously – see item 2.3 SCF281112/7.9</p>	Noted
<b>7</b>	<b>Next Community Forums (proposed)</b>	
7.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- South Community Forum – Wednesday 29 May 2013. Meeting to be held at CEC.</li> <li>- North Community Forum – Wednesday 22 May 2013.</li> </ul> <p><b>Q</b> SC asked if alternative night rather than Wednesday could be arranged?  <b>A</b> On checking diary availability group agreed to retain Wednesday as the night for meetings.</p>	Noted  Noted
<b>8</b>	<b>AoB</b>	
8.1	<p><b>Web Q&amp;A</b>  DT asked if Q&amp;A on website could be updated and that questions asked at public meetings on 30/31 Jan 2013 could be incorporated and circulated, particularly as different questions were asked at each session and some</p>	Noted

Continued

Page 12 of 14

<b>SCF060313/ 8.1</b>	were answered afterwards?  EM to supply answers to KON. KON to supply Q&A to Community Representatives for circulation. Website Q&A to be updated as appropriate and also as an ongoing exercise to reflect project progress etc.  <b>Post meeting note:</b> See Annex A - written answers that were supplied following the January update project briefings	FCBC / EDT
---------------------------	--	------------



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

### **Annex A**

#### **REF: SCF281112/7.5 - Hand-held monitoring**

EM confirmed there was an issue re power to monitors and, as a result, hand held monitoring was undertaken in Jul/Aug 2012. DT confirmed the information previously provided did not include details for Echline. EM to check and issue results.

#### **Written Answer – provided by FCBC**

All the available results are on the website.

The reason for the lack of results was a loss of power to the device when the temporary compound at Echline was moved to the permanent location. It was initially hoped that the device would be operational mid-August. However, the loss of power continued throughout August due to faulty equipment - power supply to the meter was sourced however there were faults with the connection. As a result, further works were undertaken and a new enclosure was built by FCBC at Echline corner during August to house the monitoring equipment. It was anticipated that the monitoring equipment would be moved to the new enclosure in September when mains power was connected. FCBC and a third party worked throughout September to connect the mains power, however this was delayed until early October.

#### **REF: SCF060313/3.5b - Noise Liaison Group (NLG)**

**Q** Query how noises are identified on recordings – e.g. differences between HGV and regular traffic?

**A** AM explained that most noises are distinguishable on the recordings, but this is a question best answered by the investigators at FCBC. EM to check and supply response.

#### **Written Answer – provided by FCBC**

You can *usually* tell the difference between HGV noise and road traffic noise on a given exceedance. They sound different - road traffic noise from a single vehicle is more transient.

#### **REF: SQF060313/5.1a - Forth Crossing Bridge Constructors (Principal Contract) Progress update and 3 month look ahead**

**Q** LC asked the maximum depth FCBC will reach during South Queensferry gyratory works?

**A** EM to check and clarify.

Continued

Page 14 of 14

**Written Answer – provided by FCBC**

The mainline at Ch:3600 (Below the Northern side of the Queensferry Gyratory) has a FRL (finished road level) of 47.532m. The EGL (existing ground level) at this location was 56.950m, meaning that the new FRL is 9.418m in cutting.

For the permanent works, the excavation will extend below pavement subformation (FRL minus 1.3m) and the drainage pipes will be deeper still at FRL minus 1.8m (underside of catchpits would be 0.5m below that). Overall therefore, we will be excavating to a maximum depth of 11.718m.

**Ref: SCF060313/8.1**

**AoB**

**Web Q&A**

EM to supply any written answers that were issued to KON. KON to send to Community Representatives. Website Q&A will be updated as appropriate and also as an ongoing exercise to reflect project progress etc.

**Written Answer – provided by FCBC**

Earthworks at Echline

- Pecking, in this phase, will go on 'til, we hope, no later than end Feb 2013.
- once we divert the U221, hopefully in May this year, we will commence bulk earthworks in an easterly direction removing the U221 as we go, and when we hit rock we will be looking to rip as much as we can using, probably, big dozers and rippers – we are hopeful that we will rip up to 75% of the remaining rock in Echline fields, Q Junction and Echline Strip. We don't expect to be into pecking again until Autumn this year, maybe later. The quantity of hard (pecker) rock remaining and the programme for it I shall provide when I know more – i.e. when we see how the ripping exercise is going.
- the excavation to the north of the junction shall happen once the traffic is diverted to the roundabout and the existing A904 is redundant – that being planned for May 2014. The rock excavation strategy would be as above, quantity and programme to follow when I know more.
- our intention is to rip as much as we can – it's least intrusive for you and it's best for us as it is the cheapest method of rock excavation available to us.
- The pecking hours for this phase will remain as they are – at least they're down the bottom of the excavation at present and it's not as intrusive as it might be.