



Forth Replacement Crossing South Community Forum Minutes

Meeting Location: FRC Contact and Education Centre, South Queensferry
Meeting Date/Time: 26 February 2014 – 7pm
Subject: South Community Forum

Participants: **Community Representatives**

Les Chapman, BRIGS (LC)
Peter Fitzgerald, BRIGS (PF)
John Paterson, Kirkliston Community Council (JP)
Doug Ross, LMRA/BRIGS (DR)
Doug Tait, BRIGS (DT)

Transport Scotland – Employers Delivery Team (EDT)

Lawrence Shackman, Chair (LS)
Alan Shirley (AS)
Katrina McDonald (KM)

Forth Crossing Bridge Constructors (FCBC)

Katrina Bruce (KB)
David Gough (DG)

City of Edinburgh Council

Darren Wraight (DW)

Observer

1 Observer

Apologies

Terry Airlie, Queensferry and District Community Council (TA)
Keith Giblett, Queensferry and District Community Council (KG)
David Buchanan, Kirkliston Community Council (DB)
Bert Scott, BRIGS/Cramond & Barnton Community Council (BS)
Graham Porteous, Transport Scotland (GP)
Ewen Macdonell, FCBC (EM)

Post Meeting Note:

Apologies following the meeting were received from Grant Sangster, Queensferry and District Community Council (GS)

SCF280813/2.2f	<p>Discussion with Roads Commissioner regarding Gas Board Works</p> <p>DW informed members that several meetings had taken places between City of Edinburgh Council and the Roads Commissioner to resolve issues and both parties were now content. No fines have been issued, and CEC had impressed the need for compliance with the relevant traffic management standards going forward.</p> <p>Doug Ross (DR) pointed out that there is a statutory undertaking that notice should be given prior to utility works being undertaken.</p> <p>Les Chapman (LC) and Doug Tait (DT) gave specific examples of recent instances where the Gas Board had given no advance notice to at least 3 residential properties before making approaches to attempt to carryout work.</p> <p>DT gave an example of short notice given by FCBC where notice of water works was provided on 21 February and work began on 23 February. Further, the actual work had carried on for 18 hours, as opposed to the stipulated 12 hours.</p> <p>DT emphasised that the 14 day notice period is not being met in the majority of cases</p> <p>LS intimated that he was aware of a recent instance of water work been carried out at short notice in respect of a burst water valve, and apologised for any inconvenience that had been experienced as a result of this.</p> <p>DW's knowledge was that Scottish Gas do usually undertake letter drops in advance of any work, DT acknowledged that was his experience of Scottish Water, but not Gas.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
SCF260214/2.2	<p>LS was not aware whether the 14 day notice period applied to third parties carrying out work as part of the project, but that this would be looked into.</p> <p>In response to a query regarding how residents would know whether work was being carried out as part of the project, DW suggested consulting the Scottish Road works register: www.roadworksscotland.org or Clarence 0800</p>	<p>EDT/FCBC</p> <p>Noted</p>

	232323 LS said that FCBC Community Liaison Officer Ewen MacDonell (EM) could also be contacted to ascertain this information.	Noted
SCF280813/2.2g	14 Day notice period and the three month look ahead LS informed the forum that the latest three month look forward (February 2014) was now on the TS website, which detailed potential impact of forthcoming works. Neighbourhood notification leaflets are also distributed within the vicinity of areas affected by forthcoming works. LS stated that the 14 day notice period would be further discussed at item 6.5 of community issues	Noted Noted
SCF280813/5.1c	FCBC Principal Contract – South Abutment Access Road EM emailed Evelyn Woollen (EW) on 21 February with the relevant planning application number. Application number: 12/02617/FUL	Noted
SCF280813/7.1	Commitments and undertakings Forum members were advised that this document had been updated on the TS website. Further updates would happen on a 6-monthly basis. LS highlighted that updates would be completed on a proportionate basis to reflect changes in status of the commitments and undertakings.	Noted
SCF280813/7.5	Hedge running West of A904 The hedge has now been trimmed by City of Edinburgh Council. DW informed the meeting that City of Edinburgh Council had originally been invited to attend the Forum in the capacity of an observer, but that he would be happy to attend future meetings, and would arrange for a substitute in instances that this was not possible.	Noted Noted
SCF271113/3	Forth Bridge Operating Company – update A post meeting note had been included in the minutes of the meeting held on 27 November.	Noted

SCF271113/4.4	<p>Engaging with Communities – Construction No comments have been received from Forum members in respect of this point.</p> <p>LS confirmed the Employer’s Delivery Team (EDT) would hope to be in a position to circulate a first draft of the refreshed document for members comments shortly.</p> <p>LS said that the refreshed document would be updated to reflect the progress of the project to date and include future management and maintenance of the bridge.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
SCF271113/6.3	<p>Air Pollution Mitigation – Dust on Echline Corner caused by cutting works</p> <p>EM/LC have agreed to go out on site when there was further evidence of dust.</p> <p>LS said that an additional frisbee was placed during the remainder of the ripping works on the gyratory side (North) of the old U221. No exceedances were recorded.</p> <p>The monitoring equipment station was chosen by FCBC’s air quality expert and they intend to keep it where it is. If there is a dust concern in the future FCBC will temporarily install a Frisbee in a strategic location between the suspected source and the receptor and monitor the results.</p> <p>LC saw no need for an additional frisbee at this point in time as there had been no further ripping work or dust during the period. However this should be considered further at the relevant time.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
SCF271113/7.1	<p>Seeding at U221 LS highlighted that seeding is due to commence this coming season (from April-October 2014)</p>	<p>Noted</p>
SCF271113/7.4	<p>Flyer 49 Approach Viaduct South Launch Steelwork A post meeting note was included in the minutes of the meeting held on 27 November in respect of this action point.</p> <p>DT enquired as to the outcome of the meetings with the complainants.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	Alan Shirley (AS) said that he had met with the complainant and provided the contact details of the City of Edinburgh Council Noise Liaison Group representative, so that the complainant could approach them to understand their role on the NLG and the process involved.	Noted
3	Employer's Delivery Team - Update	
3.1	<p>Briefing Sessions LS provided an update confirming that 7 stakeholder briefing sessions had been held over 2 days (11 and 12 February), with around 120 people attending those 4 sessions open to the general public. Specific sessions had also been held for elected representatives, other stakeholders and the media.</p> <p>Further briefings would be held in the Spring/early Summer to focus on the works at Ferrytoll.</p> <p>Post Meeting Note Further to a request raised at the North Community Forum, one repeat public briefing session will be held in North Queensferry on 25 March.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
3.2	<p>Quarterly project update LS highlighted that the most recent quarterly project update (February) had now published and was on the TS website – members had also been sent an electronic copy (by email on 7 February).</p>	Noted
3.3	<p>Website update LS informed the meeting that Forum members have been notified of all recent revisions to documents currently on the TS website, and that this would continue.</p> <p>The FRC section of the website is undergoing a refresh anticipated in March as part of a wider TS redesign. The TS team would be happy to assist Forum members with locating any documents meantime.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
SCF260214/3.3	LS stated that FCBC needed to address the issue of ensuring that amendments to documents were adequately highlighted within the revised documents, and that this had not been consistent to date.	FCBC

<p>3.4</p>	<p>Part 1 notices LS gave an update on Part 1 notices and claims to date:</p> <p>The Fife ITS and M9 J1a schemes have now been in operation for 1 year after being opened on 4 December 2012 and 1 February 2013. These are now subject to claims under 'Part 1 of the Land Compensation (Scotland) Act 1973 (as amended)'.</p> <p>Notices advertising the opening of Part 1 claims in respect of these schemes were placed in various newspapers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dunfermline Press, West of Fife Advertiser, Central Fife Times and Fife & Kinross Extra week commencing 5 December 2013 and the Scotsman 5 December 2013 for Fife ITS. • The Linlithgow Journal and Gazette and the Scotsman on 31 January 2014 for M9 J1a. <p>133 claims from the 316 owners/occupiers/lessees in relation to the FRC General Vesting Declaration's carried out in April and June 2011. That is an increase of 3 claims since the update provided at the last meeting.</p> <p>Of these: 24 claims have been settled in full (an increase of 2)</p> <p>26 have received 90% part payments. This is an increase of 1 since reported at the last forum.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p>3.5</p>	<p>FRC update presentation LS gave a project update to the meeting which included information presented at the recent public briefing sessions (11 and 12 February)</p> <p>Points made: <u>Fife Intelligent Transport System</u> Fife ITS opened on the 4 December 2012. In particular, initial findings from only the first year of operation showed that journey time savings of up to 8 minutes in the morning peak period and a substantial reduction in the number of injury accidents (2 compared with previous average of 12) had been recorded. LS stressed that these initial findings are from only the first year of operation and at least three years of data are required to make a fully valid comparison.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	<p>Fife ITS received an 'Excellent' rating from CEEQUAL (Assessment and Awards Scheme for improving sustainability on civil engineering projects).</p> <p><u>M9 Junction 1A</u> M9 Junction 1a opened on 1 February 2013. In particular, initial findings from only the first year of operation showed that a two minute peak journey time saving had been recorded for M90 (formerly M9 Spur) southbound traffic, time savings being limited by the heavy morning traffic on approach to the Newbridge Junction. As for Fife ITS, LS stressed that these initial findings were from only the first year of operation and at least three years of data are required to make a fully valid comparison.</p> <p>Traffic flow data for the six month period Feb to July 2013 (after opening) compared with the same period in 2012 (before opening) indicated a reduction in traffic on the A904 through Newton of 13% for all traffic and 52% for Heavy Goods Vehicles. This was due to use of the new slip roads at M9 Junction 1a. However, LS stressed that these initial findings were from only a six month period and required a longer period for full validation.</p> <p>An 'Excellent' rating from CEEQUAL (Assessment and Awards Scheme for improving sustainability on civil engineering projects) had also been gained for this project.</p> <p><u>Discussion</u> LC asked whether up to date data was available?</p> <p>LS stated that a report was due for the period up to September 2013, and would update the meeting in due course.</p> <p>DT highlighted that the issue of the B8046 being closed for 6 months and a reduction of shale deliveries over the Summer could influence the results of the data.</p> <p>LS reiterated that the figures were a snapshot over a six month period and that further data was required to validate any trends or otherwise.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	---	---

SCF260214/3.5	<p>John Paterson (JP) raised the issue of potential spent oil shale deliveries through Kirkliston.</p>	Noted
	<p>LS confirmed FCBC's planned deliveries through Kirkliston was unlikely to happen as it was now anticipated that deliveries to the project would now utilise the B8020 Beatlie Road and the A904, via Newton, as had been done previously.</p>	
	<p>JP was happy that this was now the case, but in particular wanted to minute the view and concern over a lack of communication, information and consultation with the community throughout the management of this situation. FCBC's haulage company was invited to the Community Council meeting, but there was a feeling that there was no support for the community, bearing in mind the community concern that a school and nursery were located near the suggested route.</p>	Noted
	<p>JP wished this point to be considered and hoped for improved community engagement from the project team rather just from FCBC's haulier, in the event of any future deliveries taking place in the vicinity.</p>	Noted
	<p>LS said that he had received a different account of events regarding the Community Council meeting, and stated that the project team had written to the Community Council and other stakeholders advising on this matter. LS agreed that future engagement on such matters, such they arise, were essential.</p>	Noted
	<p>DG agreed to discuss with EM a future strategy in relation to the above.</p>	FCBC
	<p>Regarding the total number of deliveries that had been planned, LS stated that the actual number had been less than the haulier had received permission for. DG confirmed that 50 loads of spent oil shale per day had been anticipated.</p>	Noted
	<p><u>Contact and Education Centre (CEC)</u> Over the last year the CEC has hosted over 40 educational visits, and is fully booked for such visits the rest of the coming year.</p>	Noted
<p>Since opening, CEC has hosted 15 open days, attracting c.2400 visitors. From 29 March, open</p>	Noted	

	<p>days will commence each Saturday until end of October 2014, where the CEC will open from 10am-4pm. In addition, technical presentations will be held on a monthly basis for interested parties</p> <p>LS stated that the CEC had gained a BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Methodology) excellence award.</p>	Noted
4	Forth Bridges Operating Company (FBOC) - update	
	<p>In the absence of Graham Porteous(GP), LS updated the meeting that the arrangements to introduce a Forth Bridges Operating Company Contract remain on schedule with no changes to the timetable or to the approach being adopted since Graham Porteous last reported. The Contract is due to be awarded in December 2014, with the successful new Operating Company due to commence provision of services in June 2015.</p>	Noted
	<p>GP would provide an update to local Community Groups on the work of the Forth Bridges Forum at a separate evening meeting scheduled to take place on Wednesday 19th March from 6 to 7pm in the CEC.</p>	Noted
	<p>Subject to availability, another Forth Bridges Forum representative is likely to attend this meeting to provide an update on either the Forth Bridge World Heritage Site Nomination, or the Forth Bridge Experience. These initiatives are being led by Historic Scotland and Network Rail respectively.</p>	Noted
	<p>The Forth Bridges Forum met earlier today (26 February) and considered proposals for a strategy on how best to take forward tourism initiatives. This work is being led by VisitScotland on behalf of the Forum. A steering group would now be set up to take this forward.</p>	Noted
	<p>More information would be provided at the next meeting of the Forum's World Heritage Steering Group, the Special Projects Team's March meeting, and at future meetings of this Community Forum. This would include information about community involvement and engagement in the strategy.</p>	Noted

	<p>DT enquired as to what stage the proposal for a visitor centre was at?</p> <p>LS stated that Network Rail had already put forward a proposal for a visitor centre on the North side – this could be found on the Forth Bridges Forum website. LS was also aware of a proposal for the South side, though was unsure if this was as advanced as the proposal for the North side.</p> <p>DT referred to Keith Giblett’s (KG) points raised in previous Forum meetings over concerns regarding lack of community engagement on this subject.</p> <p>DW informed the meeting that City of Edinburgh Council had set up a steering group on this subject, based on KB’s comments – and a meeting had been held last week.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
5	Forth Crossing Bridge Constructors (Principal Contract) – Update	
	<p>In the absence of EM, LS updated members with the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparatory work for 3 ITS gantries in the South is taking place to extend the system to Scotstoun. • Work to the South abutment of the new B800 over bridge will be started soon. • Queenferry Junction - bridge works continuing, roundabout to become operational later this year. <p>In response to a question on what would happen to the old A904, LS confirmed this would be largely removed and realigned through the new Junction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viaduct steel deliveries are taking place more or less every week, all push launches will be recorded using time lapse photography. • Pier S4 concrete pour - DG mentioned that he was aware of a problem with one of the concrete pumps, which would mean that this would extend working to c.10:30 this evening. DG confirmed that this would only entail concrete being pumped from a barge so was unlikely to cause disruption. 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

<p>SCF260214/5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centre tower – pour 7 (out of 54) would commence 27 February. • Various pre-assembly work was being undertaken offsite, with the first shipment from China expected May/June. • The North side push launch area is being prepared. • B981 and Castlandhill Road – Road construction materials have been laid. • Traffic management at Ferrytoll – B981 expected to open late Summer 2014. • Ferrytoll phasing drawings will be uploaded to the TS website in addition to the public briefings to be held later this year. <p>DT asked what the plan was for Inchgarvie and Admiral House?</p> <p>LS explained that it was SG policy not to hold onto property no longer required, so they would likely be sold.</p> <p>DT asked whether they had been considered for possible visitor centre locations – highlighting the good views?</p> <p>LS confirmed they had not – access being a key issue.</p> <p>Forthcoming works LS stated that a push launch of the North bound carriageway over Pier S8 and S7 was due to take place week commencing 17 March. This will take it to Society Road.</p> <p>The next launch will be in (about) 4 weeks' time.</p> <p>LC mentioned that people may wish to watch this process but LS confirmed that this would be a very gradual process.</p> <p>LS said that the process may be subject to traffic management and DG emphasised that while this will go near Society Road, it would not go over it. EM would notify interested parties about this work.</p> <p><u>Post Meeting Note</u> Traffic management will <u>not</u> be necessary to undertake this work, and due to the fact that it is perceived there will be no impact or disruption</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>FCBC</p>
---------------------------	---	---

	caused by this work, formal notification is not required. However EM, out of courtesy, emailed a number of stakeholders on 4 March, to inform them about the intended works.	
6	Community Issues	
	DT raised 8 issues under this item for discussion.	
6.1	<p>To discuss the difference between the scope of the legal obligations contained in the CoCP and the Forth Crossing Act 2011 and the scope of the Employer's Requirements i.e. contractual obligations between the Scottish Ministers and the Contractors, FCBC.</p> <p>LS stated FCBC are obligated to comply with the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and also with the Contract which contains specific details, such as standards for the bridge, roads and further restrictions.</p> <p>DT highlighted that he understood the Contract was between 2 parties (FCBC and TS), but the Forth Crossing Act 2011 and CoCP are between all those with an interest, including stakeholders.</p> <p>Regarding Society Road, DT stated that residents believed site traffic was using it and that levels had increased. Assurances were given at the time of the Bill that site traffic would not be permitted to use the road apart from the specific occasions stated within the commitments and undertakings and the CoCP. DT believes that FCBC are in breach of this assurance and the CoCP.</p> <p>DT presented to DG, LS and AS copies of commitment 58 of the commitments and undertaking register and paragraph 4.7.5 of the CoCP.</p> <p>DT referred to a recent response received from FCBC to a complaint about site vehicles using Society Road.</p> <p>AS and LS stated that the CoCP had not been breached, vehicles using the road were not site vehicles, but classed as private vehicles when transporting workers to site or supervisory vehicles, both of which were permitted to travel to designated car parks.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

<p>SCF260214/6.1</p>	<p>It was noted that it may be hard to distinguish site vehicles from those transporting workers or supervisory vehicles due to the fact that some incorporated orange roof lights.</p> <p>DR said that he had witnessed 2 white vans using the road. LS stated that if construction vehicles were found to be incorrectly using this road, TS would view this as a serious matter, and would take appropriate action .</p> <p>DG agreed to look into this matter further.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>FCBC</p>
<p>6.2</p> <p>SCF260214/6.2</p>	<p>Substitute members attending Forum meetings.</p> <p>Ahead of the meeting, the following note issued to members in respect of the point:</p> <p>In the event that a Forum member is unable to attend a meeting, we would have no objection to a substitute member from the relevant organisation or community group attending meetings as long as we received notification in advance. It would be for the individual member to decide whether they would like to field a substitute, we would not propose that this be a mandatory part of membership to the Forum.</p> <p>DT raised the point that the absence of a member attending in the past has sometimes caused a delay in response to an outstanding action allocated to that person. In the event that a member is unable to attend, TS should strive to obtain a response on that action, in a timely manner.</p> <p>LS agreed and stated that this had been the case.</p> <p>With regard to attendance by DW on behalf of City of Edinburgh Council, DW stated that he was not an official member of the Forum but had volunteered to attend, he would endeavour to attend all future meetings, or supply updates to actions if that was not possible.</p> <p>Forum members welcomed this.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>EDT</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p>6.3</p>	<p>CoCP specific requirements for vehicle wheel-washing facilities at all construction sites.</p>	

<p>SCF260214/6.3</p>	<p>LS stated that the CoCP did not require vehicle wheel-washing facilities at all construction site accesses.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>Giving background to this issue DT mentioned occasions where wheel-washing facilities had appeared, disappeared or were not being used at various site accesses including Echline. This had resulted in accumulation of dirt on pavements and roads, notably on the A904, some of which he considered hazardous. It was a requirement of the CoCP to ensure that vehicles are clean when going onto the road.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>DG responded by saying that setting up wheel wash facilities would be impractical if the work areas are constantly changing – which they are. CoCP CI 4.6.5 states there is a requirement to keep the roads and accesses free from mud and other loose materials arising from the works. FCBC believe they achieve this. Where the roads are discoloured, this is the effects of discoloured water - it is much more liquid than solid. In the case of the A904, there is a wheel wash on the North side and a road brush with water and suction facility on the U221 and on the A904 when required.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>DG stated that FCBC would go further on the A904 by spraying the road with the water bowser (as is done at Ferry Toll) but for the fact that the high volume of traffic could lead to accidents through driver frustration. FCBC have tried it but stopped when they noted the effect on the drivers' behaviour.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>DG commented that FCBC have been moving some materials in the past few weeks from North to South of the A904. This will cease in two weeks' time. However the A904 construction will be completed in Summer and the access /egress will change accordingly.</p> <p>DG agreed to look further into the provision of cleaning facilities in the vicinity of the A904.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>FCBC</p>
<p>6.4</p>	<p>EMP requirements for the maintenance of log books at all construction sites.</p>	

	<p>LS stated that the CoCP did not stipulate a requirement for the maintenance of log books at all construction sites.</p> <p>DT referred to The Principal Contractor (FCBC) Dust and Air Pollution Management Plan (section 4.15.1)</p> <p>DG responded by highlighting that the Dust and Air Pollution Management Plan states that FCBC will log vehicles in and out and comment on loads and cleanliness and condition of vehicles.</p> <p>The law requires, under the PUWER regulations that a written log is kept of a vehicle's condition and this should be recorded as a minimum weekly. There is a log available. FCBC have records of every delivery made to the site and of every load of material removed from the site.</p> <p>Banksmen inspect the condition of loads prior to them leaving the site and bring to the attention of the drivers any aspect that may not comply with the standards FCBC are looking to achieve . The drivers take action accordingly.</p> <p>The logging of the banksmen's observations and measures taken is not something that are logged or will be logged. With regard to the management of loads in and out of the site, FCBC are happy with the systems we are applying and the standards being achieved.</p> <p>LC raised a question regarding whether banksmen were being provided at all sites, as he did not believe, from his observations, that this was the case.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
SCF260214/6.4	<p>DG agreed to look at this further as he believed that banksmen were appropriately employed across the site.</p>	FCBC
6.5	<p>CoCP specified notice period to locally impacted residents of planned construction works.</p> <p>DT referred to paragraph 2.3.1 of the CoCP.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
SCF260214/6.5	<p>LS acknowledged that there were instances where FCBC had not provided the full 14 notice period required and agreed to look into this further.</p>	EDT/FCBC

<p>6.6</p> <p>Pollution increase on the A904 footpath and bus shelter areas.</p> <p>DG said there was heavy general traffic along this route that is not related to the FRC project, and this is a contributing factor to the pollution in question. Weather conditions may also be a contributing factor.</p> <p>During February-November of last year when there were regular deliveries along this route, the Contractor carried out a regular cleaning regime in respect of the A904 footpath and bus shelter area. Over the last fortnight there had been deliveries from Ferrytoll to the Queensferry Gyatory and this is due to continue for the next two weeks.</p> <p>DG also stated that in response to a request from a member of the public, the contractor undertook to clean the footpath and bus shelter last Friday – 21 February. Decisions to undertake further cleaning would be on a case by case basis.</p> <p>SCF260214/6.6a</p> <p>In view of comments received by members, and the fact that oil shale deliveries will recommence, DG undertook to revisit the cleaning regime.</p> <p>DW highlighted that prior to the project starting, they had received no complaints about the cleanliness of the road.</p> <p>SCF260214/6.6b</p> <p>DG agreed that if oil shale deliveries were being resumed along the A904, cleaning should also resume. However, it was recognised by LS and AS that the Forum members concern was not limited to the condition of the A904 due to spent oil shale deliveries. DG agreed that FCBC should access the wider issue of the cleanliness of the A904.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>FCBC</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>FCBC</p>	
<p>6.7</p>	<p>Status of seed planting on earth bunds etc. from January - March 2014.</p> <p>LS stated that the season for sowing grass seed is April to October inclusive and therefore seeding this year couldn't be commenced until April 2014. However, the Contractor intends to seed the verges and embankments on the U221 in April/May 2014, weather permitting.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<p>SCF260214/6.7a</p>	<p>LS also stated that he understood that seeding works would be progressed, subject to seasonal constraints and weather for all areas adjacent to the realigned A904, as soon as possible after they had been top soiled.</p> <p>DT said that he had raised this issue because of previous discussions with David Climie (DC) about seeding the U221 in October last year, which had not happened.</p> <p>DT suggested that residents should be made aware of progress and intentions regarding seeding and planting progress.</p> <p>LS agreed that updates would be provided.</p> <p>LS stressed to DG that trees should be planted as soon as was practicable, as earthworks were completed.</p> <p>LC informed LS that he understood that earthwork stockpiles/bunds that had stood for more than one season should be seeded, and that this was not being done.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>EDT</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p>SCF260214/6.7b</p>	<p>LS agreed that this point would be considered further in conjunction with EDT and FCBC.</p>	<p>EDT/FCBC</p>
<p>6.8</p> <p>SCF260214/6.8</p>	<p>FRC Project website information status.</p> <p>DT noted that a response had been received by KM to his email about the website, that it was helpful that members were being notified of revised documents that were uploaded to the website, but the fact still stood that documents were missing, and it was not always easy to see what revisions had been made to revised versions. DT did note that there were some good examples of revised documents with revisions clearly stated on them.</p> <p>KM agreed that although a page was contained within some of the plans stating what the revisions were, this was inconsistent across the range of plans on the TS website.</p> <p>LS stated that EDT were working with FCBC to</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

	ensure a more consistent approach was adopted, and that the TS website would be updated accordingly.	EDT/FCBC
7	Any Other Business	
7.1	Mud on Society Road DR mentioned that the road brushing on Society Road was not adequately dealing with the mud on the road, and that rain exacerbates the situation. It was suggested that a high pressure washer may be required for this.	Noted Noted
SCF260214/7.1	DG agreed to investigate.	FCBC
7.2	A904 Works LC informed the meeting of an instance at the crossing where Scottish Water was running a pump and generator without screening until 5am. During this time, there were several instances of shouting from workers communicating with their colleagues. DG agreed to take the noise issue forward. LS was aware that a water valve had burst in the vicinity of Echline Corner, this happened while undertaking a planned diversion , and had resulted in remedial work taking place last night and into the morning at short notice . LS apologised if any inconvenience has been caused to affected households.	Noted FCBC Noted Noted
8	Dates of next meetings	
	The next meetings of the Community Forums will take place at the Contact and Education Centre on the following dates: North Community Forum - Wednesday 21 May 2014 7pm South Community Forum – Wednesday 28 May 2014 7pm	Noted