

Project:	<b>Glasgow Airport Rail Link</b>	Job No/Ref:	<b>39055 IEDE</b>
Purpose:	<b>To discuss SEPA Comments on Draft ES</b>	Date held:	<b>28 October 2005</b>
Held at:	SEPA East Kilbride	Made by:	<b>Brian Cuthbert</b>
Present:	June Dawson, SEPA (JD) David Gardner, SPT (DG) Ian Watson, FM (IW) Brian Cuthbert, FM (BC) Kieren Jarratt, FM (KJ)	Distribution: Attendees Charles Hoskins, SPT Ian Dudgeon, FM	

No.	Item	Action By
1.	<p>The meeting commenced with introduction of attendees and confirmation that the purpose of the meeting was to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Discuss the points raised by SEPA (letter dated 13 July 2005), in response to the Draft GARL ES issued in June 2005; and</li> <li>▪ Demonstrate how these issues had been addressed in the Design that will go forward in the Parliamentary Bill and also in the accompanying Final ES of September 2005.</li> </ul>	
2.	<p>JD noted she was content that the environmental issues raised appeared to have been addressed in the ES. However, JD expressed SEPA's concerns that the mitigation measures proposed in the ES would be implemented. This included control of release of chemicals and other pollutants during construction. BC advised that these issues would be covered more specifically by the GARL Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which was in preparation.</p> <p>DG confirmed that SPT was currently reviewing the draft CoCP. JD emphasised the importance of Contractor involvement in the development of the CoCP to ensure 'ownership' and therefore successful implementation of the CoCP. BC clarified that the CoCP should remain largely 'strategic' initially and that the details of the Finalised CoCP would include Contractor input.</p>	FM
3	<p>Piling operations and potential impacts on groundwaters were discussed. JD mentioned the potential for contamination being present at shallow depth within the park that could migrate to deeper groundwater if pathways were opened up during piling operations. Chromium was noted as a specific risk in the Glasgow and Paisley areas.</p> <p>BC noted that historical records showed that the north-west corner of the site had been used as a licensed landfill although the majority of the park was know to be underlain by made ground, including construction waste. BC also noted that the area of landfill would not be subject to piling.</p> <p>JD requested that FM note that the issue of potential migration of contaminants to deeper groundwater be considered. BC and IW stated that the piling operations would be designed and carried out in such a way to prevent creation of pathways between potentially contaminated layers and deeper aquifers.</p>	

	<p>IW emphasised that examination of ground conditions was an on-going issue and that contamination risks were being fully considered in selection of the appropriate piling methodology.</p>	FM
	<p>JD stated that registration of the engineering activity of piling would probably not be required under the Water Framework Directive (which seeks to protect river catchments, including groundwater). However, as the guidance on this is currently in development, at the appropriate time the requirement or otherwise for registration will be ascertained prior to commencement of construction works.</p>	FM
4.	<p>The proposed configuration for the new Fuel Farm at Glasgow Airport, including bunding and drainage arrangements, was discussed and illustrated by appropriate Stage 3 and ES Drawings. Drainage from the facility was discussed and it was confirmed that there would be no free drainage from the site to soakaway or to the Paisley Moss LNR. BC noted that drainage would connect into the local sewer, subject to agreement with Scottish Water, etc. The requirement for a full retention interceptor was discussed, in order to provide adequate protection from spills, etc.</p> <p>JD expressed concerns about the existence of operational procedures that would prevent spills as well as guard against vandalism that might lead to spills. BC advised that SPT had no jurisdiction over the operator through the GARL scheme, although it was understood that the operator of the current airport fuel farm (Pentland Aviation Limited) already had an environmental management system and that this would probably be similar for the new site.</p> <p>JD expressed concern that the construction works would not drain the adjacent LNR due to interruption or disturbance to the base flow to or from the LNR. IW stated that such potential impacts were appreciated and that the construction methodology would minimise interference with the groundwater regime associated with the LNR.</p> <p>JD also noted that there should be specific construction methods for the fuel farm regarding the potential for pollution of the LNR.</p> <p>JD also sought assurance that the final design, including piles and foundations, would not interfere with the groundwater base flow through the LNR during operation of the facility. BC stated that there was no intention to drain the moss, or to interfere with base flow, and that the detailed construction methodology and design would ensure this. It was agreed that the direction of base flow in the vicinity of the LNR would be confirmed.</p>	FM
5.	<p>General drainage issues were discussed, particularly with regard to reinstatement works at the St James' Park playing fields. JD stated that a Discharge Consent under CoPA was not likely to be required to allow discharge of surface water drainage from the playing fields (regarded as green-field run-off). However, it would be worth contacting Renfrewshire Council and Scottish Water regarding the scheme's intentions for drainage.</p> <p>It was noted that some form of treatment (e.g. settlement tanks) or attenuation may be required to avoid excessive loading on the receiving sewers. BC noted that the preliminary design for the playing field drainage included various holding/attenuation tanks and other measures intended to prevent flow surges to the sewer system and to minimise entry of particulates to the system.</p>	FM

	<p>Track drainage was also discussed. Road drainage from St James' Park could be combined with the track drainage for treatment and disposal. JD stated the risks associated with such track drainage should be understood and appropriate treatment measures instituted.</p>	FM
	<p>JD mentioned that SEPA would expect construction compounds to be secure so that any leaks of oil, chemicals, etc., would be contained. IW confirmed that this was the intention and that such stipulations would be included in the CoCP.</p>	FM
6.	<p>DG gave an indication of timescales for submission of the Bill, indicating that it might be towards the end of this year or the beginning of 2006 before the Bill was introduced. SEPA would then be required to comment on the Bill and ES, etc. as per Parliamentary procedures.</p>	SEPA
7.	<p>The meeting concluded with BC agreeing to write to SEPA recording this discussion and to confirm that development of the details of issues such as the drainage and the CoCP were on-going and that SPT / FM would keep SEPA informed of progress as required.</p> <p>JD was advised that the Final ES was now (more or less) available on the internet <a href="http://www.spt.co.uk/garl/index.html">http://www.spt.co.uk/garl/index.html</a> and that a full copy of the ES would be forwarded to SEPA when the Bill was submitted. No further meetings were therefore arranged.</p>	BC