

**Technical Services
Major Projects**

TT7202

**Selkirk FPS
(Flood Protection
Scheme)**

**Formal review of feedback
from Public Exhibition No. 1
and Presentation held on
9th and 10th June 2010**

21st September 2010

Issue No : 06

REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Originators:

Conor Price (Project Manager)
Steven Vint (HGL Project Manager)

Approval:

Paul Frankland (Project Executive)
David Green (Senior User)
John Drake (Senior Supplier)

Signature:

Reviewers:

Signature:

Revision History

Version	Date	Summary of Changes	Author
01	10-06-2010	First draft	Conor Price / Steven Vint
02	12-08-2010	Draft for review by SBC	Steven Vint
03	08-09-2010	Comments by SBC on HGL draft	Conor Price
04	09-09-2010	HGL final comments and revisions	Steven Vint
05	09-09-2010	Issues to document Approval	Conor Price
06	21-09-2010	Approval Comments incorporated	Conor Price

Purpose:

The purpose of this document is to provide a complete review of the feedback received through various media formats at the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme (FPS) Public Exhibition No. 1 which was held in June 2010. Specifically, this report intends to:

- Catalogue the details of the questionnaires completed by the public
- Catalogue the Question & Answer discussion held at the end of the Public Presentation on day one of the Public Exhibition
- Catalogue responses received via the Selkirk FPS website
- Catalogue the Project Teams consideration of the public comments
- Discuss the potential impacts (risk and opportunity) of all comments received
- Recommend the way forward for dealing with the comments through either their dismissal (and reasons for doing so), or taking cognisance of and defining possible viable solutions which may arise from the comments

Background

The Project Team (Scottish Borders Council and Halcrow Group Limited) agreed to take forward the first Public Exhibition to display the potential options for flood protection for Selkirk. The purpose of the Exhibition was therefore:

- To highlight historical flooding events
- To show the current level of flood risk within the town
- To show the current thoughts on a variety of options that had been developed to provide flood protection for the Ettrick Water, Long Philip Burn and Shaw Burn
- To gauge and record public reaction on the options using questionnaires
- To allow for direct public comment through a Public Presentation with a Questions & Answers Session
- To demonstrate how the Project Team have taken these comments, thoughts and ideas into account within the Option Appraisal Process¹

Public Exhibition No. 1 was held in Victoria Hall, Selkirk on Wednesday 9th June and Thursday 10th June 2010. The exhibition consisted of the following visual aids:

- A video of the 2003 flood event which severely affected the Bannerfield estate

¹ The Option Appraisal Process is the process through which the Consultant reviews the many options which may be taken forward. These options are reviewed from a technical, ecological, social, environmental, economical etc. perspective. The Option Appraisal Process will culminate in the identification of the most appropriate options. The combination of these then becomes the Preferred Scheme.

- 19 no., A0 sized, professionally printed and mounted boards. These depicted historical flooding photographs, maps of the catchment and drawings, sketches, photomontages and artists impressions of the various options
- Handouts, leaflets and some examples of home flood protection products which can be purchased from Scottish Borders Council a reduced price

Those members of the public who attended the Exhibition were encouraged to fill in questionnaires which had been purposely designed for this event. A copy of the blank questionnaire is included in Appendix A of this document. Copies of the completed questionnaires which were returned to the Project Team are included in Appendix B of this document.²

The presentation was made to a public meeting at 19:00 on Wednesday 9th June 2010. The presentation was advertised in advance in the local media and was open to all who wished to attend; approximately 60 people attend the presentation.

Conor Price, Project Manager from SBC, and Steven Vint, Design Manager from Halcrow Group Limited delivered the presentation which was approximately 40 minutes long. At the end of the presentation a Questions & Answers Session was held. This session was managed through the public meeting chairperson, John Smail, and allowed those in attendance to raise any issue they felt appropriate to the Project Team.

Questionnaires

In order to provide for a consistent method of gauging public reaction, the Project Team developed a simple questionnaire. In order to maximise the percentage of questionnaires returned, the document was designed to be easy to understand, quick to fill in and anonymous. A copy of the blank questionnaire is included in Appendix A of this document.

Of the 119 people who registered their attendance at the exhibition, 35 questionnaires were filled in and returned, representing a 29% response rate.

Full copies of the original handwritten questionnaires are included in Appendix B of this report to complete the record.

A copy of the Attendance Register is included in Appendix C of this document.³

Table 1 provides a summary of the responses contained within those questionnaires and shows how the Project Team have actioned those responses to date.

² Appendix B is not uploaded to the Website. The decision not to upload Appendix B to the Website was taken by the Project Team in order to protect private information supplied on some of the questionnaires. Appendix B may be viewed by appointment with the Project Team if it is so required.

³ Appendix C is not uploaded to the Website. See Footnote No. 2.

Ref ID	Area	Q2. Selkirk FPS wanted?	Q3. Do you approve of approach?	Q4. Have you experienced flooding?	Q5. Are there flood issues you feel we have missed?	Q6. Do you use the river for recreation?	Q7. Do you have concerns about how the FPS might affect recreational use?	Q8. Any other comments?	Project Team's response on comments	Final Action(s) to be taken regarding the comments ⁴
001	Philiphaugh Area	YES	YES	Yes - 1977 & 2003 from Ettrick/Long Philip Burn	Yes - Restoration of degraded habitat from reservoir	Fishing / tourism	Yes – 1) No removal of cauld to protect fishing. Risk to embankments on Philiphaugh Estate.	2) Fence either side of LPB, protect native plant species. 3) Leave burn in existing channel within triangular field, do not alter field. 4) A708 Bridge could be removed.	1) Cauld removal option now highly likely to be dropped due to a range of technical, environmental and third party issues. 2) Potential consideration a Natural Flood Management riparian planting. 3) Existing channel does not have sufficient capacity to convey any of the flows from the three scenarios. 4) If no storage option is preferred option, then A708 will require to be removed.	
002	Philiphaugh Area	YES	YES	Yes - 1977, water was 3 inches deep inside house. Last two floods 2003 & 2004 water was in garden but fortunately though under house did not come above floor level.	No	Dog walking and salmon fishing	Yes – 1) If the option of removing Murrays Cauld is taken I feel it would ruin the salmon fishing pools below - downstream due to gravel wash down, etc	2) Removing the water from the dam (lade) behind Ettrickhaugh Road could affect security from intruders to properties at rear of houses. 3) I have a concern with the banking opposite the Howden WTW. The last flood in 2004 tore away a large stretch of embankment on the Philiphaugh side of the river. The river then came through the fields around the fish farm. Now, as Ettrick Haugh Road is downstream from this I am concerned that the water could affect us here. 4) Suggestions for protection from "Long Philip Burn events" seem to be very good and would certainly allay fears.	1) Ok – point noted regarding the salmon. Will require to look into ramifications of this with Tweed Commission. 2) Very good point – any removal of water from the Mill Lade will need to consider this and a range of environmental and social factors. 3) All options for the Philiphaugh defences take cognisance of the need to keep flood water off the Philiphaugh flood plain (to prevent the flood mechanism you refer to from happening). 4) We must keep flood water from the Long Philip Burn from crossing the A708.	
003	Bannerfield Area	YES	YES	No	No	Cycling and walking	None	1) The Bannerfield end pier of the footbridge appears vulnerable to flood damage. I assume this also is a concern.	1) The Bannerfield footbridge piers are founded on a concrete pad protected by a ring of sheet piles and should be resistant to scour erosion. Any new flood defences along the river edge (where the footbridge connects with the bank on the Bannerfield side) will require to resist the effects of erosion which is currently affecting the banking in that location.	
004	Riverside Area	YES	NO	No	Yes - The economic valuation issue of the Riverside Industrial area and its ability to survive. Its rates have increased, value has fallen - borrowing is worse.	-	None	1) Valuation of properties has been reduced because of the "flood report". Future valuations may not be restored by building walls. 2) Containment policy upstream is against nature. 3) Run-off is too fast. 4) Rivers cut channels - they don't build walls lower to river bed and water table. 5) The "Island" at the middle of the river Ettrick at Bannerfield foot bridge should be removed. It's over 20 years old.	1) Within the scope of this project, it is not possible to comment on individual valuations of properties with respect to current or future flood risk. 2) This is a very valid point. Containment of flood waters upstream of populated areas will always attract controversy as deliberate flooding of land (to protect others) will have an impact on the local environment. However, this method brings flood risk benefits to the whole valley and can mitigate the height, extent and impact of walls and embankments downstream. 3) We are investigating natural ways in which run off into the smaller burns which feed into the Ettrick and Yarrow Waters can be reduced through river edge planting etc. 4) Not sure about the true meaning of this comment 5) This island has built up because the natural river processes tend to deposit	

⁴ Final Actions to be taken will be confirmed during Outline Design Stage (early 2011)

Ref ID	Area	Q2. Selkirk FPS wanted?	Q3. Do you approve of approach?	Q4. Have you experienced flooding?	Q5. Are there flood issues you feel we have missed?	Q6. Do you use the river for recreation?	Q7. Do you have concerns about how the FPS might affect recreational use?	Q8. Any other comments?	Project Team's response on comments	Final Action(s) to be taken regarding the comments ⁴
									material at this location. Removal of the island will only work as a short term measure as material will soon start to build up again.	
005	Selkirk Town	YES	YES	No	No - Comprehensive and balanced range of options sensitive to environment (don't fight nature)	-	None	-		
006	Bannerfield Area	YES	YES	Yes - 2003 Bannerfield was flooded. My family was vacated for 6 months into Galashiels.	No	Walking	None	-		
007	Lindean Area	YES	YES	Yes - November 2009. Lindean Smithy, River opposite Smithy and houses burst its banks causing severe flooding and damage to properties.	-	Walking	None	1) Concerns about the area at the Lindean Bridge as there are three arches and only one in operation. 2) The reason for this if you are looking upstream, down to the right hand side the stones and vegetation have been allowed to grow up over the years. 3) If this was cleaned out, and river bed put back to what it should be I think it would be a good short term help to all properties.	1), 2) and 3) SBC have commenced the process to carry out works to clear out this channel and improve the conveyance of the river. This short term improvement is likely to be augmented by dedicated in channel works to keep water flowing through the Sunderland Hall side arch and prevent a future build up of material. Care require to ensure change in river regime does not affect other adjacent river banks and full study will be undertaken during the next stage of the project.	
008	Lindean Area	YES	YES	Yes - 19/11/2009 - Flooded from River Ettrick, flood water entered property.	No	Walking	None	1) Land on opposite side of river from Lindean Smithy is overgrown with trees, bushes and washed up stones etc over period of time and pushes river towards our property.	1) See response to questionnaire ID 007.	
009	Selkirk Town	YES	YES	No	No	-	-	-		
010	Earlston	YES	YES	Yes - Heavy rain over sustained time	No	Salmon and trout and grayline fishing	None	Good exhibition - well set out		
011	Lindean Area	YES	YES	Yes - Lindean Mill flooded many times	No	No	None	1) Disappointed no real plans for Lindean Mill.	1) Whilst the exhibition did not set out any specific flood defence options for the Lindean Mill area, improvements to the flood risk for these properties could be realised by the undertaking of other measures described in response to questionnaire ID no. 007 and also through the potential provision of upstream storage on the Yarrow Water at St. Mary's Loch.	
012	Philippaugh Area	YES	UNANSWERED	Yes - House surrounded and in foundations - not actually in property	No	Walking	None	1) Not enough gravel taken out of water course, which allows the water to change course and erode river banks.	1) This method of preserving the available channel cross section was very popular and perceived to be an efficient and simple way of managing flood risk. In many ways, such a process can still provide tangible benefits in terms of flood risk reduction, but it is commonly agreed that such extraction of gravels has major adverse impacts on the environment, is costly to carry out on an annual basis and cannot provide quantitative levels of flood protection necessary.	

Ref ID	Area	Q2. Selkirk FPS wanted?	Q3. Do you approve of approach?	Q4. Have you experienced flooding?	Q5. Are there flood issues you feel we have missed?	Q6. Do you use the river for recreation?	Q7. Do you have concerns about how the FPS might affect recreational use?	Q8. Any other comments?	Project Team's response on comments	Final Action(s) to be taken regarding the comments ⁴
013	Selkirk Town	YES	YES	No	No	Walking - regularly on riverside paths Cycling - occasional	Yes - Any increase in "off road" cycle routes would be welcome.	-		
014	Selkirk Town	YES	YES	No	No	Fishing	Yes - Access	-		
015	Lindean Area	YES	YES	Yes - 2009, Lindean Smithy Cottages. 18 inches through entire ground floor and outbuildings (hip high) still in temporary accommodation (7+ months on)	No	Walking, horse riding, occasional fishing	None	1) Do something as quickly as possible please. The Ettrick channel on Sunderland Hall side needs clearing. This is a river management issue - the area has not been kept clear. 2) Also the bridges at Ettrick and Tweed are always clogged with trees and debris. Could the council pay six monthly visits to assess and clear?	1) See response to questionnaire ID 007. 2) SBC regularly inspects all bridges and flow constrictions, especially after high flow events. Whilst every effort is made to clear bridge piers and cutwaters, inevitably some residual debris remains at difficult or dangerous to access locations.	
016	Selkirk Town	UNANSWERED	YES	No	Yes - As of today (10th June) the river is very low - will the proposed change impact on this scenario?	Dog walking and cycling	Yes - need to be sure it will improve the situation and not make it worse.	-		
017	Broadmeadows	YES	YES	Yes - 2003 garden inundated mild heating oil pollution. 2004 garden inundated loss of composting worm and stock on both occasions.	No	Observing wildlife	None	1) Agree entirely with Murray Cauld proposals. 2) Agree with St Marys Loch storage. 3) Long Philip Burn bridge improvements should only be done if effective upstream retention is in place.	3) The bridge improvements are more likely to be required if upstream retention is not in place. Bridge removal and replacement is required to pass forward the higher flows – if retention was in place, the extent of works to the bridges is likely to be less onerous.	
018	Yarrow Valley	YES	YES	Yes - Our whole property at Yarrow Cottage, Yarrow was flooded on 19th Nov 2009.	No	Fishing, Paddling with children, wildlife, etc	None	-		
019	Lindean Area	YES	YES	No	Don't know	Walking and cycling	None	-		
020	Riverside Area	YES	YES	No	No	Yes	None	-		
021	Riverside Area	YES	YES	No	No	Walking and cycling	None	1) In present financial climate will we ever see improvements?	1) SBC have committed to take the scheme to the conclusion of the approvals process. Once the Flood Protection Scheme's Order is approved Construction will be taken forward as funding becomes available.	
022	Bannerfield Area	YES	YES	No but 2003 flooding from Long Philip Burn, came very close to house	No	Walking and cycling	None	Hope it progresses as quickly as possible.		
023	Notes by Neil Nutt	UNANSWERED	UNANSWERED					Septic tanks for 2 & 4 Whinfield House.		
024	Notes by Neil Nutt	UNANSWERED	UNANSWERED					Lindean - 8th Jan 05 was worse than 19th Nov 09 knee deep. Oct 05 flooded again.		
025	Melrose	YES	YES	No	No	Walking, Cycling	None	Well presented information and good explanations of proposals.		
026	Yarrowkirk	YES	YES	Yes - flooded road and garden	No	Swimming, walking, canoeing	None	Informative exhibition.		
027	Lindean Area	YES	YES	No		Walking, fishing		The proposal for St Marys loch seems like the obvious way to go and the proposal for the		

Ref ID	Area	Q2. Selkirk FPS wanted?	Q3. Do you approve of approach?	Q4. Have you experienced flooding?	Q5. Are there flood issues you feel we have missed?	Q6. Do you use the river for recreation?	Q7. Do you have concerns about how the FPS might affect recreational use?	Q8. Any other comments?	Project Team's response on comments	Final Action(s) to be taken regarding the comments ⁴
								Triangular Field is important and storage upstream.		
028	Selkirk Town	YES	YES	No	Yes - how does the Haining Burn work in relation to this.	Yes	None	Delighted to know this is being considered.		
029	Selkirk Town	YES	YES	No	No	Fishing	None	-		
030	Philiphaugh Area	YES	YES	Yes - May 2003	No	No	None	-		
031	Riverside Area	YES	YES	No	Burn down from Haining floods Mill St and Buccleuch Road	Walking		Thank you. Hope you will publish developments and funding in local press.		
032	Kelso	YES	YES	No	No	No	None	-		
033	Yarrow Valley	YES	YES	Yes - Severe flooding throughout the ground floor and grounds of our house in Nov 09 - Still temporary accommodation 8 months on	No	Walking, Swimming, Paddling	None	-		

Table 1 – Summary of Questionnaire responses and project team assessment of responses

Questions & Answers

A question and answer session was held following delivery of the presentation on the evening of the 9th June 2010. Table 2 provides a record of those questions and the Project Team's responses. Final Actions to be taken regarding these comments will be updated once the preferred Scheme is defined.

Question (as posed at the presentation)	Answer	Final Actions to be taken regarding the comments
<p>Q1 (From Alec Kerr, Yarrowford)</p> <p><i>What are the proposals for the Yarrow Valley, especially the Yarrowford / Broadmeadows areas?</i></p>	<p>A1 (Conor Price, SBC Project Manager)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This public exhibition relates specifically to Selkirk. There are various options for flood protection outside Selkirk however the specific responsibility of this project is to protect the town of Selkirk. • The Yarrowford and Broadmeadows areas fall outside of the Selkirk area however the St. Mary's Loch proposal could help protect along the Yarrow Valle and along the Ettrick to Lindean. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The implementation of the St Mary's Loch attenuation proposal is likely to have benefits for the residents of the Yarrow Valley. • SBC have instructed HGL to carry out a study of the flood risk at Yarrow and Yarrowford before and after the potential implementation of the St. Mary's Loch storage option. The results of this study are will be identified in through the Selkirk FPS Project. • Separately, SBC are taking forward Flood Protection Works to improve the level of flood protection at Broadmeadows.
<p>Q2 (From Alec Kerr, Yarrowford)</p> <p><i>At a previous meeting [The Yarrow Valley Public Meeting held in Yarrowfeus Hall on 17th February 2010] Scottish Water indicated that St. Mary's Loch was full and they had no capacity to reduce it, so how can that option work?</i></p>	<p>A2 (Conor Price, SBC Project Manager)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At that meeting Scottish Water undertook to assist SBC with the Selkirk FPS and have been doing so. • At that meeting SBC undertook to carry out an analysis of the hydrology at St. Mary's Loch. Halcrow have since carried out an analysis within the Selkirk FPS. The Project Team are ongoing in assessing these proposals however they will constitute the basis for establishing the St. Mary's Loch Working Group. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St Mary's Loch Working Group (SMWLG) was established during the summer of 2010 and will hold its first formal meeting on 14th September 2010. • Scottish Water are part of this working group and have undertaken to assist in the appraisal process for this option.
<p>Q3 (From Alec Kerr, Yarrowford)</p> <p><i>By constructing the flood defences in the town of Selkirk, would this create a flow constriction resulting in greater flood risk to the upstream Yarrow Valley?</i></p>	<p>A3 (Conor Price, SBC Project Manager)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hydraulic studies have been carried out and the effects would be negligible. • This scheme is not able to specifically protect Yarrowford; however the St. Mary's Loch proposal could potentially reduce the flood risk. We will need to assess what the long term effect would be [on the loch] if it was put into action. A Working Group has been set up and discussions are being held with Scottish Water. These works could be done very quickly [relative to the rest of the works]. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Project Team do not believe defences in Selkirk will cause greater flood risk upstream. This will be looked at in detail. • Separately, SBC are taking forward Flood Protection Works to improve the level of flood protection at Broadmeadows.

Question (as posed at the presentation)	Answer	Final Actions to be taken regarding the comments
<p>Q4 (From Alec Kerr, Yarrowford)</p> <p><i>The sequence of flooding from burns, to fields, to the road is incorrect for Yarrowford [implies there are numerous flooding mechanisms for this area].</i></p>	<p>A4 (Conor Price, SBC Project Manager)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The flooding from the burns is as a result of backwater from the Yarrow so depends on the water level [all flooding mechanisms will be assessed within the areas covered by the scheme]. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No action to be taken under the Selkirk FPS. Separately, SBC are taking forward Flood Protection Works to improve the level of flood protection at Broadmeadows.
<p>Q5 (From Geraldine Bouglas, Ettrickhaugh Road)</p> <p><i>These proposals are welcome. What is the funding situation? Is there a likelihood that these proposals would have to be prioritised due to lack of funding or is it an all or nothing scheme? If so, what areas are deemed to be high priority?</i></p>	<p>A5 (Conor Price, SBC Project Manager)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The figures work out. A cost benefit analysis has been done. This compares the cost of potential damage to the cost of protection works resulting in a cost benefit ratio. A very good cost benefit analysis [strong economic case] has allowed the proposed scheme to progress. It could cost less than previously thought (in 2006). Funding is confirmed for the design costs. Once the preferred scheme is known next spring we will be able to provide further information on the construction programme and costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SBC have committed to take the scheme to the conclusion of the approvals process. Once funding is secured for construction of the Scheme (or prioritised parts of the Scheme), detailed design and procurement of those contracts will take place. Prioritisation methodologies will be based on which parts of the Scheme will provide the most benefit in terms of flood risk reduction.
<p>Q6 (From Keith Hendry, business owner in the riverside area)</p> <p><i>Why is the most obvious solution of the American concrete levy not being taken?</i></p>	<p>A6 (Steven Vint, Halcrow Design Manager)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is a long way for the water to travel from Selkirk to the sea at Berwick. This option would just pass the problem elsewhere. The flooding legislation requires that schemes need to be sensitive to their environment and to implement natural flood management [where practical]. The American model would be easy but there would be too many objections. This scheme aims to look at the catchment as a whole and integrate the Yarrow Water, Ettrick Water, Long Philip Burn etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new Flood Risk Management (Scotland) 2009 Act generally calls for flood risk reduction measures to incorporate ways in which run-off into rivers and burns is slowed down. In some cases, however, ensuring the water can flow from point A to point B as quickly as possible is actually the best way of managing flood risk, providing it can be proved that downstream flood risk is not made worse. Whilst it is not acceptable to provide very expensive unsightly concrete channels, more subtle ways to utilise this concept can be provided over short stretches (Shaw Burn at Ashy Bank, Long Philip Burn at Bannerfield as examples).
<p>Q7 (From John Smail, resident of Lindean area and Chair person of the presentation)</p> <p><i>He knows of a resident at Lindean who was stopped from putting a bund around their property. Are people allowed to take their own measures?</i></p>	<p>A7 (David Green, SBC Flood Protection Team Manager)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each person has a responsibility to protect their property and is entitled to do so. However, this has to be within established processes and where there would be interference with a waterway various approvals would need to be sought e.g. Planning permission, SEPA approval. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No action required.

Question (as posed at the presentation)	Answer	Final Actions to be taken regarding the comments
<p>Q8 (From Mr Anderson, resident of Bannerfield and previously Lindean) <i>If a person is carrying out such works, are permissions dependant on interference with waterways at normal or flood levels?</i></p>	<p>A8 (David Green, SBC Flood Protection Team Manager)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permissions are required regardless [for all states of flow]. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No action required.
<p>Q9 (From Jim Mitchell, resident/farmer at St. Mary's Loch) <i>Would like note to be taken on how low the level of St. Mary's Loch can be. It is at the normal spring level just now. Scottish Water does not appear to be releasing water from the dam. Who would have control of the 'tap'?</i></p>	<p>A9 (Conor Price, SBC Project Manager)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project team are aware of the current levels, and that it was recently 300-400mm below the Normal Loch Level [as defined on Scottish Water drawings of the St. Mary's outlet]. All obligations from the public meeting in the Yarrow Valley will be taken forward. Scottish Borders Council is consulting with Scottish Water. Ettrick and Yarrow Community Council have had a meeting and Conor Price has been in contact with them. Stakeholders for the St. Mary's Loch proposal are being identified. • It isn't possible to confirm who would control the 'tap' at this stage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The control of the 'Tap' will be determined by the St. Mary's Loch Working Group.

Table 2 – Record of Questions & Answers and actions to be taken

Outcome:

This document will be available on the Selkirk FPS Project Website at www.selkirkfloodscheme.com as soon as possible.

Gratitude:

The Project Team would like to express their thanks to everyone who attended the Public Exhibition No. 1 and the Presentation and specifically those people who participated in the Questions & Answers Session.

The Project Team would like to extend special thanks to John Smail who volunteered to independently chair the Presentation and Questions & Answers Session.

APPENDIX A:

- This is a copy of the blank questionnaire developed by the Project Team for use at the Public Exhibition No. 1.
- The questionnaire is in one pdf document form and is provided as a separate document to this report.

APPENDIX B:

- This is a copy of all questionnaires completed by the public.
- This is in 35 No. pdf documents and is provided as a separate document to this report.
- This document is not uploaded to the website as detailed on the footnote no. 2 on page no. 3.

APPENDIX C:

- This is a copy of the Registration of Attendance Sheets completed by the public at the Public Exhibition No. 1.
- This is in one pdf document form and is provided as a separate document to this report.
- This document is not uploaded to the website as detailed on the footnote no. 3 on page no. 3.