	Questionnaire follow up conversation notes	
	If someone indicated in the questionnaire that they wished to talk further about	
	the proposed Harbour Revision Order, a follow up conversation was arranged	
	with the Oban Bay Harbour Manager. The observations made during this	
	conversation are recorded here.	
Conservation	Observations	Contact date to
Date		initiate conservation
Date		
18 Jun 18	The preservation of anchorages Gallanach Bay, Little Horseshoe and SW end of Horseshoe bay, inside the S end of Heather island, as almost all other areas are too deep for small vessels or occupied by moorings. The areas of seabed with present cables, normal small ferry routings & large ferry routes and manoeuvring space to be kept clear of moorings and anchoring vessels. Present inshore waters areas with existing moorings to be preserved except for special purposes. A body should be formed to oversee all moorings existing and applications for new ones and all developments that may affect moorings of any craft within the SHO. This body, or person of the body, should be attending harbour management meetings and informed of any special purposes and developments forthcoming. There has to be adequate control of space for shipping and to this end I think the SH limits should adequately take in the narrow channels and the approaches to. Propose S limit due east of South tip of Kerrera. North limit to include two cruise ship anchorage locations outwith the North of Kerrera entrance, this could be a radius area or a boxed area limit. Delineate a limit across Ardentrive bay to exclude this area from the SHO. Control of smaller vessels within the bounded area is covered fairly adequately by the present code of practice document. If a designated anchorage within the bay area has to exist it must not be positioned to inconvenience any larger vessel movements. We already have often enough vessels holding off, prior to another clearing a berth. Basically minimise congestion in a confined waters space. Designated anchorage no1, I suggest is removed.	
	Not enough small vessels monitor 12 & 16 as dual watch within the bay or approach. This needs addressing for safety, so possible signage? Areas where small vessels may be able to wait for a clear passage should be noted in the code of practice. The bay SE of the N spit pole on Kerrera, the bays due south of and NW of Dunollie Castle. It is good practice to slow and wait and show this intention in an area, rather than impede a large vessel. From these 3 positions you are out of the way and also have a good view of movements. The areas of seabed with present cables, normal small ferry routings & large ferry routes and manoeuvring space to be kept clear of moorings and anchoring vessels.	
	No response	27-Jun-18
		27-Jun-18
	No response	
	No response	27-Jun-18
	No response	27-Jun-18
06-Jul-18	Concerned Harbour Authority run by largest commercial operator causing a	27-Jun-18
	conflict of interest.	
	Safety announcments on VHF 12 OTT.	
	No response	27-Jun-18
	·	27-Jun-18
	No response	
	No response	27-Jun-18
	No response	27-Jun-18

No response

No response

27-Jun-18

27-Jun-18

12-Jul-18	Make a channel east of Maiden Island	27-Jun-18
	VHF traffic too high on Ch 12	
	Use AIS virtual buoyage to create a small vessel channel	
	Use CCTV footage a a learning tool	
	Place traffic lights on the TBF pontoons to prevent outbound conflict with large vessel movements.	
	Place traffic lights at north entrance Don't impose more charges for moorings	
	Establish a small vessel call channel to request permission to use large vessel	
	channel	
	Coded vessel must have AIS	
	I also think widening a lesuire preferred channel next to Maiden island could be	
	considered.	
	The option of a buoyed small vessel western channel next to the ship channel	
	might be viable. Exclude leisure traffic from ship channel. Have a eastern access	
	East to maiden Island too for leisure craft. This keeps independent access.	
	No response	27-Jun-18
	No response	07-Jul-18
	Generally very supportive of the safety initiative.	07-Jul-18
	Oban needs more joined up infrastructure to attract the marine user. To captialise)
	on the transit hub it is for the west coast.	
	No response	07-Jul-18
	No response	07-Jul-18
	No response	07-Jul-18
12-Jul-18	Nothing further	07-Jul-18
	No response	07-Jul-18
	No response	07-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	Nothing further	11-Jul-18
12-Jul-18	I don't have any further questions but was indicating a willingness to engage if more feedback was requested on specific issues. One point I think I made was that the information provided about the impact of the	11-Jul-18
	proposal seemed insufficient to make an informed decision	11-Jul-18
	No response No response	11-Jul-18
	Incorrect e-mail	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
12-Jul-18	Will call back & attend public meeting	12-Jul-18
12 001 10	No response	11-Jul-18
	Incorrect e-mail	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	Incorrect e-mail	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
12-Jul-18	Fully support the CMAL proposal and disgusted with RYA stance. I am delighted	11-Jul-18
	to have been consulted and express my opinion.	11 Jul 10
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18

13-Jul-18	Not a proponent of over regulation. No particular issues.	11-Jul-18
	Please to be consulted	
	No response	11-Jul-18
13-Jul-18	Is the CMAL board going to have local representation / input Traffic light system for small vessel at north entrance.	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
16-Jul-18	It is a good thing that a formal harbour is being proposed to manage vessel	11-Jul-18
10 001 10	movements at Oban. Not sure CMAL or A&BC are the best organisations to do this. NLB would be a more objective organisation to do this. A 'clear channel'policy for large vessels (like southampton water) would work well for the north entrance.	
	No response	11-Jul-18
12-Jul-18	Appreciated the greater detail. Satisfied in the sense behind the decisions and that harbour will be run for benefit of all and little or no cost to leisure users.	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
12-Jul-18	Nothing further to add	12-Jul-18
12-3ul-10	No response	11-Jul-18
		11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
40 Jul 40	No response	
12-Jul-18	Solution must be managable and simple for people to able to abide by it.	11-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	Postmaster failure	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
13-Jul-18	Ferries do come up fast on yachts in north entrance. LPS is required One ferry manouvring in the bay at a time Cow Pt reef needs marked off the beacon Fill in the Corran Ledge and the Scrat to shelter the harbour more from SW and NW and create quay space.	12-Jul-18
	Postmaster failure	12-Jul-18
02-Aug-18	We need to know what the proposals actually are because it looks like they will be very restrictive. We need something more tangible to understand	12-Jul-18
	My objection is one of transparency and accountability Cal Mac is a business and if it controls all port aspects of Oban it will be inclined to alter the rules to suit themselves rather than other users If there was a steering committee with teeth like a board that included other interested parties Eg other commercial users, pleasure boat users, RNLI and say a tourist board representative That had clear oversight and direction with teeth. Then I would have no objection	12-Jul-18

	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
14-Jul-18	From what I have read on this matter the "Stakeholder Questionnaire" is little more than a "box ticking" exercise. I have little doubt the future plans will have been formulated and simply await the passage of time to endorse them and if that is the case there is no point in further debate. However, it should be remembered that a considerable amount of public money has been invested already in the pontoon facility which spends much of it's time half empty, a testimony to it's ludicrous pricing structure designed to deter the very users who would actually spend the most in the area to the benefit of local businesses, and attract those who spend the least. Perhaps it's failure as a financial asset would serve CMAL's aims, justifying it's	
	removal easing the exclusion of leisure boats from the bay altogether or perhaps the exclusion of leisure boats will simply render it redundant. I can't help but think, regardless of stated intentions, the only beneficiary will be Calmac and that will be at every other users expense.	
	the exclusion of leisure boats will simply render it redundant. I can't help but think, regardless of stated intentions, the only beneficiary will be	12-Jul-18
	the exclusion of leisure boats will simply render it redundant. I can't help but think, regardless of stated intentions, the only beneficiary will be Calmac and that will be at every other users expense.	12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18
	the exclusion of leisure boats will simply render it redundant. I can't help but think, regardless of stated intentions, the only beneficiary will be Calmac and that will be at every other users expense. No response	
	the exclusion of leisure boats will simply render it redundant. I can't help but think, regardless of stated intentions, the only beneficiary will be Calmac and that will be at every other users expense. No response No response	12-Jul-18
	the exclusion of leisure boats will simply render it redundant. I can't help but think, regardless of stated intentions, the only beneficiary will be Calmac and that will be at every other users expense. No response No response No response	12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18
14-Jul-18	the exclusion of leisure boats will simply render it redundant. I can't help but think, regardless of stated intentions, the only beneficiary will be Calmac and that will be at every other users expense. No response No response No response No response	12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18
14-Jul-18	the exclusion of leisure boats will simply render it redundant. I can't help but think, regardless of stated intentions, the only beneficiary will be Calmac and that will be at every other users expense. No response No response No response No response Everone of the main user at Oban needs to be consulted. Foreign yacht seem to be a problem and they need to be captured with the code fo conduct, prior to arrival. No response	12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18
14-Jul-18	the exclusion of leisure boats will simply render it redundant. I can't help but think, regardless of stated intentions, the only beneficiary will be Calmac and that will be at every other users expense. No response No response No response No response Everone of the main user at Oban needs to be consulted. Foreign yacht seem to be a problem and they need to be captured with the code fo conduct, prior to arrival.	12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18
14-Jul-18	the exclusion of leisure boats will simply render it redundant. I can't help but think, regardless of stated intentions, the only beneficiary will be Calmac and that will be at every other users expense. No response No response No response No response Everone of the main user at Oban needs to be consulted. Foreign yacht seem to be a problem and they need to be captured with the code fo conduct, prior to arrival. No response	12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18
14-Jul-18	the exclusion of leisure boats will simply render it redundant. I can't help but think, regardless of stated intentions, the only beneficiary will be Calmac and that will be at every other users expense. No response No response No response No response Everone of the main user at Oban needs to be consulted. Foreign yacht seem to be a problem and they need to be captured with the code fo conduct, prior to arrival. No response Postmaster failure	12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18
14-Jul-18	the exclusion of leisure boats will simply render it redundant. I can't help but think, regardless of stated intentions, the only beneficiary will be Calmac and that will be at every other users expense. No response No response No response No response No response Everone of the main user at Oban needs to be consulted. Foreign yacht seem to be a problem and they need to be captured with the code fo conduct, prior to arrival. No response Postmaster failure No response	12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18
14-Jul-18	the exclusion of leisure boats will simply render it redundant. I can't help but think, regardless of stated intentions, the only beneficiary will be Calmac and that will be at every other users expense. No response No response No response No response No response Everone of the main user at Oban needs to be consulted. Foreign yacht seem to be a problem and they need to be captured with the code fo conduct, prior to arrival. No response Postmaster failure No response No response No response	12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18
14-Jul-18 13-Jul-18	the exclusion of leisure boats will simply render it redundant. I can't help but think, regardless of stated intentions, the only beneficiary will be Calmac and that will be at every other users expense. No response No response No response No response No response Everone of the main user at Oban needs to be consulted. Foreign yacht seem to be a problem and they need to be captured with the code fo conduct, prior to arrival. No response Postmaster failure No response No response No response No response No response	12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18
	the exclusion of leisure boats will simply render it redundant. I can't help but think, regardless of stated intentions, the only beneficiary will be Calmac and that will be at every other users expense. No response No response No response No response No response Everone of the main user at Oban needs to be consulted. Foreign yacht seem to be a problem and they need to be captured with the code fo conduct, prior to arrival. No response Postmaster failure No response No response No response No response I just believe that some one just be in charge of the bay as rules of the road go	12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18
	the exclusion of leisure boats will simply render it redundant. I can't help but think, regardless of stated intentions, the only beneficiary will be Calmac and that will be at every other users expense. No response No response No response No response Everone of the main user at Oban needs to be consulted. Foreign yacht seem to be a problem and they need to be captured with the code fo conduct, prior to arrival. No response Postmaster failure No response No response No response I just believe that some one just be in charge of the bay as rules of the road go out the window in the bay and speed limits are not used.	12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18
	the exclusion of leisure boats will simply render it redundant. I can't help but think, regardless of stated intentions, the only beneficiary will be Calmac and that will be at every other users expense. No response No response No response No response No response Everone of the main user at Oban needs to be consulted. Foreign yacht seem to be a problem and they need to be captured with the code fo conduct, prior to arrival. No response Postmaster failure No response No response No response I just believe that some one just be in charge of the bay as rules of the road go out the window in the bay and speed limits are not used. No response No response	12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18
	the exclusion of leisure boats will simply render it redundant. I can't help but think, regardless of stated intentions, the only beneficiary will be Calmac and that will be at every other users expense. No response No response No response No response Everone of the main user at Oban needs to be consulted. Foreign yacht seem to be a problem and they need to be captured with the code fo conduct, prior to arrival. No response Postmaster failure No response No response No response I just believe that some one just be in charge of the bay as rules of the road go out the window in the bay and speed limits are not used. No response	12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18 12-Jul-18

14-Jul-18

Thanks for clarifying the cmal/calmac distinction, which I was only vaguely aware 12-Jul-18 of. What I take from your reply is that calmac (or private sector successor) will have day to day responsibility for operationally implementing the approach that cmal mandates, should the proposal go ahead. While cmal will encode its desires in the contract with calmac (or other), there will presumably be latitude in how things actually happen since its impossible to totally nail things down contractually. I have always viewed calmac as a responsible public sector operator that takes a mature, partnering approach to carrying out its activities, my concern would be that a potential private sector successor may take a less constructive and more hard line interpretation of its obligations under the contract with cmal. For example, its hard to unambiguously define when a vessel has been impeded in the north channel, its a judgement call. A private sector operator with delivery targets (and bonuses) dependent on running services to schedule may be inclined to interpret its powers in a way that reduces delays but which impairs the free navigation of others. I don't think calmac would do this, just suspect another operator might be more inclined to. I appreciate this is a hypothetical scenario, but we must be aware how things may evolve down the line.

The other point I have is that I'm struggling to understand in practical terms what is really meant by "vessel traffic can be managed for the safety and benefit of all users". What aspect of safety or benefit is not happening at the moment? How would cmal address these if it had control of the north channel? Is it really possible to do so in a way that benefits all users, rather than benefitting some at the expense of others? I would really appreciate more specifics here since the quoted phrase is too ambiguous. If the problem is that inconsiderate yachties are blocking the channel and need 5 short blasts from the clansman to get the out of the way, then just say that. And back it up with some statistics setting out how often it happens, how much delay is incurred, how many actual accidents etc. And if the proposed solution is to close the channel 10 mins either side of departure so that clansman can shoot through at 15 kts (which it seems to do anyway), then say that too. The problem is the lack of detail in the proposal, so people will be suspicious and worry about worst case scenarios. If you provide more concrete examples of actual issues and potential solutions, you will allay those concerns.

My overall observation is that some (a minority) of leisure boaters do not behave as well as they could. My obvious concern is that cmal brings in draconian restrictions to all boaters, including those that do behave well. On a practical point and one that might not be appreciated, a yacht at kerrera cannot hear the ch16/ch12 announcement from an incoming vessel since they are behind the hill. So you leave Kerrera, turn left to see a large vessel bearing down. I think a central ch12 control broadcasting in the bay would solve this (assuming users actually listened to 12 which is another issue).

13-Jul-18	Oban public own the bay.	12-Jul-18
	Public have been ignored in this matter.	
	No response	12-Jul-18

	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
16-Jul-18	Not keen on a port being opertated by the main user.	12-Jul-18
10 001 10	Oban should be operated for the benefit of all users.	12 001 10
	No response	12-Jul-18
	Postmaster failure	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
12-Jul-18	Nothing further to add	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
13-Jul-18	Overseas until Sep.	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
13-Jul-18	No response	12-Jul-18
13-Jul-18	There must be some compromise whereby CMAL can set up a version of a harbour board which also involves proper representation of other users rather than it being seen as a monopoly	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
16-Jul-18	I believe that a better controlled and marked approach would improve safety, particularly at the north entrance. It can be difficult to anticipate or see ferry movements when approaching the bay's north entrance and there is little room for manoeuvre once in the channel and committed.	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
13-Jul-18	CalMac and CMAL should not be allowed to for a harbour that will be operated in their own interests. It would be illegal to do so.	
	No response	16-Jul-18
	No response	16-Jul-18
	No response	16-Jul-18
17-Jul-18	Concerned that a major user of the harbour would be the harbour operator.	16-Jul-18
	No response	16-Jul-18

18-Jul-18	I need more information to be able to answer some questions in the questionnaire properly. Will updates be sent to my e-mail address?	16-Jul-18
	No response	16-Jul-18
	No response	16-Jul-18
	I am surprised Oban Bay is not already a SHA considering the volume of traffic. It does need to be a single harbour authority with a LPO. The proposal is a good idea. The Corran Ledge would benfit more buoyage to mark the shallow areas better, giving yachts more confidence to keep out from the centre of the channel.	16-Jul-18
	No response	16-Jul-18
	No response	16-Jul-18
18-Jul-18	I am fully supportive of a wider harbour authority and its aims, to help prevent people getting the regulations wrong and spoling it for others.	27-Jul-18
	No response	
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18 27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response No response	27-Jul-18
		27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response No response	27-Jul-18
30-Jul-18	Just wanted to say that I did not think that a majority user of Oban Bay should be	
30-Jul-18	in control of the harbour at the same time. There could be issues with transparency.	27-Jul-10
	No response	27-Jul-18
30-Jul-18	Whatever happens, given the exponential rise in the use of Oban Bay by ever larger vessels coupled with the increase of yachting traffic crossing the ferry routes as yachts go to and from the Transit Marina, it would appear sensible to have some form of 'control' to avoid conflicting movement with all that could lead to. Like many, I suspect that I would rather see a 'light touch' solution rather than a heavy handed approach.	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
30-Jul-18	The must be maintained access for leisure uses, this should be placed in protected provisions. CMAL board must demonstarte objectivity to all users not just CFL.	27-Jul-18
30-Jul-18	Seems to be workinh OK at the moment but it makes sense to have the area under HM control.	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
30-Jul-18	Concered that there is no redress to what CMAL will do runnning the harbour. Would prefer a trust port be set up.	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response	30-Jul-18

		00 1 1 40
	No response	30-Jul-18
	No response	30-Jul-18
	No response	30-Jul-18
03-Aug-18	I have no wish to discuss things further	30-Jul-18
02-Aug-18	Frustrating as a yachtsman that the base for west coast sailing has such poor facilities. The Transit Berth Facility has made a big difference. Oban Marina not ideal with a ferry required for access. Better buoyage is required at the north entrance. Small vessel channel buoyage is required. Ideally this buyoyage would continue right to the TBF entrance.	30-Jul-18
	No response	03-Aug-18