

12-Jul-18	<p>Make a channel east of Maiden Island 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.</p>	27-Jun-18
	No response	27-Jun-18
	No response	27-Jun-18
	No response	27-Jun-18
	No response	27-Jun-18
	No response	27-Jun-18
	No response	27-Jun-18
	No response	27-Jun-18
	No response	27-Jun-18
	No response	07-Jul-18
	Generally very supportive of the safety initiative. Oban needs more joined up infrastructure to attract the marine user. To captialise on the transit hub it is for the west coast.	07-Jul-18
	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 proposal seemed insufficient to make an informed decision	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	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
	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
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
12-Jul-18	Fully support the CMAL proposal and disgusted with RYA stance. I am delighted to have been consulted and express my opinion.	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18

13-Jul-18	Not a proponent of over regulation. No particular issues. Please to be consulted	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	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 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.	11-Jul-18
	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
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
12-Jul-18	Nothing further to add	12-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
	No response	11-Jul-18
12-Jul-18	Solution must be manageable 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
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	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 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
		12-Jul-18

	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	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.	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
14-Jul-18	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
	No response	12-Jul-18
	Postmaster failure	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
13-Jul-18	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
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18

14-Jul-18	<p>Thanks for clarifying the cmal/calmac distinction, which I was only vaguely aware 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.</p>	12-Jul-18
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p>		
13-Jul-18	<p>Oban public own the bay. Public have been ignored in this matter.</p>	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-Jul-18
	No response	12-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 benefit 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 spoiling it for others.	
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	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 in control of the harbour at the same time. There could be issues with transparency.	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	No response	27-Jul-18
	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 demonstrate objectivity to all users not just CFL.	27-Jul-18
30-Jul-18	Seems to be working 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	Concerned that there is no redress to what CMAL will do running 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
	No response	30-Jul-18
	No response	30-Jul-18
	No response	30-Jul-18
	No response	30-Jul-18

