

Document Name	2017 stakeholder meetings QandA document.docx
Author	Lorna Spencer
Date	Thursday, 01 February 2018
Reference	HP/900/9001

Questions that have been asked frequently will not be repeated, please check through list and if your question and suitable response not included please just let us know.

Item	Question	Reference	Response Provided	Updates August 2017
Uig – 3rd April 2017, Tarbert – 4th April, Lochmaddy – 5th April				
1.	The area behind the warehouse contains some Fuel tanks, clarity is sought on who is responsible for these, can they be removed and how can the area be developed.	Uig	CMAL/HC – have had initial discussions with HIE with respect to the wider opportunities for development at Uig, this includes the warehouse and the area behind it. Clarity will be checked with respect to ownership/responsibility for the land where the fuel tanks are. A wider plan will be progressed with HIE and taking into consideration the Fire Dept requirements and any commercial opportunities once the immediate priorities are in hand.	The Highland Council are responsible for the fuel tanks. The Highland Council Project Design Unit have met with Council Planners, HIE, Fire Scotland and CMAL to look at the development of the area. It is proposed that a development plan will be produced for the area and a consultation event organised by Council Planners will take place within the next 3-4 months.
2.	A drying out berth for small vessel repairs is required if the current facility will not be available following any works	Uig	We would request that details are provided in terms of need and these will be incorporated into the options development.	Any loss of fishing berths will be replaced within the improvement proposals with the intention of no loss to users.
3.	How will current businesses and small boat services be accommodated during works	Uig	At this stage there is no clear delivery plan for works however we will ensure that all parties are involved in the planning of works to allow delivery with as little disruption as possible.	The preferred options will be discussed with the business and small boat services and how the construction works can be delivered with minimal disruption.
4.	To consider upgrading the facilities for small boats and associated tourist activities – such as provided at Fort William.	Uig	Details and requirement to be established for consideration within the works	Communication is ongoing and the preferred options will be discussed with the small boat owners/operators and marine tourism companies operating at Uig and if any of their aspirations can be accommodated into the construction works. Unfortunately any additional works out with the projects scope are unlikely to be funded, however, it will be worthwhile looking at future aspirations to ensure that the works will not impact or

Item	Question	Reference	Response Provided	Updates August 2017
				restrict any future works . Highland Council have met with Alan Rankin, Coigach Consulting, who has been employed to progress Scotland's Marine Tourism Strategy. Alan is aware of the proposals at Uig and the aspirations for improved marine tourism facilities. Uig is low in the prioritisation list of key ports for Marine Tourism.
5.	Some of the fishing boat berths will be lost with the current development plan, how will these be replaced within the proposals.	Uig	HC are aware of this and will work with the Fishing community to identify on-going needs	Any loss of fishing berths will be replaced within the improvement proposals with the intention of no loss to users.
6.	There are bigger fishing boats are being built and any berthing needs to accommodate these.	Uig	Please provide the details of future requirements and these will be considered within in the plans	The preferred options will be discussed with the fishermen and details of bigger boats and their berthing requirements will be considered for inclusion in the detailed design.
7.	Current fendering for fishing boats is not suitable and needs to be upgraded	Uig	HC to identify needs and incorporate in plans	The fishermen's fendering requirements for their fishing boats will be discussed and considered for inclusion in the detailed design.
8.	There is a concern with respect to shelter that is available for fishing boats.	Uig	HC will explore this with the fishing representatives and give consideration to the concerns raised	The proposed works will be discussed with the fishermen to determine if the proposals can provide improvement.
9.	There are several small tourist boats and work boats using the facilities, how will these be accommodated within the development to improve facilities.	Uig	As the options are developed consideration will be given to requirements and incorporated into the plans when practicable.	As item 4.
10.	Will the ferry be able to berth overnight and in poor weather conditions if necessary	Uig	The resilience and availability of the pier should improve after suitable upgrade works have been completed. The suitability of the berth for an overnight stay will always be properly considered by the Master in light of current and forecast weather conditions.	Proposals to improve the wave climate at the ferry berth will be included in the required Harbour Revision Order. Further studies will be carried out (vessel simulation, wave/coastal modelling, skipper records of the new vessel on wind, wave and current conditions and berthing). If these studies conclude that additional

Item	Question	Reference	Response Provided	Updates August 2017
				pier upgrade works are required, these will be progressed and will improve the berthing and mooring conditions for all.
11.	There were earlier plans for a new slipway that was not progressed, could a slipway be included within the current development. Previous plans developed were provided at the later meeting and passed to HC.	Uig	The plans provided will be reviewed and provision of a slipway will be considered in the options.	The project provides for the new ferry vessel and is funded through harbour dues and is unable to include additional works out with the scope of the project. The existing slipway is located out with the works area and will not be affected. Depending on the solution to be adopted then during the design development of the land reclamation, consideration will be given to incorporation of a new slipway, to determine if this can be achieved at reasonable cost and at a location and orientation that will not adversely affect the operation and use of the car parking, marshalling and trailer drop areas. The opportunities will only become apparent as the detailed design develops and consultation with the local community will be held to consider any additional provision and any necessary approvals and consents that would be required.
12.	The fuelling area for fishing boats is exposed and there is too much movement when ferries are in to re-fuel, could an alternative location or better protection be provided.	Uig	As the options are developed consideration will be given to requirements and incorporated into the plans when practicable.	As Item 10.
13.	Can electric power be provided on the pier for fishing boats and will the vessel be able to be on shore power.	Uig	Part of the work that is ongoing is to understand the power requirements at all the ports and where possible we will look to provide shore power. This will depend on the requirements and the costs to provide.	The project provides for the new ferry vessel and is funded through harbour dues and is unable to include additional works out with the scope of the project. However, it will be worthwhile looking at future aspirations for shore power provision and ensure that the works will not impact or restrict any future opportunities to provide shore power. Consideration will be given to the installation of ducting to the works

Item	Question	Reference	Response Provided	Updates August 2017
				as the detailed design progresses.
14.	There is a requirement for fishing boats to be connected to shore power when crew remain on board overnight. Is this a legal requirement and can power be provided for fishing boats.	Uig	Legal requirements will be checked, The Terms & Conditions required by the Harbour Authority (Highland Council) will provide guidance for harbour users Reference above question 13 for provision of power	This is not a legal requirement.
15.	A Covered walkway at Uig is considered essential for passengers	Uig	This has been included in the initial options development	A covered walkway was considered in the Masterplan and is the preferred option for passenger access to the vessel.
16.	There is a plan available that shows a larger area for reclamation and development.	Uig	The plan that was shown at the meeting was a planning zone plan that is published on Council website. It is indicative that there are planning considerations in the area but is not representative of the extent of the proposals for the Pier.	
17.	Providing pontoons for yachts are believed to be beneficial for the wider community benefits and could provision of pontoons be considered within the scope of the project.	Uig	The scope of the project is currently for the provision of appropriate infrastructure for the provision of lifeline ferry services and to ensure current customers are accommodated at the pier. The group is supportive of any proposals that would bring wider community benefit however the current funding proposals will not extend to provision of pontoons. In design development, the provision of such a facility will be considered in order to ensure any works would not prohibit development at a future time. It may be that infrastructure can be designed to accommodate pontoons at a later date and this will be considered. The Council is under challenging fiscal constraints and have no additional funding to support at this time. The local community is encouraged to form a group to progress locally.	The provision of pontoons is out with the scope of this project. Due to challenging fiscal constraints, it is unlikely that the Highland Council could fund pontoons. However, the design proposed does not preclude the installation of pontoons by others, such as a local community group.

Item	Question	Reference	Response Provided	Updates August 2017
18.	Can consideration be given to wider opportunities to be incorporated into the options and planning process.	Uig	Provided it is clear what is required plans will be developed as far as practicable to allow future development aspirations. Design will be progressed “for” but perhaps not “with” the opportunities identified such as pontoons and a slipway.	As Item 4 and 11.
19.	Are there any commercial development opportunities in the fringes of this project.	Uig	There is an opportunity to develop the current ticket office, warehouse and land area behind this building, interest has been expressed by a local business for expansion opportunities. This will be further explored once we have the current priorities underway. Consideration to the needs of the Fire Brigade will need to be accommodated in any development.	As Item 1.
20.	Who owns the current ticket office and warehouse.	Uig	CMAL own the warehouse, ticket office and an area of land behind it and are happy to explore opportunities using these areas in any future developments.	As Item 1.
21.	What is the plan for the provision of car parking within the development	Uig	The parking requirements are still to be established, it is intended to provide parking and drop of area within the current marshalling area.	
22.	A temporary fisherman’s compound will be required during the works.	Uig	HC will identify a suitable temporary compound in consultation with the users	This requirement will be included in the construction works contract documents.
23.	What are the proposals for a suitable fisherman’s compound within the scope of the redevelopment	Uig	A needs assessment will be undertaken and options for provision considered through engagement with users.	The fishermen’s requirements for a new compound will be discussed and considered for inclusion in the detailed design.
24.	What is the plan for providing the ship with LNG	Uig	CMAL and CFL are working with suppliers to identify the requirements in order these can be allowed for within the development.	
25.	Have you considered using a Catamaran on this route	Vessel	The ships being built meet the statement of requirements provided by CalMac and these could not be delivered with a catamaran design. All the current infrastructure would be redundant and	

Item	Question	Reference	Response Provided	Updates August 2017
			need completely re-built if catamarans were to be considered. Catamarans would also reduce flexibility across the network in terms of vessel deployment.	
26.	When the Hebrides was introduced on the route there was an event for local school children to visit and see the new ferry, can this be done with this new ship also?	Uig	We will ensure this is captured on any events being planned for the new ship	
27.	Concern was raised about the varying speed limits on the road, it is too high at the ferry terminal. The road is a designated trunk road at this point and under the management of Transport Scotland	Uig	HC will look into this and raise with Transport Scotland colleagues with a view to improving the situation.	The issue has been discussed with Transport Scotland. This will be included in formal consultation with Transport Scotland as part of the detailed design and consent process which will include information from the traffic study.
28.	What are the profits from running the ferries used for? And could this profit not be used to assist the local community developments.	Operations	The provision of lifeline ferry operations do not make a profit and are heavily subsidised by Transport Scotland (less than half of the costs of providing these services are covered by fares paid by ferry customers).	
29.	Will there be linkspan closures and if so how long will this be for.	Uig	HC are currently looking at both replacement and refurbishment options, at the moment it has not been identified if a closure will be necessary , further details will be provided as the options are progressed. Any closures will be planned carefully with all parties to ensure minimum disruption.	Whilst some disruption is inevitable and unfortunately unavoidable with this scale of works, this will be minimised as far as practicable with minimal outage for linkspan replacement.
30.	Is it correct that Balfour Beatty are no longer working with Highland Council.	Uig	Balfour Beatty were engaged through the SCAPE framework with HC and have provided guidance in the initial stages of the project but have withdrawn due to the complex nature of the construction work. A more traditional contractor procurement process will	

Item	Question	Reference	Response Provided	Updates August 2017
			be followed.	
31.	What are the next vessels in the network that need to be replaced.	Vessel	TS working with CMAL and CalMac to review the demand and capacity modelling, this identifies pinch points and future priorities, currently work is underway to develop a 10 yr plan that identifies and prioritises vessel replacement and associated infrastructure requirements. A further Vessel Replacement & Deployment Plan will be published later this year.	
32.	Have concepts such as hydrogen powered ships been considered.	Vessel	CMAL have been involved in a development project looking at hydrogen powered ship and this work is supported by Ministers and Transport Scotland.	
33.	Concern raised regarding the additional traffic that will be have to be accommodated on the roads locally and across the island.	Uig	It was suggested that these concerns should be raised with local councillors as the impact is out with the scope of this project.	As Item 27.
34.	There is an open electrical cabinet on the pier, is this not dangerous?	Uig	This will be investigated and rectified with utmost priority	The cabinet has been replaced.
35.	What will happen if there is no funding made available to provide the infrastructure improvements?	Infrastructure	The new ferry will be able to berth, get the ramps down and discharge and load passengers however operating limitations may be in place such as restrictions in certain weather conditions, carrying capacity not maximised.	Operating limitations may be applied under certain conditions (eg. restrictions in certain weather conditions, restrictions on berthing at low tides, vessel carrying capacity not maximised).
36.	Will the new ferry not create a bigger wake as it is more powerful?	vessel	The speed of approach and the wake created should be managed through the berthing procedures and operations	
37.	Who will manage berthing operations in bay	Operations	It is for the Harbour Authority (Highland Council) to manage berthing operations and activity in the bay in line with the statutory powers they have in place.	
38.	Will the timetables be affected by the need to bunker LNG	Operations	The ferry is designed to operate on Marine Gas Oil as well as LNG and it is not anticipated that there will be changes to timetables at this time.	
39.	When will the new ferry	Vessel	It is anticipated that it will be delivered from the shipyard	The shipyard are focusing efforts on NV 801 and the

Item	Question	Reference	Response Provided	Updates August 2017
	come into service?		to CMAL in summer 2018, following this CalMac will undertake familiarisation and training. Once that is complete it will enter service. The harbour infrastructure team is working on September 2018 to complete any works considered critical for operations. Other works required will be planned and delivered as appropriate and funding allows.	delivery date for NV 802 has not been updated at this time.
40.	Will there be any disruptions to the service when works are being undertaken?	Operations	The team will work to minimise any disruptions to operations and will fully engage with communities and customers to ensure that any impact is fully communicated and mitigated against.	
41.	Will the new vessel go faster than the current one and what will be the impact on the timetable?	Vessel	There is no proposal to change the current timetable	
42.	Will the new ferry operate in worse weather conditions than the current ferry	Vessel	The new ferry has been designed with enhanced sea-keeping capability and is more powerful than previous ships on this route. Therefore it is anticipated that the new ferry, along with infrastructure improvements to the ports, may improve the resilience of the service in adverse weather conditions. The final decision regarding whether or not to sail or to berth at a particular port in adverse weather always lies with the vessel's Master after properly considering the relevant risks to the ship, people and the infrastructure.	
43.	What is the internal seating capacity?	Vessel	Planned for 650 internal seats, there is additional external seating that is enclosed on three sides. This will comfortably accommodate current and forecast passenger numbers.	
44.	Would it be possible for the external seats to be incorporated in the internal	Vessel	This is not possible as it will affect the stability and weight of the vessel.	

Item	Question	Reference	Response Provided	Updates August 2017
	structure?			
45.	Will the check in times change	Operations	It is not anticipated that there will be any changes to check in times and timetables	
46.	Could space be provided on the vessel for tourist information, paper leaflets have always proved popular	Vessel	The ferry will be designed to have visitor information on TV screens, comments on paper information has been noted and will be given considered.	
47.	It seems that in comparison to works undertaken in Brodick, Ullapool and Stornoway for example the considerations across the Skye Triangle appear to be a “sticking plaster” approach.	Infrastructure	The works planned at all three ports are being designed and delivered in a very similar way to works at Ullapool and Stornoway. The needs at Brodick are very different and it is difficult to consider on a like for like basis. It is not the intention to provide a sub optimal solution and as a priority the appropriate infrastructure required to operate the service will be provided.	
48.	What is the process for securing funding to deliver the harbour works?	Infrastructure	<p>CMAL capital works are funded through GIA at 75% contribution from TS with balance from CMAL revenue. HC and WIC will fund works through Public Works Loan borrowing and funded through an agreed Harbour Charges model.</p> <p>CMAL are working with HC and WIC to pull together the finance model for all ports in for Transport Scotland to be in a position to inform budget processes during summer 2017.</p>	<p>CMAL capital works are funded through Grant In Aid at 75% contribution from TS with balance from CMAL revenue budget.</p> <p>We have been working with TS on the approvals required to deliver the project. The commission for detailed design is now progressing.</p> <p>Works will be financed through Public Works Loan borrowing and funded through an agreed Harbour Charges model.</p> <p>CMAL have developed with CnES the finance model and this has been presented to Transport Scotland for consideration in the upcoming spending review.</p>
49.	The location of the marshalling at Lochmaddy is shown over the access the pontoons, why is that?	Lochmaddy	Currently we are reviewing options for marshalling areas, the plan is indicative only and we look to provide the best solution for all parties	A number of options for increasing the marshalling capacity were considered. Operationally, the most desirable solution is to have the additional marshalling area adjacent to the existing marshalling yard. It would not be feasible to add capacity to the south of the existing area due to the location of the pontoons.

Item	Question	Reference	Response Provided	Updates August 2017
				Provision of an additional area to the West, in the area of the current pontoon access and facilities was therefore considered identified as the preferred solution. Discussions are ongoing with North Uist Estate and Comann na regarding the use of this area.
50.	How is the current work being funded?	Infrastructure	The current design works are being funded by each party through revenue budgets and this will continue until design and tendering is complete. The capital funding will need to be secured in advance of any works contract being awarded.	The detailed design, tendering and construction work will be financed through Public Works Loan borrowing and funded through an agreed Harbour Charges model as detailed in 48 above.
51.	Has changing the pier orientation at Uig being considered, berthing in westerly wind conditions would be much easier if a north – south orientation was delivered. Post meeting note: <i>Following initial review the current ferry berth and linkspan is in a north-south orientation, further feedback requested.</i>	Uig	The initial plans for works at Uig have been discussed with the marine department at CalMac, this group involves masters who operate on this route. They have made valuable contributions to inform the works however there has been no representations about the general orientation of the pier. CFL were asked to identify requirements/improvements to the existing pier/berth, not consider a new pier construction (as recognised in the answer to Q59). Following recent discussions however CFL have now considered these additional options and have submitted comments for review. We will however take back the comments and re-visit the pier orientation through the review process. This will be undertaken alongside the simulation berthing trials that are on-going with Glasgow Nautical College, CMAL, FMEL and CalMac. We will provide feedback.	Considered in the Masterplan and previous modelling study concluded that the proposed orientation in the East/West direction was not considered to be operationally feasible by the prospective users of the berth. CFL have been re-consulted on the issue and confirmed that the east/west orientation provided no improvement to the berthing. CMAL are working to develop Uig and NV 802 within the simulation environment.
52.	Is the open deck space bigger than the Hebrides for carrying livestock.	Vessel	The area is similar to that of the Hebrides, however we will check and provide feedback.	The open deck vehicle space is about 10% bigger than the Hebrides.
53.	It has been suggested that the pier extension proposed at Lochmaddy	Lochmaddy	Discussions with CalMac marine team have informed the preliminary pier extension dimensions. An extension of 30m has been suggested but also a clearance of 30m	Discussions with CalMac marine team have informed the proposed pier extension dimensions. An extension of 30m has been requested but also a clearance of

Item	Question	Reference	Response Provided	Updates August 2017
	should be longer at 45m, where has the current proposal come from.		from the North side of the pier to the -3.5m seabed contour. Results of a recent bathymetric survey at Lochmaddy have now been received. These will be reviewed to determine the proposed length of the extension. Feedback will be provided in due course.	30m from the North side of the pier to the -3.5m seabed contour in order to provide sufficient space for the vessel to berth safely regardless of wind direction. A bathymetric survey has been carried out and reviewed to confirm that the requested clearance to the -3.5m contour can be achieved in conjunction with the 30m extension. This is considered feasible and will be achieved by dredging of an area of rock to the North of the pier. This rock will be used as infill material for the proposed marshalling area reclamation at Lochmaddy and also Tarbert.
54.	Will there be access to all decks for those that are mobility impaired.	Vessel	There are 4 lifts on the vessel that will provide access to all passenger decks.	
55.	Will the annual docking schedule of the new ferry place as much disruption as current docking schedules.	Vessel	Annual docking is an important aspect of the continued M&R of the ferries. The schedule and requirements is determined by the vessel certification. The deployment of ferries to cover the route is at the discretion and planning of CalMac.	
56.	What will be the extent of disruption during the works	Infrastructure	At the moment we do not know. This will become clearer as the scope of works is clarified and the delivery methodology becomes clearer. The team will be working to ensure that works are delivered with as little disruption as possible and where there will be disruption communications and engagement is critical to success.	It is considered that the identified preferred options can be constructed without disruption to the ferry service. Lochmaddy - A key aspect of this will be the extension of the pier using a concrete caisson which will be constructed off site, floated and towed to site and then placed between scheduled services. This approach was successfully adopted in the recent past at Ullapool.
57.	How will LNG bunkering take place and will this impact on operations?	Operations	The ferry is designed to operate on Marine Gas Oil as well as LNG. CMAL and CFL are working with suppliers to identify the requirements in order these can be allowed for within the development.	
58.	How will it be decided on	Infrastructure	Phasing will depend on agreement and confirmation of	Tarbert - At present, it is planned to deliver the works

Item	Question	Reference	Response Provided	Updates August 2017
	what the phasing of works will be?		funding, we are however designing for a full optimal operating solution and will endeavour to deliver all necessary works.	in two phases. The first phase will be aimed at enabling the vessel to berth without restriction and will comprise pier extension, existing pier strengthening works, new fendering and dredging. The second phase will be aimed at allowing the full capacity of the vessel to be utilised and will encompass the marshalling area extension and power upgrades. Although in two phases, it is likely that the work will be delivered under the same construction contract.
59.	If a new pier was to be built in a better North-South (further clarification required) orientation with a new linkspan then there would be no disruption at Uig.	Uig	We will review the orientation of the pier as mentioned earlier however the costs of providing a completely new facility may be prohibitive.	As item 51.
60.	Will the new ferry be quicker?	Vessel	The new ferry as 2 service speeds of 14.5kts and 16.5kts as required in the specification.	
61.	Who will own the infrastructure at Lochmaddy once works are complete.	Lochmaddy	The infrastructure will continue to be owned and operated by CnES	
62.	Could a slipway at Lochmaddy be included in the plans	Lochmaddy	We will take the request into consideration and look at the options and delta in costs. We are happy to work with local groups to identify opportunities and improvements. If it is not possible to deliver works then we will look to design for and not with to allow for future development	Given the driver for this project (ie. Introduction of a new ferry) and the funding model being adopted (ie. ultimately funded via ferry berthing dues), it would not be possible to fund the provision of a slipway as part of the project. Also, given the proximity of the pontoons and other moorings, there is accessible accommodation available for leisure craft. Any potential future provision of a slipway would need to be via an alternative means of funding.
63.	What is the programme for works and what if there are	Lochmaddy	The ferry will be able to berth and operate from the existing facility but this is not an optimal situation. A	The ferry will be able to berth and operate from the existing facility but this is not an optimal situation as

Item	Question	Reference	Response Provided	Updates August 2017
	not complete before the ferry is in service		programme for works has not been agreed or confirmed at this time however we appreciate the tight timescales. The Programme will be clarified as the scope, delivery method and funding is clearer.	operating limitations may be applied. Now that we have identified preferred solutions, we understand the approximate programme for carrying out the detailed design, securing the necessary consents and undertaking the construction works. Currently, we would anticipate that the work on site will start in Autumn 2018 and be completed in May/June 2019. Update Jan 2017: site start now proposed early 2019 with completion in circa 12 months
64.	Should Dunvegan not have been considered as an alternative port location.	Infrastructure	Building a new facility will be very costly and take many years, it was not part of this project to consider alternative locations.	
65.	Can HC and WIC not pay for the works from the Harbour Dues they already collect rather than increasing charges?	Infrastructure	HC and WIC will be asked to provide a response.	The current level of harbour dues enables the current harbour facilities to be operated, maintained and renewed as necessary. However, the introduction of a larger vessel, which necessitates enhancement to the current facilities, is not included in the existing level of harbour dues set.
66.	A new pier construction at Lochmaddy was asked to be included as an option given the condition and age of the existing pier structure and the costs of constructing an offline option would save on the disruption and maintain the ferry service. The whole life cost of this option against the other options should be considered.	Lochmaddy	Request will be reviewed by the project team	Investigation into the condition and capacity of the current pier has been carried out as part of the design development work. The inner pier section (oldest part) and outer pier section (newest part) are both in good condition and require no remedial work. The middle section (constructed in the 1960s) needs some concrete repair works but is repairable. The existing pier therefore will be serviceable for many years to come. In addition, it is considered that the project can be delivered without disrupting the ferry service. There is therefore no business case at this time for provision of a new pier.

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
Uig – 4th Sept 2017, Tarbert – 5th Sept, Lochmaddy – 6th Sept.				
67.	Would want further information on the internal layout of the new ferry. The extension of Lochmaddy pier (30m as opposed to the 35 proposed)	Vessel / Lochmaddy	<p>Vessel layout details will be presented at next public meeting</p> <p>The length of extension was determined in consultation with Calmac Masters. The combination of the 30m extension and removal of some of the rock to the North of the pier provides the flexibility required for berthing.</p>	Detailed design of the pier extension is now progressing for Lochmaddy. The caisson extension when fabricated will be 33m. It will be placed just off the existing pier end with an 'infill' section joining the caisson to the existing pier. This will add perhaps 2m to the overall length. Therefore, the total additional length will be around 35m.
68.	Will there be enclosed gangway for new ferry? Plus as it is a new generation of ferry. Hope everything is done to for the heavier boat.	Lochmaddy	<p>No enclosed gangway proposed at this stage. Design will enable addition of enclosed gangway at a later stage however.</p> <p>The works are being designed for the new heavier vessel. In addition to this, consideration has been given to other vessels in the fleet such as Isle of Lewis (Lochmaddy and Tarbert) and Loch Seaforth (Tarbert) to ensure there is flexibility for other types of vessels.</p>	
69.	Car parking for public and CalMac staff. More information on work for CalMac	Lochmaddy	The proposed reclaim area to the West of the site at Lochmaddy will provide the facility for additional carparking. The precise 'allocation' of parking spaces between staff and public has not been determined as yet. This will be subject to further discussion between CMAL, CFL and CnES.	The layout of the reclaim area is being 'firmed up' currently. The impact on parking space numbers hasn't quite been bottomed out but will be in the near future. Trailer drop off is also being considered.
70.	They seem to be starting much too late ie vessel half built but port works still at outline design stage! Apparent lack of communication between CalMac and	Lochmaddy	It is correct to say that progress on the vessel is further ahead than the development of the infrastructure work.	

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
	port owners		However, we have been aware that the vessel will be able to access the ports even if the planned infrastructure works has not been completed. This was a condition of the design of the vessel. The situation would not be ideal however as some restrictions may have to be imposed (eg. restricting berthing velocity and avoiding very low tides) but operation would still be feasible.	
71.	No problems. Good presentation. I believe that one big ferry is going to create problems. Why not have two ferries running in tandem ie Uig/Tarbert and Uig/Lochmaddy giving 3 to 4 per day instead of two. This reduces the congestion at ferry terminals	Lochmaddy	Point regarding two vessels noted. This will be shared with Transport Scotland.	
72.	The Timescale? Will the new ferry be in service before the upgrades are completed?	Lochmaddy	Potentially yes. However, the ferry will be able to operate from the existing facilities, albeit some restrictions may apply with regard to speed of berthing and potentially at very low tides.	
73.	I'm not sure how much provision will be made for long stay parking at each terminal. At times during the summer season, I suspect it is heavily utilised. Long stay provides flexibility when vehicle spaces aboard are in short supply.	Lochmaddy	The proposed large reclaim area to the West of the site will provide potential for additional parking as only a part of this area will be used for marshalling and access to the marshalling area. The precise number of spaces provided and allocation of spaces across the whole site (ie. staff or public spaces) has still to be determined.	The layout of the reclaim area is being 'firmed up' currently. The impact on parking space numbers hasn't quite been bottomed out but will be in the near future. Trailer drop off is also being considered.
74.	The change in a timetable for ferry route would make a big change with early sailings or a freight service.	Lochmaddy	CFL have no plans at the moment to change any timetables.	
75.	I would like to see a lift at the terminal to enable people with access issues to board the ferry the same was as able bodied people. They shouldn't have to	Lochmaddy	The provision of a bespoke mechanical access system (such as those at Ullapool and Stornoway for example) and	

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
	<p>battle the elements whilst taking the long route aboard via the car deck. Also would like to see a 'changing places' facility . There are no Changing Places facilities in the Western Isles, so this would be good PR for CMAL.</p>		<p>alterations to the building are not included in the current plans. This has been considered in some detail. However, with the current numbers of foot passengers using Lochmaddy or Tarbert, it is very difficult to justify the level of expenditure required in providing these facilities. With budget being challenging, the first priority needs to be getting the ferry in and operating without operational restriction. The potential inclusion of a PAS and alteration of the building have been considered in the overall plan and the plans developed such that these facilities can readily be provided in the future if demand requires them and the funds are available. We have considered the current gangway access to the vessels and will be altering this access to reduce the maximum slope onto the vessels at high tide.</p>	
76.	<p>It is important that I am informed when the interior of the terminals are being designed. I want to feed ideas for the interior design for disabled people, through the Harris Disability Access Panel.</p>	Lochmaddy	<p>There will be no works carried out to the building at Lochmaddy, only Tarbert. We will invite the Harris Disability Access Panel to participate in the detailed layout design of the proposed terminal building works.</p>	
77.	<p>There should be a FREIGHT sailing twice a week in the summer months. With the increase in tourism to islands the freight sailing would ease the pressure all round</p>	Lochmaddy	<p>CFL have no plans at the moment to change any timetables.</p>	

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
78.	The sooner the better, Firm start and finish dates and how the upgrades will affect the service	Lochmaddy	Estimated programme dates will be 'firmed up' over the coming months as the design and various consent applications progress. We will provide periodic updates on this.	
79.	At the ferry terminal in Lochmaddy there is an art Installation of lyrics from the World famous band RUNRIG (two of the band are from Lochmaddy) there is also a tune Welcome to Uist by Blair Douglas on the doors of the terminal. Will these artworks be relocated to the new ferry terminal ? Taigh Chearsabhagh Museum and Arts Centre who led on the project are willing to help.	Lochmaddy	There are no works planned to the existing ferry terminal building at Lochmaddy so the current artworks will be unaffected.	
80.	How will you maintain the pontoon access at Lochmaddy?	Lochmaddy	Alternative pontoon access will be provided from the proposed reclaim area. During construction, the contractor will have to maintain access to the pontoons- it will be a requirement of the construction contract that the contractor agrees the means of temporary access with the pontoon operators before work in this location of the site commences.	
81.	May I suggest that on the round heads at the seaward end of each of the three piers, that some form of small circular rail is fitted possible in the centre of each roundhead. This would allow the person mooring a vessel to wear a safety harness which he or she could clip a cord from the harness onto this rail. The length of the cord to allow the person to move around the entire deck area of the roundhead unrestricted but to be of such a length to only allow the person to reach the roundhead coping. This safety harness would then prevent the wearer from being blown off the roundhead by a strong gust of wind ending up in the sea, which could result in serious injury, or loss of	Lochmaddy	This will be considered with the design team with advice from CalMac and the Harbour Operators.	This is still under review as part of the detailed design- update will be provided in due course

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
	<p>life. This may be the right time to design and install such an important safety feature on exposed pier roundheads.</p>			
82.	<p>There is a serious shortage at present at this port for Long and Short Term car and lorry parking, along with Artic Trailer changeover parking and Passenger drop off/pick up parking. At present some Artic Units arriving off the ferry have to drop their trailers on the two way road in front of Lochmaddy Hotel as there is seldom any available parking for this purpose, in order to return to the Assembly Area to hitch on to their outward bound trailer to return on the same sailing to Uig. This leaves other vehicles coming off the ferry with no alternative but to overtake these dropped trailers on the road in the wrong lane in the face of oncoming traffic, an accident waiting to happen ?. The answer to this serious lack of parking is, to infill the foreshore between the Terminal Building and the pier entrance, over what remains of the disused cattle ramp to provide the required number of parking bays for the port.</p> <p>It is my view that the caisson extension to the pier should be 35m in length to allow for an improved line of approach to the berth for vessels approaching through the North Channel.</p> <p>The fender piles on the North Face berth at the pier will require to be adjusted to maintain the same line as the fender piles on the inside berth (North Face) of the caisson pier extension, I do not see this fendering arrangement shown on the drawings ?</p>	Lochmaddy	<p>There is a proposal to reclaim the ‘beach’ area to the West of the existing marshalling area. This will be used to provide additional marshalling capacity but it will also provide a large ‘hardstanding’ area which could be used for additional parking and/or lorry trailer parking. The precise layout and use of the hardstanding area needs to be agreed with CnES and Calmac. We have considered also the area mentioned in the location of the cattle ramp. However, this would add significant further cost to the project and we consider that the additional area to the West of the site coupled with the existing parking and trailer areas will provide sufficient capacity for the site.</p> <p>The proposed length of pier extension (30m) was determined in consultation with Calmac Masters who have experience of navigating the route into the ferry terminal. The combination of the 30m extension and removal of some of the rock to the North of the pier provides the flexibility required for berthing.</p> <p>The fendering on the North side of the pier will be considered during the detailed design of the Caisson extension.</p>	<p>The layout of the reclaim area is being ‘firmed up’ currently. The impact on parking space numbers hasn’t quite been bottomed out but will be in the near future. Trailer drop off is also being considered.</p> <p>Detailed design of the pier extension is now progressing for Lochmaddy. The caisson extension when fabricated will be 33m. It will be placed just off the existing pier end with an ‘infill’ section joining the caisson to the existing pier. This will add perhaps 2m to the overall length. Therefore, the total additional length will be around 35m.</p> <p>The fendering on the North side of the pier will be considered soon during the detailed design of the Caisson extension.</p>

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
83.	<p>Why has the approach been taken to try and make the old infrastructure good rather than construct new berths in deeper water that will have a much longer lifespan?</p> <p>All of these berths are old steamer piers that should have been replaced long ago. New berths should be built to accommodate vessels of a standard draft and around the length of the Loch Seaforth to make them future proof. Building new berths would also mean that there would be NO disruption to services on the Uig triangle which will no doubt be affected throughout 2018 and 2019.</p> <p>Lochmaddy - The caisson extension is a good idea but given the poor material condition of the rest of the berth a new pier should be considered in a location that would give the ferry more sea room</p> <p>It's time CMAL used some common sense when attempting to improve the ferry network. The design of the new ships was bent to fit the current berths however now all 3 berths need huge sums of money spent to accommodate the vessel designed for them. These ships are to stated to fit X amount of berths in the CMAL presentations so how many more berths will now need strengthening work to accommodate them? If new berths had been part of the initial plan CMAL could have built much better ships than what are currently under construction</p>	Lochmaddy	<p>Re-building existing Infrastructure is the most efficient and cost effective methodology to ensure resilience of facilities</p> <p>Review of alternative locations was not included within the scope and timescales of this project across the 3 ports.</p> <p>In scope vessels identified as suitable by CalMac have been included within the design works to provide a much flexibility across the fleet of vessels as possible.</p> <p>Your comments regarding improving ferry network will be fed into the Network Strategy Group that is led by TS and considers future vessels and infrastructure needs.</p>	
84.	<p>A lot of planning and detail has gone into the development project. It's a challenge with huge costs but it's a major benefit to the islands. I hope public safety will be of top priority to all passengers. We have a very good ferry service and looking forward to the new vessel.</p>	Tarbert	<p>Safety is always the first consideration for everyone involved in the operation of the ferry service, including the travelling public, staff and contractors. CMAL and Calmac are committed to ensuring that this is always the case.</p>	

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
85.	It would be of major benefit widening the approach route in ferry terminal and extending one of the main car parks because there is such a heavy volume of traffic	Tarbert	We are actively considering how the marshalling area and surrounding road junctions and approaches can be improved as we are aware that it is not ideal at present. We have had discussions with the local authority roads department and will be speaking with them again soon to present ideas.	We have identified a road layout which we think will provide a much better approach to the marshalling area. This layout, incorporating a roundabout, will also provide a means of turning if someone finds themselves going in the wrong direction. At present , this does not exist meaning that people need to either turn at junctions or execute 3 point turns on the public road. The layout has been discussed with the roads authority and a Traffic Impact Assessment is currently being carried out to determine the effectiveness of the proposed solution.
86.	The current winter timetable does not allow daily access between Uig and Tarbert. The timetable should be amended to facilitate this.	Tarbert	CFL have no plans at the moment to change any timetables.	
87.	Tarbert - proposals are generally good and should improve unloading. However a solution (roundabout) is required to the issue of people turning vehicles at the head of the marshalling area. General - Building 2 boats (1 for each route) would have surely been less than the £55m to be spent coping with a bigger vessel.	Tarbert	As stated above, we are aware that the road layout at the marshalling area isn't ideal. Any need to turn at the marshalling area in particular is difficult. We are currently looking at how this could be improved. One of the options being considered is the provision of a roundabout to help turning and avoid blocking the road and/or marshalling area.	See response to point 85 above in relation to the turning of vehicles.
88.	Will it still be possible to have running moorings as before? At least we would like to have the option.	Tarbert	Any running moorings on the North side of the loch will need to be removed to facilitate the construction of the extended marshalling area. Given the closer proximity of the extended marshalling area to the pontoons, it is unlikely that these will be reinstated. There are no plans at this time to touch any running moorings on the South of the loch although this will be confirmed at detailed	

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
			design stage.	
89.	Is it best to dredge all of the loch, rather than just the area around the pier?	Tarbert	This is being considered. The limiting factor here will be the requirement to utilise the material dredged in the works as we do not have a nearby sea disposal site and disposal on land would be very expensive and potentially disruptive to the village given the number of lorries required. If we can use the material, we are open to considering additional dredging.	We undertook vibrocore sampling of the seabed material during December 2017 in order to test the material for suitability as fill for the extended marshalling area. This included sampling towards the head of the loch in the area of the pontoons. Unfortunately, the samples recovered identified that the seabed material to a depth of at least 2 metres is unsuitable for use as infill and any material dredged therefore will need to be disposed of. There is no available site on land to dispose of this and the nearest open sea disposal site is near Stornoway, meaning that disposal will be an expensive operation. Although discussions on this are ongoing, it now seems unlikely that dredging outwith the ferry berth area will be feasible as we will not receive funding for this.
90.	I would like to see a lift at the terminal to enable people with access issues to board the ferry the same way as able bodied people. They shouldn't have to battle the elements whilst taking the long route aboard via the car deck. Also would like to see a 'changing places' facility at the Tarbert Terminal (plus other two). There are no Changing Places facilities in the Western Isles, so this would be good PR for CMAL.	Tarbert	The provision of a bespoke mechanical access system (such as those at Ullapool and Stornoway for example) is not included in the current plans. This has been considered in some detail. However, with the current numbers of foot passengers using Lochmaddy or Tarbert, it is very difficult to justify the level of expenditure required in providing these facilities. With budget being challenging, the first priority needs to be getting the ferry in and operating without operational restriction. The potential inclusion of a PAS and alteration of the building have been considered in the overall plan and the plans developed such that these facilities	The current building plans for Tarbert now incorporates a 'Changing Places' facility.

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
			<p>can readily be provided in the future if demand requires them and the funds are available. We have considered the current gangway access to the vessels and will be altering this access to reduce the maximum slope onto the vessels at high tide.</p> <p>Regarding the building, we are currently reviewing the requirements and the provision of a 'changing places' facility is something that is actively being considered.</p>	
91.	Grateful for assistance and answering questions. Can we please have a community feedback group with weekly meetings during the building works?	Tarbert	On other projects, we have held regular 'drop in' sessions to enable the community to discuss any issues with the project team. We are committed to doing something similar in this case.	
92.	More information on exit for vehicles leaving the ferry, entering the marshalling key vehicles going on ferry	Tarbert	As stated above, we are currently considering options for improvement of vehicular access. We will present this information in due course.	
93.	Lack of access at Tarbert for disabled and wheelchair pedestrian users - from piers onto ferry.	Tarbert	see response to 90 above regarding passenger access.	
94.	Impact on foot passengers transport connections by late sailings needs consideration	Tarbert	These will be taken into account	
95.	Tarbert - really need improved access for elderly and wheel chair users - poor if gangway still being used. At moment people/cars collect tickets at office, head west on one-way system, and have to complete three	Tarbert	<p>see response to 90 above regarding passenger access.</p> <p>Regarding vehicle access and the</p>	<p>see response to 90 above regarding passenger access.</p> <p>We have identified a road layout which we think will</p>

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
	point turn to get into marshalling yard. This should not be part of the construction.		requirement to complete a 3 point turn, options are actively being considered to provide a more appropriate means of access to the marshalling area from the direction of the terminal building.	provide a much better approach to the marshalling area. This layout, incorporating a roundabout, will also provide a means of turning if someone finds themselves going in the wrong direction. At present , this does not exist meaning that people need to either turn at junctions or execute 3 point turns on the public road. The layout has been discussed with the roads authority and a Traffic Impact Assessment is currently being carried out to determine the effectiveness of the proposed solution.
96.	Can you please dredge entire bay to help new marina project?	Tarbert	This is being considered. The limiting factor here will be the requirement to utilise the material dredged in the works as we do not have a nearby sea disposal site and disposal on land would be very expensive and potentially disruptive to the village given the number of lorries required. If we can use the material, we are open to considering additional dredging.	See response to 89 above regarding dredging
97.	Please dredge entire basin to improve accessibility for leisure craft.	Tarbert	This is being considered. The limiting factor here will be the requirement to utilise the material dredged in the works as we do not have a nearby sea disposal site and disposal on land would be very expensive and potentially disruptive to the village given the number of lorries required. If we can use the material, we are open to considering additional dredging.	See response to 89 above regarding dredging
98.	Rather late in starting, could upset next year visitors and locals. More exact times of work start and completion	Tarbert	The starting time for such works is always a balance in priorities. Ideally, the bulk of the construction work would be carried out through the summer months. However,	

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
			<p>this is when the potential for disruption is at its greatest. We are therefore looking to start the work in the Autumn/ winter with the hope that most of the work can be completed before the summer months. There are lot of tasks around consents and approvals to be completed before work can commence so it is not possible to provide more accurate starting dates at this time. We will provide more information however as and when it becomes available.</p>	
99.	<p>It is important that I am informed when the interior of the terminals are being designed. I want to feed ideas for the interior design for disabled people, through the Harris Disability Access Panel.</p>	Tarbert	<p>Agreed that this is important. We will invite the Harris Disability Access Panel to participate in the detailed layout design of the proposed terminal building works.</p>	<p>Harris Disability Access Panel sent details of current proposed building layout for review. Discussion will then be arranged to go over points noted by the Panel.</p>
100.	<p>Will there be accommodation for HGV drivers onboard equal to the MV Loch Seaforth?</p>	Tarbert	<p>No plans for this however there is a quiet lounge.</p>	
101.	<p>May I suggest that on the round heads at the seaward end of each of the three piers, that some form of small circular rail is fitted possible in the centre of each roundhead. This would allow the person mooring a vessel to wear a safety harness which he or she could clip a cord from the harness onto this rail. The length of the cord to allow the person to move around the entire deck area of the roundhead unrestricted but to be of such a length to only allow the person to reach the roundhead coping. This safety harness would then prevent the wearer from being blown off the roundhead by a strong gust of wind ending up in the sea, which could result in serious injury, or loss of</p>	Tarbert	<p>This will be considered with the design team with advice from CalMac and the Harbour Operators.</p>	<p>This is still under review as part of the detailed design- update will be provided in due course</p>

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
	<p>life. This may be the right time to design and install such an important safety feature on exposed pier roundheads.</p>			
102.	<p>Why has the approach been taken to try and make the old infrastructure good rather than construct new berths in deeper water that will have a much longer lifespan? All of these berths are old steamer piers that should have been replaced long ago. New berths should be built to accommodate vessels of a standard draft and around the length of the Loch Seaforth to make them future proof. Building new berths would also mean that there would be NO disruption to services on the Uig triangle which will no doubt be affected throughout 2018 and 2019. Lochmaddy - The caisson extension is a good idea but given the poor material condition of the rest of the berth a new pier should be considered in a location that would give the ferry more sea room It's time CMAL used some common sense when attempting to improve the ferry network. The design of the new ships was bent to fit the current berths however now all 3 berths need huge sums of money spent to accommodate the vessel designed for them. These ships are to stated to fit X amount of berths in the CMAL presentations so how many more berths will now need strengthening work to accommodate them? If new berths had been part of the initial plan CMAL could have built much better ships than what are currently under construction</p>	Tarbert	<p>Re-building existing Infrastructure is the most efficient and cost effective methodology to ensure resilience of facilities Review of alternative locations was not included within the scope and timescales of this project across the 3 ports. In scope vessels identified as suitable by CalMac have been included within the design works to provide a much flexibility across the fleet of vessels as possible. Your comments regarding improving ferry network will be fed into the Network Strategy Group that is led by TS and considers future vessels and infrastructure needs.</p>	
103.	<p>When it comes to our ferry service, are you building one large ferry which requires all the link-spans in the</p>	Lochmaddy – received via	<p>We acknowledge that there are a number of different iterations that could address</p>	

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
	<p>3 ports to be updated? Why can't there be two ferries, one for each leg, which would mean less expenditure beyond maintenance of the existing port infrastructure and provide additional capacity for when the inevitable arises: breakdown, annual service etc., which would mean that at least we would have one ferry to fall back on when one was out of action.</p> <p>I appreciate you have perhaps accessed particular funding against the environmental element of a dual fuel ferry but at what other costs?</p>	<p>email 06/09/17 responded to by LS 25/09/17.</p>	<p>the services to the Outer Hebrides. This is also the case for other island groups that rely on the lifeline services.</p> <p>Transport Scotland chairs a monthly tripartite meeting with CMAL and CalMac concerning the Network and there are very detailed discussions and considerations that need to be taken into account. Some of these are listed below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Age of Port Infrastructure • Future spend on renewal of existing infrastructure • Additional costs of infrastructure required for new vessels • Capital Cost of vessel/s • Cost of fuel • Emissions of CO2, NOx, SOx, Particulates • Lifetime running costs • Level of service and comfort provided • Profiling the customer (passenger, car, coach, freight) demand into the future with economic modelling <p>'When all of these aspects and others were taken into consideration it was decided that there would be an order for 2 new Dual Fuel Ferries. The existing Port Infrastructure will allow these vessels to operate however it is recognised that for</p>	

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
			<p>operations to be optimised there was a requirement to enhance current facilities.</p> <p>Naturally with the quantum of expenditure these decisions are not taken lightly and are considered in detail prior to sign off by Scottish Government.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the vessels under construction can also operate on a number of other routes and therefore there is future flexibility built into the plans in terms of future redeployment.</p>	
104.	The current winter timetable does not allow daily access between Uig and Tarbert. The timetable should be amended to facilitate this.	Uig	CFL have no plans at the moment to change any timetables.	
105.	Uig - The improvements to marshalling/parking/relocation of office look like they will work well hopefully the timber wave screen will improve berthing days in rough weather. General - Building 2 boats (1 for each route) would have surely been less than the £55m to be spent coping with a bigger vessel.	Uig	Your comments have been noted, however the infrastructure at the ports (and many others across the network) is reaching the end of its serviceable life and significant upgrades would be required for existing vessels. The new vessels are the catalyst to the works being delivered.	
106.	I would like to see a lift at the terminal to enable people with access issues to board the ferry the same was as able bodied people. They shouldn't have to battle the elements whilst taking the long route aboard via the car deck. Also would like to see a 'changing places' facility. There are no Changing Places facilities in the Western Isles, so this would be good PR for CMAL.	Uig	The provision of a Passenger Boarding Bridge (PBB) or Passenger Access System (PAS) was considered in the Masterplan. However, considering the significant costs associated with providing a full PBB or PAS and given the distance from the terminal building to the vessel berth, it is difficult to justify the level of expenditure required in providing these facilities. A covered walkway with gangway was considered in the Masterplan and is the preferred option	The new terminal building plans currently propose to include a 'Changing Places' facility.

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
			for passenger access to the vessel. The request for a “changing places” facility is noted and will be passed to Council Architect for consideration for new terminal building at Uig.	
107.	Lack of access at Uig for disabled and wheelchair pedestrian users - from piers onto ferry. During relief ferry operations (e.g. MU finlaggar). There have been major failures in ability to cross and land at Uig pier - reorientation of Uig pier should be considered.	Uig	Noted and will be considered as the detailed design develops. As item 51 for reorientation of the pier.	
108.	Uig - Passenger journey for ticket office to boat should be undercover.	Uig	A covered walkway was considered in the Masterplan and is the preferred option for passenger access to the vessel.	
109.	I would still have concerns regarding the work at Uig Pier and primarily how the new vessel is able to cope with westerly winds. Would need to be convinced that all avenues have been exhausted in terms of ensuring that weather related problems are kept to a minimum.	Uig	A wave/coastal modelling study will be carried out during detailed design to consider engineering options for improving wind, wave and swell at the berth. When the new vessel comes into service it is proposed to monitor the climate and berthing conditions/difficulties/disruption which will inform if the preferred engineering option is required in consultation with CFL.	A review of the wave/coastal modelling study is being carried out in consultation with CFL with a view to provide the optimal solution to improve climate conditions at the berth.
110.	Timescale of completion in relation to the arrival of the new ferry and resulting problems.	Uig	The ferry will be able to berth and operate from the existing facility, however, this is not an optimal situation as operating limitations may be applied.	
111.	Consideration must be given to local fishermen and pier users - ie consultation regarding positioning of drying berth	Uig	Meetings have been arranged in October 2017 to meet with harbour users and the community groups to consider the developing design.	Ongoing consultation with the Uig Harbour Users and Community Group is taking place with three meetings been held, two in October 2017 and one in January 2018.
112.	Do not upset the fishermen	Uig	As 111 above.	Ongoing consultation with the Uig Harbour Users and Community Group is taking place with three

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
				meetings been held, two in October 2017 and one in January 2018.
113.	Minimum access under present legislation does not allow for increased size of wheelchairs	Uig	Noted and will be considered as the detailed design develops.	
114.	I look forward to seeing full plans of the terminal buildings	Uig	Noted and these will be provided at detailed design completion.	
115.	I work with people with disabilities. I am interested in the inclusion environment and access for all. I would like to ensure that the needs of people with disabilities (physical, visual and others) are considered in the design like accessible toilet, ease of passage from parking to ferry, on and off ferry. Meeting minimum standards is not acceptable.	Uig	Noted and will be considered as the detailed design develops.	The concerns highlighted are being considered in the detailed design.
116.	Would like info on the waiting rooms layout when they are available	Uig	Noted and these can be provided.	
117.	No community benefit. Highland council should be upgrading facilities at the pier - nothing spent on it since the mid-eighties and that was very short sighted as we see now. Once again, nothing for the people in the community!	Uig	The project provides for the new ferry vessel and is funded through harbour dues and is unable to include additional works out with the scope of the project. Ongoing meetings have been arranged with harbour users and the community groups to consider the developing design.	Ongoing consultation with the Uig Harbour Users and Community Group is taking place with three meetings been held, two in October 2017 and one in January 2018.
118.	One would hope this will not be a half hearted solution. There is an opportunity to provide a first class solution but is there the commitment. A cheap fudge will only lose more in the long run. The CalMac shed is sixty years old and long past its sell by date. it occupies an extensive footprint which could be better utilised and so much more attractive.	Uig	A Masterplan detailing the preferred options for the infrastructure improvements has been completed and submitted to Transport Scotland for consideration of approval of the preferred options and funding. A Mini Development Brief workshop has been arranged for 26 October 2017 to consider potential land	

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
			uses and development opportunities for the landward area which will include the existing terminal building.	
119.	It is easy to draw fancy plans but will it be delivered	Uig	The plans detailed at the PAC and community consultation detailed the preferred options identified with the intention of constructing each of these options subject to approval and funding.	
120.	Looking forward to next discussion where facts for piling, environmental and funding issues will be available.	Uig	These will be developed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).	
121.	Will highland council invest in the roads? Is it suitable for the increased number of lorries? Will THC invest in facilities that will be open all year?	Uig	Any road improvements out with the vicinity of the pier approachway and marshalling area will be out with the scope of the project. The increase in traffic will be primarily associated with the A86 trunk road which is under the jurisdiction of Transport Scotland. The current harbour facilities are open all year and the intention will be to maintain this position.	
122.	Area for dog walking before ferry travel and fouling issues	Uig	There are currently footways within the vicinity suitable for dog walking and dog fouling disposal bins are available.	
123.	If there is a significant increase in road traffic, can the existing infrastructure cope? Has the environmental impact of additional traffic been taken into account?	Uig	As 121 above. It is envisaged that there would not be any transport and traffic impacts classified as being "significant" both during the operational and construction phase of the proposed development and therefore the production of an EIA would not be warranted in respect of Traffic and Transport.	

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
124.	With the amount of money being deployed I don't see any benefit to Uig. What I do see is the highland council and CalMac will be cutting corners. If they wanted this is should have been sorted out four years ago. Now it's rush, rush, rush and once you start rushing you become a cowboy.	Uig	A Masterplan detailing the preferred options for the infrastructure improvements has been completed and submitted to Transport Scotland for consideration of approval of the preferred options and funding. The detailed design will progress and timescales will be dictated by the consenting process. Following Marine Licence consent and EIA/Environmental Statement the construction works will be carried out through a traditional tendering process with appropriate timescales.	
125.	Will there be accommodation for HGV drivers onboard equal to the MV Loch Seaforth?	Uig	No plans for this however there is a quiet lounge.	
126.	There should be a FREIGHT sailing twice a week in the summer months. With the increase in tourism to islands the freight sailing would ease the pressure all round	Uig	Your comments are noted and have been passed to the Network Strategy Group for consideration alongside the vessel replacement and deployment plan.	
127.	The sooner the better, Firm start and finish dates and how the upgrades will affect the service	Uig	These will be confirmed as the detailed design develops and timescales become clearer and fixed. The proposals will be discussed with CFL to confirm how the upgrades will affect their service.	
128.	Why are there no plans to include pontoons for other sea craft to encourage more sea tourists and activities?	Uig	The provision of pontoons is out with the scope of this project. Due to challenging fiscal constraints, it is unlikely that the Highland Council could fund pontoons. However, the design proposed does not preclude the installation of pontoons by others, such as a local community group.	
129.	I don't believe that Highland Council or Calmac {CMAL}	Uig	Following the decision by the Scottish	

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
	<p>have the interest of the community of Uig at heart my belief is that you are ticking boxes that the government have set out, at the drop in session on Monday the question that's was ask no one could give a proper answer to, we have to live with the mess when you leave this is a opportunity that should be done right you have left it far to late in the day and now you are rushing bad management but I am not surprised.</p>		<p>Government, to provide a larger vessel (currently under construction) for the Uig/Tarbert/Lochmaddy Triangle lifeline ferry service to the Western Isles, The Highland Council, in conjunction with Caledonian Maritime Assets Ltd (CMAL), CalMac and the Western Isles Council, has been working towards developing the three ports to accommodate the larger vessel and the potential for additional passengers and vehicle traffic. Detailed discussions are ongoing between Transport Scotland, CMAL, CalMac, The Highland Council and the Western Isles Council to identify the preferred works to each terminal and also to identify the funding and phasing of the works. Ongoing consultation with harbour users and community groups will continue to consider their concerns and consult on the developing design.</p>	
130.	<p>May I suggest that on the round heads at the seaward end of each of the three piers, that some form of small circular rail is fitted possible in the centre of each roundhead. This would allow the person mooring a vessel to wear a safety harness which he or she could clip a cord from the harness onto this rail. The length of the cord to allow the person to move around the entire deck area of the roundhead unrestricted but to be of such a length to only allow the person to reach the roundhead coping. This safety harness would then prevent the wearer from being blown off the roundhead by a strong gust of wind ending up in the sea, which could result in serious injury, or loss of</p>	Uig	<p>Noted and will be considered as the detailed design develops and discussed at future harbour users and community groups meetings.</p>	

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
	life. This may be the right time to design and install such an important safety feature on exposed pier roundheads.			
131.	<p>It has already been identified that there is a requirement at that pier for a Breakwater or Wave Screen, so why are Highland Council not providing it in phase 1, instead of waiting until after the vessel comes on service ?, or could they kick it into the long grass as it were ?. They say that they require data from the Master on the new vessel when in service, why can the Masters on the "Hebrides" not provide this data to them this coming winter ?. In 1986/87, the first winter of the "Hebridean Isles" using the new pier at Uig, it was soon identified that owing to the heavy swell coming through underneath the pier in certain wind directions, that a Breakwater was required. Despite numerous requests being made to Highland Council from the Masters on the vessel, Councillors from North Uist and Harris, Comhairle nan Eilean Siar and many service users, no action was taken by Highland Council and the problem still exists thirty one years later. Ironically around the same time Highland Council provided a Breakwater at Lochinver Pier which is mainly used by foreign fishing vessel, certainly not by a Life Line ferry service. The lack of a Breakwater or a Wave Screen at Uig has meant that the ferry cannot berth overnight at that pier except for a short period in the peak summer season, this greatly reduces timetable options for the service, which affects service users.</p>	Uig	<p>A wave/coastal modelling study will be carried out during detailed design to consider engineering options for improving wind, wave and swell at the berth. When the new vessel comes into service it is proposed to monitor the climate and berthing conditions/difficulties/disruption which will inform if the preferred engineering option is required in consultation with CFL.</p>	<p>A review of the wave/coastal modelling study is being carried out in consultation with CFL with a view to provide the optimal solution to improve climate conditions at the berth.</p>
132.	Why has the approach been taken to try and make the old infrastructure good rather than construct new	Uig	The scope of the project is currently for the provision of appropriate infrastructure for	

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
	<p>berths in deeper water that will have a much longer lifespan?</p> <p>All of these berths are old steamer piers that should have been replaced long ago. New berths should be built to accommodate vessels of a standard draft and around the length of the Loch Seaforth to make them future proof. Building new berths would also mean that there would be NO disruption to services on the Uig triangle which will no doubt be affected throughout 2018 and 2019.</p> <p>Uig - The cost of the works here are eyewatering when a new berth could be built in a much more suitable location in Loch Dunvegan.</p> <p>It's time CMAL used some common sense when attempting to improve the ferry network. The design of the new ships was bent to fit the current berths however now all 3 berths need huge sums of money spent to accommodate the vessel designed for them. These ships are to stated to fit X amount of berths in the CMAL presentations so how many more berths will now need strengthening work to accommodate them? If new berths had been part of the initial plan CMAL could have built much better ships than what are currently under construction</p>		<p>the provision of lifeline ferry services and to ensure current customers are accommodated at the pier. Due to challenging fiscal constraints, the current infrastructure will be used and improved to accommodate the new vessel and it is unlikely that funding for new infrastructure which does not utilising the existing infrastructure which has remaining serviceable life would be acceptable.</p>	
133.	<p>Have the lanes on the car deck of the new vessel been made wider to accommodate the larger motor homes that at present cause havoc on the decks of current vessels in the fleet?</p>	Vessel	<p>Yes the lanes of the new vessel car deck are wider than the older vessels. CFL will review cause of the issued experienced on existing vessels.</p>	
134.	<p>Working a 14 day I found it hard to attend the local consultation meetings. Perhaps for future reference later times would be more appropriate.</p>	General		

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
135.	The Ferry does not have many (if any) seats that people can lie down on. In the winter rough seas people will end up on the floor rather than somewhere safer to ride out the motion of the boat. Can anything be done about this. The current ferry has significant couch seating to allow those who are badly affected to rest it out.	Vessel	A range of sofa seats are included in the design.	
136.	Timescale of completion in relation to the arrival of the new ferry and resulting problems.	Uig	The ferry will be able to berth and operate from the existing facility, however, this is not an optimal situation as operating limitations may be applied.	
137.	Can a slipway and/or boat cradle be provided at or near the fisherman's compound? This generates income elsewhere and would be good to have at Uig	Uig	This would likely be out with the scope of this project, however, any other potential projects would be carefully considered during the detailed design of the ferry infrastructure improvements such that these would not be precluded from development at a later date.	
138.	Can consideration be made as to the requirement to dredge around the fish quay (in particular the dredged "pocket" at the shoreward end) as the extension of the pier will make berthing and manoeuvring of vessels very difficult at low tides (fishing vessels can raft up to 3 deep at the existing quay.	Uig	This point was noted and has been incorporated into the scoping report for the proposed scope of the EIA and included within the scope of the project. This has also been discussed at the harbour users and community groups meeting on 2 October and will be considered as the detailed design develops.	Ongoing consultation with the Uig Harbour Users and Community Group is taking place with regard to this issue and two further meetings have been held, one in October 2017 and one in January 2018.
139.	There were concerns that the drying out berth as proposed is in the wrong location i.e. Is situated at an area with a high bed level which will make access more tidally restricted.	Uig	This was noted and has been discussed at the harbour users and community groups meeting on 2 October and will be considered as the detailed design develops.	Ongoing consultation with the Uig Harbour Users and Community Group is taking place with regard to this issue and two further meetings have been held, one in October 2017 and one in January 2018.
140.	Skye and Lochalsh Access Panel - Access within the terminal building should be considered and designing to the minimum standards within the Equality Act	Uig	Noted and will be passed to Council Architect for consideration although terminal building internals are at an early	The new terminal building plans currently propose to include a 'Changing Places' facility.

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
	2010 and other legislation may not always be sufficient to allow turning of larger wheelchairs etc. Building corridors and vessel gangways should try and be sized above “minimum standards” and should avoid right-angled turns where possible and it should be noted that specialist wheelchairs may require larger activity space than standard wheelchairs considered within Legislation. There should be access to and within the new pier waiting room for disabled passengers not boarding the vessel by car.		stage of design.	
141.	Can consideration of berthing on the non-ferry berth side of the extended pier be made?	Uig	This is unlikely to be feasible or practical given the westerly side’s exposure to wind, wave and swell and lack of fendering.	
142.	Can consideration be given to extending the proposed offshore wave screen to protect the exposed open piled end of the fish quay or introduction of a wave screen beneath the pier?	Uig	The detailed design of the new wave screen has not yet been carried out. Consideration will be given to designing the screen to mitigate waves to this area.	
143.	There were some concerns regarding feedback in that there was a perception that following public meetings, several months had elapsed before an update was produced.	Uig	Noted. There has been no development of the detailed design since the public meeting in April 2018.	Ongoing consultation with the Uig Harbour Users and Community Group is taking place with three meetings been held, two in October 2017 and one in January 2018.
144.	Could re-use of the existing ferry terminal building be investigated for use by the fisherman as a covered compound area which would negate the requirement for the marshalling area based compound and would free that area up for the potential introduction of a slipway?	Uig	Noted. Uses for the existing terminal building were currently being discussed but no definite solution had been reached.	Following the meeting on 2 October 2018 with harbour users and community groups, the preferred option location for the fishermen’s compound was considered to be the most effective location in terms of operation and reducing harbour user conflicts.
145.	There were concerns raised regarding resilience, (infrequent) instances were recounted where the vessel was able to sail from Tarbert (Harris) to Uig but then find it impossible to be able to get alongside the ferry berth at Uig and then either have to circle in Uig Bay until weather abated or sail back to Tarbert.	Uig	Noted. By introduction of a larger more powerful vessel, it is hoped that this will not occur. The wave screen is a potential further option to provide additional protection to the berth.	

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
146.	There were several positive responses in relation to the possibility of a covered passenger walkway along the pier approachway.	Uig	Noted and is included as a preferred option infrastructure improvement.	
147.	There were several queries in relation to alternative forms of construction for the wave screen i.e. floating breakwater structure in the form of tyres or concrete units and whether these could attenuate waves better than the wave screen	Uig	At preliminary design stage, a timber wave screen was deemed the most effective form of construction. Floating wave attenuation options are normally only feasible for more sheltered locations. Also, see 131.	A review of the wave/coastal modelling study is being carried out in consultation with CFL with a view to provide the optimal solution to improve climate conditions at the berth.
148.	The Tarbert Disability Access Panel stressed that they very keen to be involved in the building design at an early stage. Advice had been given to CalMac at smaller locations.	Uig	Noted and will be considered as the detailed design develops.	
149.	Should two ferries not have been considered for the route? This would have allowed the potential to run one vessel from Uig to Tarbert to Uig to Lochmaddy to Uig with the other vessel operating Uig to Lochmaddy to Tarbert to Uig. This may then have introduced the possibility of an extra daily sailing from Uig to the Outer Hebrides which may have negated the requirement for larger single vessel and the associated infrastructure improvements.	Uig	Noted. Transport Scotland had advised at a ferry user group meeting that two ferries may operate on this route sometime in the future if demand and operations necessitated, however, no timescales were determinable.	
150.	The lease holder of the fish farm within Uig Bay expressed concern regarding potential impacts from dredging and dredge disposal activities on fish farm operations. Could the Council as developer confirm with the fish farm operators and lease holder what the implications will be for the re-opening of the fish farm? Could the fish farm operators be involved in the identification of the dredge disposal site?	Uig	Discussions have taken place between THC and the lease holder of the fish farm. THC have confirmed that it will be acceptable to grant mooring rights to the fish farm subject to certain conditions. The site selection for the dredge disposal site and EIA will take into account the two potential fish farms in the vicinity of the project. Further discussions will be had with the lease holder and operators of the fish farms during the site selection process.	
151.	What will be visibly different for local residents?	Uig	The key visual differences for local	

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
			residents will likely be the increased marshalling area on the reclaimed land, the new ticket office on the increased marshalling area, the LNG tank and wall on the berthing structure/pier head and the covered pedestrian walkway. There will be widening changes to the approachway and berthing structure but this will be in keeping with the existing infrastructure.	
152.	What will happen to the existing ticket office and who owns that land?	Uig	Discussions are on-going with the terminal building owners, CMAL, as to the possible options for the building following completion of the new terminal building.	
153.	Concern about proximity to LNG. What locations are being considered and what potential implications are there for local residents?	Uig	Two options are being considered by CFL for the location of the tank: the Berthing Pier and the Old Pier. The final location of the LNG storage facility will be determined following consideration of the following: available space, outcome of DNV-GL risk analysis, impacts to ferry operations, cost to accommodate facility and discussions with key stakeholders. CFL will advise on the final location and the implications for local residents and harbour users.	
154.	Can consideration of having two berths at Uig be made to allow for the possibility of having two vessels operating on the Skye Triangle?	Uig	A single berth has been considered as the most appropriate, cost effective option for Uig. Also, see 149 above.	
155.	Concern was raised as to where the fishermen would go.	Uig	During the works the works Contract will have an obligation to maintain the number of berths in so far as is practicable throughout the construction phase. Meetings have been arranged in October to meet with harbour users and the community groups to consider their	Ongoing consultation with the Uig Harbour Users and Community Group is taking place with three meetings been held, two in October 2017 and one in January 2018.

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
			concerns and consult on the developing design.	
156.	Will there be a dual carriageway along the pier?	Uig	The preferred option is for a double lane carriageway on the widened approachway. The intention is to retain single way traffic (to suit vessel loading and unloading), however, there will be space available for vehicles to pass in abnormal circumstances e.g. vehicle breakdown, accident etc. which is not currently possible.	
157.	Concern was raised about timescales and ensuring that all harbours would be ready for the new vessel to avoid delays similar to those experienced during the improvements to Stornoway Harbour.	Uig	Noted. It is possible for the new vessel to geometrically fit the existing berths at all three locations albeit with some operating limitations.	
158.	Could consideration be made to berthing the ferry on the opposite side of the pier to the current ferry berth?	Uig	Switching the ferry to the opposite side of the pier would likely involve significantly more expenditure than the current proposals. It is also not a favoured option of CFL given the westerly side's exposure to wind, wave and swell.	
159.	<p>Why are you building one large ferry which requires all the link-spans in the 3 ports to be updated? Why can't there be two ferries, one for each leg, which would mean less expenditure beyond maintenance of the existing port infrastructure and provide additional capacity for when the inevitable arises: breakdown, annual service etc., which would mean that at least we would have one ferry to fall back on when one was out of action.</p> <p>I appreciate you have perhaps accessed particular funding against the environmental element of a dual fuel ferry but at what other costs?</p>	General	<p>We acknowledge that there are a number of different iterations that could address the services to the Outer Hebrides. This is also the case for other island groups that rely on the lifeline services.</p> <p>Transport Scotland chairs a monthly tri-partite meeting with CMAL and CalMac concerning the Network and there are very detailed discussions and considerations that need to be taken into account. When all of these aspects and others were taken into consideration it was decided that</p>	

Item	Question	Reference	Initial Response-Sept 2017	Updates January 2018
			<p>there would be an order for 2 new Dual Fuel Ferries. The existing Port Infrastructure will allow these vessels to operate however it is recognised that for operations to be optimised there was a requirement to enhance the current facilities.</p> <p>With the quantum of expenditure these decisions are not taken lightly and are considered in detail prior to sign off by Scottish Government.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the vessels under construction can also operate on a number of other routes and therefore there is future flexibility built into the plans in terms of future redeployment.</p>	