



## Minutes

Client: Argyll and Bute Council

Project: Caignure Pier OBC

Meeting date: 15 January 2025

Meeting location: MSTeams & Ramboll Edinburgh office

Meeting title: Caignure Pier Development Working Group - Meeting 03

## Attendees and distribution list

Name	Company	Initials	Present/Apology
Craig MacDonald	T&T	CM	A
Lynsey McNeilly	T&T	LM	P
Orla Wilson	T&T	OW	P
Ed Lacey	Ramboll	EL	P
Jamieson Bruce Christie	Ramboll	JC	A
Ross Tait	Ramboll	RT	P
Allan Finlay	Argyll and Bute Council	AF	P
Kelly McKellar	Argyll and Bute Council	KMcK	P
Scott Reid	Argyll and Bute Council	SR	P
Declan MacDonald	CMAL	DM	P
Doug Mackay	CMAL	DMK	P
Lewis Hammell	CMAL	LH	P
Morven Bridges	CMAL	MB	A
Colin Campbell	CalMac	CC	A
Fraser Wallace	CalMac	FW	P
Gordon McKillop	CalMac	GM	A
John Simm	CalMac	JS	A
Kerry McLachlan	CalMac	KMcL	A
Caroline Connelly	Transport Scotland (TS)	CC	P
Graham Patrick	Transport Scotland	GP	P
Paul Linhart MacAskill	Transport Scotland	PL	A

**Signed:** L McNeilly

**Date:** 15/01/2025

## Minutes

Discussion topic	Action and date
<p><b>1 Introductions</b></p> <p>1.1 Scott Reid welcomed everyone to the meeting.</p> <p>1.2 New attendee's since last week – Fraser Wallace, CalMac.</p>	Note
<p><b>2 Actions from previous minutes</b></p> <p>30.10.24</p> <p>2.1 CalMac response to Meeting 01 preparatory questions. <b>Initial response received, items outstanding for terminal building requirements.</b></p> <p>2.2 Ramboll will outline the impact of including the older vessels in the design, and a decision is then required should they be accommodated. <b>Primary &amp; secondary list has been provided by CalMac. This will be reviewed &amp; any impact highlighted &amp; discussed with A&amp;BC. Note as actioned as this is covered within Employer's Requirement works.</b></p> <p>2.3 The number of potential vessels using the pier was discussed. It is noted as likely to be a 2 vessel service with the potential of a 3rd vessel at some point in the future. OBC team &amp; A&amp;BC to review flexibility/possible expansion in future if the planned operational routes/vessels/frequency was to change. <b>Ongoing.</b></p> <p>2.4 Previous minutes were updated from feedback from KMCL. These will be re-distributed. <b>Actioned.</b></p> <p>(Note item numbering has changed since minutes 01)</p>	<p>See later action point in Section 5</p> <p>EL - ongoing</p>
<p>27.11.24</p> <p><b>Actions from discussions on Linkspan &amp; fixed ramp.</b></p> <p>2.5 KMCL will respond in regard to the Loch Frisa &amp; Coruisk being considered as primary or secondary, from CalMac point of view. KMCL, 04/12/24. <b>Actioned.</b></p> <p>2.6 EL will review what the restrictions will be for secondary vessels and feedback. <b>Actioned - the restrictions are reported in the document that was shared.</b></p> <p>2.7 It is to be confirmed if MV Alfred should be included on the list of vessels &amp; primary or secondary. CalMac to confirm. KMCL, 04/12/24. <b>Actioned.</b></p> <p>2.8 EL will explain what amendment to design would be required to accommodate MV Alfred, then A&amp;BC can feedback on if this is required or not. <b>Actioned.</b></p> <p>2.9 May need to re-look at the resilience when vessels are using a fixed ramp to see what this looks like. Then the design team can feedback</p>	

## Minutes

Discussion topic	Action and date
<p>what length is suitable for the requirements. <b>EL, 12/12/24 This has been actioned &amp; will be revisited to confirm suitability now that primary &amp; secondary vessel list confirmed.</b></p> <p>(Note item numbering has changed since minutes 02)</p>	
<b>3 Terms of Reference (TOR)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TOR was issued following the previous meeting.</li> <li>Comments received from TS, CalMac and confirmation of no comment from CMAL. Comments will be reviewed &amp; document updated where required &amp; distributed. Document will be issued along with minutes of CPDWG meeting 03</li> </ul>	LM 29/01/2025
<b>4 Project Update</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LM provided an update on EIA, design, OBC.</li> <li>EL provided an update on detailed design &amp; queries.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Project update summary</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EIA scoping - EIA Scoping submitted. EIA surveys to commence approx. 2025</li> <li>OBC – OBC works ongoing, submission date is currently April 2025</li> <li>Stage 2 design ongoing, forecast delivery end of February.</li> <li>Employer's Requirements (ER) circulated for review. No slipway included. ER will be amended based on feedback/responses from parties.</li> <li>Linkspan / Fixed Ramp proposals circulated for review. Catamarans would need to have split / offset ramp to use the linkspan. Linkspan/fixed ramp. Discussion point later in meeting.</li> <li>Location of pier: Option D1 (closer to existing) selected following CalMac feedback. Option D3 did not give significant benefit during construction. Stage 2 design &amp; OBC will be based on this GA location.</li> <li>Small vessel pontoon and wave screen included – RNLI and small craft (cruise tenders, fish farm vessels etc).</li> <li>New terminal to be operational ~2030.</li> </ul>	Note
<b>5 Information Awaited &amp; discussion points</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CalMac: Review of Terminal Building User Requirements</li> <li>CalMac / CMAL: Confirmation on number of vessels berthed simultaneously – for discussion. FW will take the query to CalMac, in relation to the vessel deployment.</li> <li>CalMac: Feedback on Linkspan / Fixed Ramp geometry</li> </ul>	FW, action dates TBC by CalMac
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The options of a 2 or 3 vessel route were discussed with input from all parties. At this stage a 3-vessel route is not costed, it is aspirational.</li> <li>SR explained that for this design, a 2-vessel route will be the default setting. Default setting need's to be set to enable the next steps to proceed, unless told otherwise by other parties.</li> <li>CalMac / CMAL: Feedback on Linkspan / Fixed Ramp geometry</li> </ul>	

## Minutes

Discussion topic	Action and date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EL summarised what the situation would be for different vessel types, and what the proposed linkspan parameters would mean. Linkspan/port conditions will need to be taken into account when finalising vessel design. In terms of confirming the hull type, approx. 3-4months from now.</li> <li>As design is further defined for Craignure, a closer look is needed between OBAN1 &amp; Craignure pier, so that the pier &amp; vessel designs are suitable/compatible.</li> <li>Fixed ramp – CMAL fed back that often the fixed ramp is not utilized frequently elsewhere. EL queried is there more understanding/ reasoning know about this, FW will take this query to CalMac.</li> <li>EL summarised reasoning for proposal having 1 x fixed ramp &amp; 1 x linkspan.</li> <li>It would be beneficial to understand linkspan downtime. SR provided an explanation that it will be as per the current requirements, to minimise any interference with planned operations, i.e. work is planned at vessel downtime, apart from planned inspections for example 5-yearly, 10-yearly.</li> <li>CC highlighted this is similar to the arrangement at Port Ellen, 1 x linkspan, 1 x fixed ramp.</li> <li>It is understood that the linkspan design provides a wide envelope within which the vessel design is expected to be able to be designed to fit.</li> </ul>	FW, action date TBC by CalMac.
<b>6 GA</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EL presented the GA &amp; talked through the drawing.</li> <li>There is potential the marshalling yard size may reduce as vessel options/sizes are progressed. It is applicable at this point to allow for the largest window required.</li> <li>CC queried had a passenger traffic survey been completed. To check/confirm the design is not making current situation any worse. Currently the project team have completed a check to ensure the pedestrian routes are not negatively affected, however it is not compared to existing scenario.</li> <li>Project team to take action to confirm at what stage this task is completed.</li> <li>FW from CalMac requested that they work closely with A&amp;BC in relation to this survey/works, from an operational viewpoint.</li> </ul>	EL, LM, 02/04/25  EL, LM, CalMac.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>AOB</b></li> <li>Report going to Harbour Board for March, detailing where we are in terms of programme, what has been covered in these meetings, decisions, assumptions &amp; feed in from CMILG.</li> <li>CC queried does the council have a dedicated page for Craignure Pier project, are there any other comms planned. SR confirmed it is intended the updates will go onto a page on the website.</li> </ul>	Note
<b>7 Arrangement of next meeting (monthly) &amp; other required meetings</b>	

Minutes

Discussion topic	Action and date
7.1 LM listed out the next meeting dates proposed, invites and agendas will be issued in advance of each.	LM, ongoing
7.2 The next Craignure Pier Development Working Group meeting will be arranged for 2 <sup>nd</sup> April 2025.	Note
7.3 The next CMILG meeting proposed for 29 <sup>th</sup> January, MSTeams.  The CMILG will be an opportunity for all parties in this working group to provide any relevant update to the community in relation to the Craignure Oban route. Any items to be added to the agenda to be issued to LM in advance of the meeting, this will be noted in the meeting invite.	LM, SR 22/01/25
Scott Reid thanked everyone for attending and the meeting was closed.	Note
<b>8 Actions</b>	
8.1 As noted throughout.	

© Turner & Townsend Project Management Limited. This document is expressly provided to and solely for the use of **Error! No text of specified style in document.** on the **Error! No text of specified style in document.** and takes into account their particular instructions and requirements. It must not be made available or copied or otherwise quoted or referred to in whole or in part in any way, including orally, to any other party without our express written permission and we accept no liability of whatsoever nature for any use by any other party