

**MINUTES of the FERRIES COMMUNITY BOARD MEETING
held on Friday 5 December at 09:00
at The Studio, Hope St, Glasgow and on Microsoft Teams.**

[FOISA Status – Exemptions under Section 30 (Prejudice to effective conduct of public affairs) Section 33 (Commercial interests) and Section 36 (Confidentiality)]

Present:

Angus Campbell - Chair (AC)
Angus Campbell (AC2)
Bill Calderwood (BC)
David Herriot (DH)
Gail Robertson (GR)
Jim Porteous (JP)
Kirsty MacFarlane (KMacF)
Kenny MacLean (KMacL)
Colin Smith (CS)
Richard Bentley (RB)

In attendance:

Morag McNeil (MMcN) - CMAL
Blair Moglia (BM) - CMAL
Brian Fulton (BF) - CMAL
Edward Dowd (ED) - CMAL
Kevin Hobbs (KH) - CMAL
Robert Morrison (RM) – CalMac
Ailsa Stephen (AS) – CalMac
Pauline Blackshaw (PB) – CalMac
Lauren McEwan (LMc) – CalMac
Chris Wilcock (CW) – Transport Scotland
Ewan Walker (EW) - Transport Scotland
Fiona Hyslop, Cabinet Secretary for Transport (FH)

Apologies: Murdo MacLean (MMaL), Christine Murdoch (CM), Joanna Peteranna (JoP), Mack MacArthur (MMcA).

1 GOVERNANCE

1.1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies from Murdo MacLean, Christine Murdoch, Joanna Peteranna and Mack MacArthur.

1.2 Declarations of Interest

Affixed to meeting minute.

1.3 Minutes of meetings held on September 6 and Matters Arising

The minutes were approved and there were no matters arising.

1.4 Actions from previous meeting

Matters marked as closed to be removed from the list.

2 Cabinet Secretary for Transport

AC welcomed the Cabinet Secretary to the meeting. Introductions were made.

The Cabinet Secretary, Fiona Hyslop presented Angus Campbell (Chair) with a gift to recognise his patience, perseverance and leadership of the Ferries Community Board since his appointment in 2017.

FH began a statement, emphasising her strong desire to have an independent voice from the islands.

She said there is lots of work going forward, the community needs assessments are important and the needs are different for all islands. We have a continuous improvement agenda, but I would be interested to hear your expectation or scoping of what this might look like. The KPIs are important that they are meaningful. The ICP is being published, and we also have the northern isles to consider here, for their own vessel procurement. She concluded by wishing Angus Campbell well in his future endeavours.

AC asked about the place of the community board. One of the things we must be careful on is taking part in discussion versus decision making. We are happy to be part of it but are not the final decision makers.

KMacF and GR raised the issue of the new structure of area management and having high hopes at first. This has not materialised for some places, but it has for others. AC2 added that area management is just another way of pushing an agenda from head office. KMacF agreed and said that there has been a culture shift, and the higher levels of the organisation (CalMac) feels further away, giving more to the Area Managers.

RB asked about expanding the Board membership to more people, with some members due to leave shortly. As we go through this transition, the share of work is a concern.

The Cabinet Secretary said that there is an optimal number for Boards to work well. We must manage expectations for individuals, because people are giving up their time.

AC concluded the agenda item by saying that the change in culture is critical. At the joint-DML board we did not feel that we got what we needed. Especially after requesting a 50/50 agenda. He thanked the Cabinet Secretary for making the time to come along.

The Cabinet Secretary presented a gift on behalf of the parliament.

3 CalMac Update

5-year Outlook for Vessel Deployment

AC welcomed Pauline Blackshaw [PB], Lauren McEwan [LMcE].

LMcE shared presentation on screen.

AC asked what mechanism and what confidence is there that community views have been captured in this work? Not as a tweaking exercise as we are well down the road, but from the start, what has the mechanism been throughout?

CW said that this should be separated – these are interim cascade plans. We must make the best of what we have. For Barra, for example, communities made comments about capacity versus reliability. We get mixed messages from this community. This is about us capturing what the immediate needs are and what we can do with what we have. This does not say there can't be further drive to improve.

AC raised concern about the 5-year timescale. Lots of communities could make or break during that time.

CW spoke of the difficulties of planning additional capacity in such advance.

AC spoke about the knock-on effect of additional capacity in one place perhaps interfering with another.

CW spoke about there being a trigger point that must be met to increase capacity. There is nothing saying that as we progress with the SVRP, that this cannot be reached or progressed.

CS said that community feedback should come at the start of a process and drive the needs.

BC thanked LMcE and raised a concern about the presentation. There does not seem to be anything in here about community needs. For example, in my own area, taking the Caledonian Isles away will lose 5 sailings a day from a preferred contact port on Arran, replaced by 3 sailings per day. These boats will have no alternative port of refuge in adverse weather. We cannot survive on 3 sailings per day – it impacts medical staff, residents, teachers, social care. There doesn't seem to be anything in here about community needs. We need to be more innovative, and we need to challenge ourselves. In general, I'd be reluctant to share this with the community because of the wording.

PB replied, the presentation today does not give the full nuance of all the engagement that we have, and all the data and information gathered and taken into consideration. We have had lots of engagement around the future of the Arran service, and we hear the feedback on the challenges around the

maintenance period. As part of that, we committed to using the resilience vessel if required. We need to look across the network and take the wider view which needs us to go into individual community views.

AC2 echoed this point and asked about community feedback mechanisms. Particularly about the demand.

PB discussed forecasts originally prepared in 2016 (the VRDP) which are still used, and the measurement shows that the demand we expected has not met forecast. We need to ask how demand is satisfied, but the data we use now is driven by data (albeit out of date) but it still is far below original projections.

AC said that this is seriously flawed because of infrastructure changes since.

CW said that the community needs assessment, if done correctly, should capture this.

KMacF recognised that we are talking about two quite different scenarios that have been captured. One is where new vessels will be deployed, and I understand the frustrations around the infrastructure. My concern is that these ships are getting older, what happens when they experience outages, and we are back in a position of firefighting. What is the position if one or two of these older vessels cannot manage?

DM said that the general approach is something this group has discussed for a while. It won't solve the problem over night, but on Wednesday afternoon we spoke about the FCB moving forward and being able to contribute and identify areas for development. Where you start with a set of factors and drivers and work from there.

JP said that a lot of work is required on the VRDP to have it reasonably accurate. Tourism quoted a figure of 4% which has not been the case and utilisation was also a factor. It was a good basis to go forward but we need to unpick it and upgrade it for the ferries that we are getting. It would be welcome to do one in conjunction with all the different areas. There would be a lot of work though.

BC said that trends change over time and there are reasons the VRDP has not been reached. Hopefully the journey Pauline speaks of is along the lines of continuous improvement that can be refined.

RB asked if there is any guarantee that vessel cascades will not result in any reduction to service compared to current timetable.

CW there is a risk of that.

RB asked if the needs assessment is the same as others done or will they be done by separate contractors.

PB said that the needs assessments referenced by CW were completed by TS. CalMac will take over in doing the analysis at a future point of those assessments. The demand forecasts will help to feed into the needs assessments that TS are currently doing.

RB have you engaged with all communities impacted on this?

LMcE confirmed, not yet but Area Managers are arranging these now for early 2026. Feedback we have has been shared directly by communities upon review of the ICP. Action to share presentation with the FCB [Action – AS]

AC thanked Pauline and Lauren for attending.

.

4 CMAL Update

AC welcomed BF, BM, ED, MMcN and KH.

KH opened the floor to questions, assuming the CMAL report had been read and digested.

CW asked about the Islay class vessels and their ability to use Oban. My understanding is that they can, but some work at the berths might be needed.

KH confirmed, yes. We can use it fore and aft on the number 2 linkspan at Oban but not on the number 1. The stern ramp is effectively moveable and can move laterally across the beam of the ship. The clam-shell doors when they are open, the exit point is dead centre on the new ones which gives a slight problem as it's too close to the seaboard side of the linkspan. Effectively, we didn't replace the bank seed – mass concrete pivot point on the shore, or the lifting dolphins. Other upgrades weren't completed and all of it is around 55 years old now. There is a body of work needing done.

KMacL asked about LOTI decision time scale. Is there a risk that a delay could mean that the LOTI requires a major refit, and all the costs that would incur?

KH said it wouldn't need a major refit. It is heading towards the Hebridean Isles scenario. I cannot see the ship managing to pass a special survey. The fact it operates in the northern European waters too doesn't help. Now it's with TS as we cannot go out to tender. A decision will be imminent I believe.

CW said that this was raised in the FM's questions yesterday. The First minister said that they hope to decide on the procurement for the LOTI replacement as soon as possible.

KH commented on CMAL almost being ready but having to review a significantly long document.

AC asked about how a direct award influenced this, if the basis would be the same.

KH said that if it was a direct award, the ask is still the same but there is not the necessity to go out and do all the same assessments. The costs would be unknown and the timescales for delivery would be unknown.

KMacF mentioned that she attended the online consultation about Oban number 1 berth online. She recalled that KH and DM referred to putting in a 3rd berth in Oban, is this correct?

KH said that it has not been scaled back but it is extremely complicated and many questions on whether from an engineering sense it could be achieved. We need to do something with the number 1 linkspan anyway because this is critical and 1 linkspan is not enough for 7 islands. The larger problem is one that we have initiated a solution for, but it is very complicated and eye-wateringly expensive (if it can indeed be delivered). We are constrained by the railway on the landward side, and we had a conversation around 7 years ago with Network rail. We got an agreement to remove two of the railway sidings which meant that the road could move over, creating 50 or 55 spaces for cars. The concern at this point was trying to not create the gridlock situation in the centre of Oban. Given the continuing growth of the islands, particularly during the summer, we really need more space than that now. What this means is that we need to create a suspended deck on piles out into Oban Bay. Not far from the berth, we find very deep water. This is good from a vessel point of view, but piles, no matter how big have finite strength and the longer it is, the more flexible it is. There is a question as to how far you can take it out before it becomes unfeasible. It's a very complicated project and we cannot wait for several years of tests for linkspan 1 to fail. The works we have planned will give the berth another 50 – 60 years of life. What we did before gave it only 15 years more.

JP said the cabinet secretary had some concerns about Port Ellen costs. We are concerned locally that this goes through. In your paper, you say that the business case you are working on will hopefully be available in the new year. Our road infrastructure is not capable of working with just one port for any length of time.

KH said that we are painfully aware that the facilities at Port Ellen are not substantial enough for the Finlaggan let alone the Isle of Islay or Loch Indaal. With the new ships you'd be restricting them to 60% density of loading which is nonsense. He spoke about the cost of rotary piling which is necessary but hugely costly. A modern port should be fit for purpose for at least 60 years. There will be pain closing Port Ellen, so you don't want this to happen in short succession, it should be a generation thing.

RB asked about the works on Oban1 linkspan. What impact will it have on operations?

KH said that it will have to close. However, we can just about cope in the winter period using primarily number 2 linkspan and the slip for Lismore. It doesn't work at all in the summer and we're working hard to see how we can compress the programme to ensure we don't disrupt summer timetables – we do not have an answer to this yet.

RB asked if vessel redeployments and cascades coming up, are there any headaches for you with works going on?

KH it's all ok. There is no final decision on what is going where yet but we have a major part to play because the matrix of what fits where lies with us. There are some vessels which have never been tried

at ports, but we have naval architects who can model this. That said, all the modelling in the world sometimes can't reveal some issues you get by trying.

DM said that in the interim, when we do get a new vessel or a new class of vessel, it's important to take it round the network to see where it fits. There will be pressure when she is delivered to do this – history tells us when you get a new class of vessel, there comes an issue with the second, third and so on. But it builds in a forward look to flexibility.

BC asked about confidence level of the MV Glen Sannox return, and will that mean a retrofit on the Glen Rosa before it is handed over?

KH said that the work being done on the Sannox is already planned prior to delivery for the Rosa. They are sister ships. If you have one vibration problem, you have two. The people planning and doing that now are fully employed at Cammell Laird to ensure it's done properly. Fergussons will do that work on Glen Rosa. We need to get new propellor blades and they have quite long lead times.

DM added that all CalMac drydock work is complete and what is now taking place is warranty works from Fergussons. We are just about to go public on our expectation for return to service.

BC thanked KH and CMAL for addressing the situation at Ardrossan. Are you still comfortable that this is progressing?

KH confirmed. It is still progressing, and I hope we are close to a conclusion on it. We have the business purchase agreement to populate and there is some due diligence work needing done.

MMcN reiterated KH's point. It is a full-time pursuit for many of us and it is hugely difficult. We have the statutory harbour authority transfer also, which is a statutory process with no shortcuts. It is a complex deal.

KH commented that the harbour operating agreement is running well. The relationship between CMAL and CalMac is the best it has been.

MMcN agreed, the relationship is not a result of CHFS3, but the people involved working well together. The benefit of the arrangements we have is that we can change things and be flexible. In the past it was contractual and a totally different territory. It is worth having regular reviews to ensure that it is delivering a great service and if it is not, then we can tweak it.

AC thanked CMAL colleagues for their attendance and updates.

MMcN wished the Chair all the best on behalf of CMAL.

5 TS Update

CW said that we are into month 3 of CHFS, working through very detailed reporting. This is something that at some point in time we would like to discuss with the Board – how we use the data, how the reflect experiences and whether some are of use at all.

AC2 asked about when there might be transparency on when these KPIs would be published.

DM agreed to check [Action].

CW did say that we are just a couple of months in, so there may be a lag.

BC said that people are looking for this data, so hoped to have it available. The format has not been universally welcomed. Is there any scope to tweak that before the end of the March period to start a new full year with a revised format?

DM agreed to pass this on to PB [Action].

CW continued about budgets. We have the figures for next year that we anticipate from CalMac's business plan projects into next year's budget.

AC asked if there was a danger we could end up in a worse position?

CW a different position as it's not contractual but I cannot imagine it being the first place anyone would take a massive reduction on. No anticipation that this will be a difficult budget, but there are very big numbers and as time goes on, numbers go up as new vessels come in also.

CW said that CNA questionnaires will be going out for Oban routes (except Barra) shortly. This quite evolved from what was done at Dunoon-Kilcreggan, with more in person engagement involved. The team is working on a lot of Northern Isles work. There is an investment in new tonnage there, but also the tender of the contract for NIFS. We have just been through the public engagement on this, and some very interesting responses to this. 13k responses versus 300 responses for CHFS. A variety of factors influence this of course, but a report will come out on this.

RB asked about the freight fares review.

CW said that the next part of the island connectivity plan is that. Mid 2026 is when we're expecting to come back to this. We are committed to reviewing it, we just need the programme of work for it. There are some difficult choices there and specific island needs to consider.

KMacF referred to the length of time infrastructure projects take, such as the small works planned to No 1 Berth in Oban, where, if all goes well, the work will start 3 years from now. Do these timescales ever give the Cabinet Secretary or her colleagues pause to think that maybe something should be changed or amended. Some of these things are desperately needed.

CW said that availability of staff is a consideration and the consenting element of it also. This sits with Marine Scotland and TS. We do all that we can to triage and prioritise, but it is an ongoing challenge. We have a huge volume of projects currently.

BF noted that there were two very different processes between vessel projects and port infrastructure projects. Vessel projects follow timelines within specified design and build contracts. Port infrastructure projects additionally rely on third party consenting processes which have their own timescales and can be variable. Examples include environmental impact assessments which may need to be done by season, and equality impact assessments.

CW suggested the tripartite send some pieces of work that are upcoming and ask the FCB for their specific views on those topics.

AC agreed. A special session on innovation would be a good way to start that off.

AC asked about the set up with area management and the hierarchy. The reality is not the expectation that communities or the Board had. We thought decision making might follow into that space. Deputy levels would be used as a way of spreading the work of Area Manager availability, but they seem to do a different job.

DM answered, the area manager role and the concept of that was to respond to community feedback that people were finding it hard to get in touch with someone who understands local developments. They should be able to be there, present and listening to that. The Area Manager should be able to have input on operational issues and I see that a part of the day-to-day drumbeat of disruption management and looking ahead at the next week or two.

AC asked about the on-call system. The deputy, could they be used for 24hr spread of contact?

DM said that the Deputy Area Managers oversee standards at ports.

RM said that the Deputy Area Managers did a lot of work in the background on harbour safety and contractual obligations. They manage the safety, and I was pleased to hear that CMAL are seeing the benefit of this. The Area managers support community views and every Monday morning, part of that is for area managers to review engagement effort in each of their areas. Having 6 now means we can see community meetings happening.

GR said that her contact with an area manager is less and worse than before, and yet they were busier. IT's not yet at a point where it benefits communities and customers.

DM said that through ferry committees and those structures, the stakeholder plan, that is clearly scrutinised. We would need to look at that from your personal experience rather than as a ferry committee member. Perhaps there are areas that need a deep dive.

BC said that people have heard there are AMs and DAMs, but in the absence of the AM, communities think the DAM would then be the step-up to contact instead. People do not understand the roles. The title DAM is misleading.

DM and RM agreed that there is a piece of work on communicating this that could be done [Action].

KMacF said there has been a real increase in contact with the Area manager in her location. Certain routes are interconnected with others and the process by which CalMac makes that decision is very unclear. It would be good to develop a way of bringing these players together. We have pioneered this before on Coll and Tiree. At an early stage it would be good to have this incorporated. For the last few years, we have had a string of 6-8 week rescheduling that are out of sync with the new timetable. Whose voice carries more weight and how do you come to the decision you come to on these?

RM said that the challenge is that the impact is across multiple communities. Area Managers should be front and centre on these discussions.

KMacF said that it's understandable when there are instant changes like a breakdown, but I meant more around planned changes.

AC added that there is benefit to this to have everyone round the table, as others will be more affected than others.

JP gave a final point on Area Managers. Over a period of around 10-12 years, we have seen a massive change. The first area managers we had would say no to everything. Absolute sea change now. It's a developing process and some managers are just finding their feet. It is developing on Islay and by no means perfect, but we are fortunate. Our area manager listens, is positive and keeps us informed. They also take initiative on things that are upcoming and this is extremely encouraging. The only thing I would say – and it is not criticism – is that the more wins area managers get, that boosts their confidence and encourages credibility in the community. It's an area to keep in the back of your mind, to give them as many wins as you can.

DM thanked JP for the point made. We are in that position. I wouldn't want people to feel that there was a bureaucratic process with people round a table in Gourock – the short-cycle operational choices are done in teams calls with company leaders, skippers, the full multi-disciplinary setup. It is focussed on our options and how we work through those. Area managers are active contributors to that. Whilst we apply a degree of science, I do see where some communities are taking a hit, and others are not on an ongoing basis, and we must bear this in mind and make directions accordingly.

AC said we just want assurance that all information is on the table when decisions are made.

DM agreed – we want to know everything too. Often in the past it would be frustrating hearing certain elements after a decision had been made, so it helps us too.

6 Lunch Break – 12:30 – 13:00

7 Joint Session – already covered items before lunch.

8 Board Session

Board Engagement Strategy for the FCB.

AC led a discussion on the engagement strategy for the FCB, and asked if there were any more interest groups that the FCB might wish to make a connection with.

The discussion moved on to geographical responsibility and the new areas set out by CalMac in the enhanced engagement programme.

BC suggested bringing in external parties such as Scotrail, SPT if they were intent on the aims to help 'improve every journey'. This depends on not only CalMac but other transport providers. Could we engage with them also?

CS agreed – it would be good to involve them too and make connections.

AC suggested hosting joint meetings with various groups, and gave the example of the transport group, organised by GR. She discussed the terms of reference of this group, which was required to engage with CHFS. AC agreed that this would be good, to meet with and know the goals or purpose of these groups.

JP said that the ferry service has lost credibility and after a lot of disruption, people struggle to see improvement. We want to publicise ourselves in the local paper and on Facebook. We also want to put up a terms of reference or a paragraph to show our purpose. Then an invitation to ask for people's views. There are a wide range of people who would have their say if they believed there was a good purpose for it. We do not have proper PR. We used to have calling cards, we spoke about posters (this probably needs to be done after we have had the refresh), and we need to get a few articles in the press to build enthusiasm.

GR asked if we could share the annual report out publicly?

AC agreed – once it's been finally signed off, yes, we should.

Recruitment

Discussion around the term of membership and around recruitment of Chair. AC answered some questions about the position of Chair and the new appointment.

AC suggested that members encourage people they know to apply, to get good representation from across the network.

CS cautioned about succession planning, with members having to leave in due course due to terms coming to an end. Discussion followed about encouraging people to apply to the Board if they are interested in having their say.

Interim Chair

It was agreed that in the interim period between the departure of Angus Campbell and the appointment of a new Chair, that Bill Calderwood and Kenny MacLean would share the responsibility as spokesmen of the Board.

Under-22 Travel

Final action to determine dates for 2026 series of Board meetings.

- March and September meetings to be network held
- June and December meetings to be Glasgow based.

Review of Actions and Next Steps

With immediate effect, Kirsty MacFarlane gave notice of her resignation from the Ferries Community Board. The Board shared their sincere thanks to Kirsty for her work over the years and wished her all the very best.

-

Meeting concluded with thanks to all for their contribution.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 2026 Meeting dates to be determined.

#	Action	Owner	Status	Date Originated
1	FAIR FARES ENGAGEMENT CW took action to go back to TS colleagues for an update on what the engagement there would be for the public on the fair fares piece of work.	CW	Closed.	<i>December 2023</i>
2	EBOOKING FIXES & AR TURAS MEETING CFL agreed to share a list of fixes [eBooking] with the FCB.	CFL	<u>29/08/2025</u> - IT Director, David Gammie attended FCB Meeting on 5 September to update members.	<i>December 2023</i>
3	CHFS2 RECONCILIATION EXERCISE CW agreed that CHFS2 has not been scrutinised or audited to the degree it should have. Before the end of the contract, it should be reconciled. CW agreed to pick up on this and take it away. A reconciliation and reflection on management of the contract, to cover resourcing levels, structure, etc.	CW		<i>September 2024</i>
4	TEMPORARILY UNBOOKABLE MESSAGING – ONLINE JP offered feedback on when booking is temporarily unavailable. Messaging to say that transfers are being made, and it is worth trying again later. This may prevent people from giving up entirely when unable to book. DB agreed to take this away and explore how this can be done.	BC	This item was covered in eBooking agenda item on 5 September.	<i>September 2024</i>
5	THIRD PARTY & LOCAL AUTHORITY NEEDS BC asked if there was a resource that showed third party and local authority needs in one place. TS may have a comprehensive list.	TS	<u>07/03/25</u> - ongoing.	<i>December 2024</i>
6	FEEDBACK FROM CEO VISITS KMacF asked if there was a collation of feedback received from the combined CMAL, TS and CalMac visits around the network. DM offered to take this offline and explore what an update on this might look like.	MS	<u>06/06/2025</u> – MS explained that from now, the tripartite will be represented on these visits. Action to be closed, subject to one-pager provided on outcome of visits and what has been learned. This links to the CRM project. BM asked, if possible, to collaborate on this, as it is a tripartite visit.	<i>December 2024</i>
7	FACILITATED WORKSHOP WITH TRIPARTITE AND SCOTTISH FUTURES TRUST After agreement from all parties, it was agreed that a workshop should take place to workshop what the future of the FCB should be – structure, appointments, remit. JoP agreed to approach TS to propose this, as it aligns with the CHFS3 strategy.	JoP / Transport Scotland	Work on the remit of the FCB is ongoing, and this support was not required, though TS did pick up with SFT at an early stage. Closed.	<i>December 2024</i>
8	COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENTS CW offered to speak about how community needs assessments will work at a future FCB meeting. Action was taken to add this	CW	<u>06/09/25</u> - CW suggested inviting a member of his team to join the FCB meeting in December. Richard Hadfield to be invited	<i>December 2024</i>

	to forward agenda. CW suggested someone from his team come along to present to the Board.		to the next board to cover the granular detail of where this project is.	
9	INTERISLAND TRAVEL KMacF asked if inter-island travel was now available everywhere, as she had only read of the 'Western Isles' now having this.	KMacF / CW	Brian Gordon in touch with KMacF and position is now understood. Closed.	<i>December 2024</i>
10	FCB CONTACT DETAILS AS to liaise with RM and colleagues at CFL on purchase of domain for @FCB, or similar, email addresses. AS to liaise with GR and JoP on progress. Combined with previous action for FCB contact posters to be displayed on vessels with new contact information.	RM	<u>29/08/2025</u> - ferrycommunityboard@gmail.com now live. Please request access. Contact posters drafted. 05/09/2025 - Update required for CFL website on contact. Members to volunteer Gmail access.	<i>December 2024</i>
11	ROUTE FLEXIBILITY After discussion around restrictions to change timetables and extend services, considering hours of rest etc. The Board agreed that there would be value to having a discussion on what is possible on a route-by-route basis. RM agreed to investigate the opportunity for future discussion on this.	RM	<u>29/08/2025</u> - Moving forward, this should be a natural discussion point for new area management. Closed.	<i>March 2025</i>
12	PORT ASKAIG – MARSHALLING AND LAYOUT CONSULTATION KH agreed to contact Fraser Wallace of CFL to come back to JP with an answer about a consultation underway to review marshalling and layout at Port Askaig.	FW/DB		<i>June 2025</i>
13	PORTFOLIO OF PORTS ON THE CLYDE BC asked about ongoing work to add to the portfolio of ports on the Clyde. KH agreed to contact BC directly about this.	BC/KH	<u>02/07/2025</u> - KH contacted BC with an update. Closed.	<i>June 2025</i>
14	FCB X TS ENGAGEMENT AC raised the point of lack of engagement with TS – CW agreed to check on this with his team and if TS have not been forthcoming in answering FCB requests, to get back on track with this.	CW	CW shared an update in advance of the September meeting. Closed.	<i>June 2025</i>
15	QUALITATIVE CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE INSIGHT JoP highlighted concern that customer satisfaction surveys may be mainly completed by holiday makers. there something on a semi-regular basis we could do to capture island resident sentiment. CW agreed to take this away and investigate – do we distinguish between customers by post code – do we host focus groups? Check what other organisations do, such a Scotrail.	CW		<i>June 2025</i>

16	ROLE OF THE FCB PAPER LK agreed to take the document with tracked changes and combine with the FCB feedback paper to add detail around the contract management process.	LK	This has been shared with the Board. Closed.	<i>June 2025</i>
17	DECK SPACE PILOT Discussion took place about the different needs for different routes and the varied economies of the islands. TS and CFL agreed to take this away to develop further and explore options.	CFL/TS		<i>June 2025</i>
18	ON-ISLAND TRANSPORT CONNECTIONS BC raised the point of connections. If you have a car, you can be diverted but most of the islands are only provided with public transport on the premise of getting students back and forth from school. Is there something in the new arrangement where community needs for connectivity will come onto the service provider's radar? RM agreed to check in relation to on-island connections.	RM	<u>29/08/2025</u> - Bus interconnect options will fall to the new CalMac Transport Integration Manager. This will require coordination with island-based bus services. Update to be provided post 5 September from CalMac's IOCC department due to main POC being on leave currently.	<i>June 2025</i>
19	CUSTOMER ENGAGEMENT CENTRE OPENING MESSAGE JoP asked if it might be possible to reduce the opening message when you call the CEC. It is very long, and when you are a regular customer, it can be frustrating to listen to the full narrative every time.	RM	AM confirmed that it is not possible, however; FCB members suggested that for trusted partners and account holders, there might be a reduction in the opening message to critical information only. MS agreed to speak with Caroline Black and Susan Weston.	<i>June 2025</i>
20	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST Board members agreed to submit all declarations of interest and involvement in other community groups to AS for the record.	All	Closed. Attached to meeting minutes.	September 2025
21	Community Feedback Consultancy Work RB asked about community needs assessments, particularly the brief given to consultants carrying out the work. Will the FCB and communities see the output of this and have an opportunity to comment? LK confirmed that the brief has been updated and he offered to share the methodology.	LK		<i>September 2025</i>
22	Electric Vehicle Bookings BC asked if there was information available on the CalMac website relating to electric vehicle bookings. Having the information on the website would be useful for customers.	AC/MS		<i>September 2025</i>

23	Definition of Area Manager and Deputy Area Manager Roles The Board suggested that it would be good to have a definition of the roles of AM and DAM for communities to understand that structure. RM suggested inviting FMacR to the next meeting to discuss the structure and the on-call process surrounding it.	RM		<i>September 2025</i>
24	Recruitment for Mobility and Access Committee Scotland MS offered to share recruitment for the Mobility and Access Committee for Scotland	MS		<i>September 2025</i>
25	Young Islander Contact Details RM promised to provide contact details for Victoria Shaw to Mack receive the safety report from Young Islander's network. Also to share contact details of the transport integration manager.	RM		<i>September 2025</i>
26	Presentation on Vessel Cascade Plan AS to share presentation from Lauren McEwan.	AS	Closed. Shared to FCB members by email.	<i>December 2025</i>
27	Contract KPIs AC2 asked when contract KPIs can be published and transparent to the public. DM agreed to check. Further, BC asked if there would be opportunity to tweak the format of data before the end of March, to start a new year with a revised format. DM agreed to pass this action to Pauline Blackshaw.	DM / PB		<i>December 2025</i>

Declarations of Interest – Ferries Community Board

Angus Campbell (Chair)

HIE Chair, UHI Court, Colleges Scotland Board

Gail Robertson

Haulage Contractor in the CHFS3 Area, CalMac Customer Steering Group

Richard Bentley

Colonsay Lifeline Transport Group, Colonsay Community Council

Bill Calderwood

Arran Community and Voluntary Services, Arran Ferry Committee, CalMac Customer Steering Group

Angus Campbell (2)

Chairman of Cumbrae Ferry Committee, Cumbrae Community Council, Consultancy work for CMAL on high voltage electrical supplies for new electric small ferries

Jim Porteous

Islay Community Council Secretary, Islay Community Council Ferry Committee Secretary, Islay RNLI Management Committee Chair, Islay Energy Trust, Ileach Newspaper, South Islay Development Director, Port Askaig Harbour Committee, CalMac Customer Steering Group

Kirsty MacFarlane

Convenor of Coll Community Council, Coll Transportation Subcommittee

David Herriot

Bute Ferry Committee, Fyne Homes Board, Fyne Futures, Fyne Initiatives, Scottish Island Federation, Bute Shinty Club SCIO and Beachwatch Bute SCIO