Armada and Mallaig STAG - Scope of Work

Background

Following the introduction of Road Equivalent Tarriff (RET) and a Mallaig to Lochboisdale ferry service there is a need to undertake a full appraisal of the suitability of the harbour infrastructure at both Armadale and Mallaig.

Caledonian Maritime Assets Ltd (CMAL) own the harbour Infrastructure at Armadale, Isle of Skye with Mallaig Harbour Authority (MHA) being the owner of the harbour and infrastructure at Mallaig.

The work will be led by CMAL with MHA representation as a key participant.

Following the STAG methodology and delivering the tasks identified below the output should deliver evaluated options for infrastructure options at both ports.

These options should be fully costed with indications of delivery timescales; the options should also consider the deliverability of the options while maintaining ferry operations.

STAG is objective led and not solution led and follows the following process with a key focus on participation and consultation.

Full details of the STAG guidelines can be found:-
### The STAG Process

#### Pre-Appraisal
- Analysis of Problems and Opportunities
- Objective Setting
- Option Generation, Sifting and Development

#### Initial Appraisal: Part 1 Appraisal
- Transport Planning Objectives
- STAG Criteria
- Established Policy Directives
- Feasibility
- Affordability
- Public Acceptability
- Rationale for Selection or Rejection

#### Detailed Appraisal: Part 2 Appraisal
- Transport Planning Objectives
  - Environment
  - Safety
  - Economy
  - Integration
- Accessibility and Social Inclusion
- Cost to Government
- Risk and Uncertainty
- Monitoring Plan
- Evaluation Plan

#### The STAG Report
- Project Implementation

#### Post Appraisal
- Monitoring
- Evaluation
### Scope of Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.   | Commission Management | Management of the commission under CMAL’s Framework including the following:  
  a. Ancillary activities associated with liaison and administration of the Work Package, as set out under CMAL’s framework Scope in Part 7, including monthly progress reporting.  
  b. Monthly progress meetings to be held in CMAL’s office.  
  c. Monthly invoicing & cash flow.  
  d. Maintenance & updating of overall project programme. |
| 2.   | Inception and Project Management | To obtain clear agreement on the project work programme and clarify any aspect of the proposal.  
To agree ‘acceptance criteria’ for project milestones.  
To establish lines of communication and data sources.  
To exchange relevant information.  
Ongoing monitoring of the project throughout its duration.  
Identification of key stakeholders and establishment of steering group and appropriate meeting schedule. |
| 3.   | Pre-application Consultation | To develop a clear understanding of the operational and technical issues surrounding the current infrastructure at Armadale & Mallaig. |
| 4.   | Objective setting and evaluation methodology | To agree planning objectives and evaluation methodology (may include operational / delivery impacts in evaluation methodology). |
| 5.   | Pre-appraisal | To undertake the Pre-Appraisal stage of the Armadale & Mallaig STAG, identifying options to be taken forward to a more detailed appraisal. |
| 6.   | STAG part 1 Appraisal | To undertake the detailed option development and STAG Part 1 stage of the Armadale & Mallaig STAG, identifying options to be taken forward to a more detailed Part 2 appraisal. |
| 7.   | STAG part 2 Appraisal | To undertake the STAG Part 2 stage of the Armadale & Mallaig STAG. |
| 8.   | Part 2 Consultation and Engagement | To consult on the emerging findings from the STAG process. |
| 9.   | STAG report | Provision of a final STAG report to include (in addition to normal outputs)  
  - Fully costed options  
  - Timescales for delivery  
  - Evaluation against operational / delivery aspects (to be agreed) |
Reference Requirements / Vessels

Table 1: Considers vessel deployment on the assumption that any infrastructure upgrades will be on a like for like basis and as such CFL will continue to be constrained in the size of vessels they can deploy on the route.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel(s)</th>
<th>Length OA (m)</th>
<th>Beam (m)</th>
<th>Draft (m)</th>
<th>Displacement (t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lord of the Isles</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loch Bhrusda</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loch Fyne</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochnevis</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallaig</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coruisk</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1A: Considers vessel deployment to meet demand projections for the next 30 years, removing the constraints in regards infrastructure suitability and suggests larger reference vessels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel(s)</th>
<th>Length OA (m)</th>
<th>Beam (m)</th>
<th>Draft (m)</th>
<th>Displacement (t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finlaggan sized vessel</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clansman sized vessel</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochnevis</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loch Bhrusda</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>