



Shetland Islands Council

Ferry Service Review Project

Specification of Options for Part 2 of the Infrastructure Ferry Service Review STAG stage 2 Appraisal

This document sets out in detail the characteristics of each option, the results of the filtering process on the rejected options and the costings and other relevant information which has guided the endorsement of successful options. The Baseline conditions and the assumed Do Minimum (with short commentary on assumptions) are first established for the appraisal, followed by information on each option which has been taken forward from the Part 1 appraisal.

A short title page has been used to define each option. This document allows for inclusion of a list of the necessary background information, relevant input studies/sources and supporting data. Each successful option, where relevant, will include the supporting financial data, statistical analysis and predictions based on the qualified data which has been used to identify whether the option will result in a positive or negative change in the services available and a reduction in the cost of providing the service.

This document is structured as follows:

1. Present Baseline Service Provision and Infrastructure Mapping
2. Do Minimum Service Provision and Infrastructure
3. Lifeline Service – statement
4. Present cost distribution of Ferry Service
5. Specification of Options, which includes option categories:
 - Operational Change 1
 - Operational Change 2
 - Service Change 1
 - Service Change 2
 - Service Change 3

1. Present Baseline Service Provision and Infrastructure Mapping

<p>Routes & Vessels</p>	<p>1. Bluemull Sound: Two Roll on Roll off (Ro-Ro) vessels – MV Bigga & MV Geira Passenger Capacity: 50 – 96 dependant on route and season Vehicle Capacity: Up to 16 PCU equivalents Bigga, and 12 PCU equivalents Geira</p> <p>2. Yell Sound: Two Ro-Ro vessels – MV Daggri & MV Dagalien Passenger Capacity: 144 (6 crew) Vehicle Capacity: Up to 32 PCU equivalents each vessel</p> <p>3. Skerries: One vessel – MV Filla Passenger Capacity: 29 (5 crew) Vehicle Capacity: Up to 9 PCU equivalents Cargo Capacity: 120 tonnes cargo in addition to PCU's.</p> <p>4. Whalsay: Two Ro-Ro vessels – MV Hendra & MV Linga. Passenger Capacity: 95 Linga, Hendra 50-95 Vehicle Capacity: Up to 14 PCU equivalents Hendra, 16 PCU equivalents Linga</p> <p>5. Papa Stour: One vessel - MV Snolda (24.4m long, 150t deadweight, max draft 3.36m). Passenger Capacity: 12 Vehicle Capacity: Up to 6 PCU equivalents Cargo Capacity: 40 tonnes cargo in addition to PCU's</p> <p>6. Bressay: One Ro-Ro vessel – MV Leirna. Passenger Capacity: 124 summer, 113 winter (5 crew) Vehicle Capacity: Up to 20 PCU equivalents.</p> <p>7. Foula: One vessel – MV New Advance (9.8m long, 21t deadweight, max draft 1.72m). Passenger Capacity: 12 Cargo Capacity: 9 tonnes cargo or 1 small vehicle</p> <p>8. Fair Isle: One vessel - MV Good Shepherd IV (18.3m long, 54t deadweight, max draft 2.63). Passenger Capacity: 12 Vehicle Capacity: 1-2 vehicles dependant on size Cargo Capacity: 55 tonnes cargo</p> <p>9. Relief Vessels MV Fivla: Ro-Ro vessel. Passenger Capacity: 50-95 dependant on season Vehicle Capacity: 12 PCU equivalents MV Thora Ro-Ro vessel. Passenger Capacity: 50-93 dependant upon season/route Vehicle Capacity: nominally 10 PCU's equivalents</p>
------------------------------------	---

<p>Vessel manning</p>	<p>1. Bluemull Sound: MV Bigga: 4 Crew consisting of; 1 master, 1 mate, 1 engineer & 1 Deckhands (2 if passengers more that 46) MV Geira: 4 Crew consisting of; 1 master, 1 mate, 1 engineer & 1 Deckhands (2 if passengers more that 46)</p> <p>2. Yell Sound: MV Daggri: 5 Crew consisting of; 1 master, 1 mate, 1 engineer & 2 Deckhands (3 deckhands if passenger numbers more than 95) MV Dagalien: 5 Crew consisting of; 1 master, 1 mate, 1 engineer & 2 Deckhands (3 deckhands if passenger numbers more than 95)</p> <p>3. Skerries: MV Filla: 5 Crew consisting of; 1 master, 1 mate, 1 engineer & 2 Deckhands</p> <p>4. Whalsay: MV Hendra: 5 Crew consisting of; 1 master, 1 mate, 1 engineer & 2 Deckhands MV Linga: 5 Crew consisting of; 1 master, 1 mate, 1 engineer & 2 Deckhands</p> <p>5. Papa Stour: MV Snolda: 4 Crew consisting of; 1 master, 1 mate, 1 engineer & 1 Deckhand MV Thora: 4 Crew consisting of; 1 master, 1 mate, 1 engineer & 1 Deckhands</p> <p>6. Bressay: MV Leirna: 5 Crew consisting of; 1 master, 1 mate, 1 engineer & 2 Deckhands, can be reduced to 4 crew (1 deckhand) if conditions allow, passenger numbers then restricted to 50</p> <p>7. Foula: MV New Advance: Contracted out</p> <p>8. Fair Isle: MV Good Shepherd IV: 4 Crew consisting of; 1 Skipper, 1 mate, 1 Workboat Rating & 1 Workboat Deckhand</p> <p>9. Relief Vessels MV Fivla: Depends on service, minimum 4 (Master, Mate, Engineer, 1 Deckhand) MV Thora: Depends on service, minimum 4 (Master, Mate, Engineer, 1 Deckhand)</p>
----------------------------------	--

<p>Overnight Berthing & Departure Port</p>	<p>1. Bluemull Sound: Bigga berths Gutcher overnight attached to linkspan. Geira berths Hamarsness in Fetlar or Cullivoe in Yell dependant on weather forecast</p> <p>2. Yell Sound: Both vessels berthed overnight at Ulsta 1 on linkspan the other at lay-by berth. Service is provided 24 hours/day; however, late evening runs are restricted and operate on a bookings only basis.</p> <p>3. Skerries: Vessel berthed at Symbister on Whalsay where crews report for duty. Service operated by SIC using one ferry working primarily between Skerries and Vidlin except on Tuesday and Thursday when service is between Skerries and Lerwick. Service does not operate on Wednesday.</p> <p>4. Whalsay: Both vessels berthed overnight at Symbister M/V Linga on linkspan and M/V Hendra at lay-by berth</p> <p>5. Papa Stour: Vessel berthed overnight at West Burrafirth where Crew reports for duty. Service operated by SIC using one ferry working between West Burrafirth and Papa Stour. Present service vessel is limited to carrying 12 passengers year round. The M/V Thora if available can be deployed during June and July (max 93 passengers)..</p> <p>6. Bressay: Vessel berthed overnight at Bressay, the evening crew provide a standby duty and therefore must remain on the island overnight the crews report for duty at the Bressay terminal.</p> <p>7. Foula: Crewed by staff based on Foula (at least when on duty). Service operated by BK Marine Ltd using one ferry based at Foula, working primarily between Foula and Walls.</p> <p>8. Fair Isle: Existing crewing is wholly from staff living on Fair Isle. Service operated by SIC using one ferry based at Fair Isle, working primarily between Fair Isle and Grutness.</p> <p>9. Relief Vessels: MV Fivla relief vessel for planned or breakdown maintenance and principal relief vessel for dry docking arrangements. If vessel is out of service she is usually berthed at Sellaness. MV Thora relief vessel for planned or breakdown maintenance and a back up to the M/V Fivla as relief vessel for dry docking arrangements. If vessel is not in service she is usually berthed at Sellaness except when based at West Burrafirth for summer period</p>
---	---

<p>Timetables</p>	<p>1. Bluemull Sound: Two vessels provide up to a 17 hours 365 day service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combined ferry sailings commence at 06:20 (Gutcher) Monday – Sunday and end at 22:35 Monday to Saturday (22:30, Sunday) • On Mondays there are 23 return sailings between Gutcher and Belmont and 7 return sailings to Fetlar • Tuesday to Saturday there are 29 return sailings between Gutcher and Belmont and 10 return sailings to Fetlar • on Sundays there are 17 return sailings between Gutcher and Belmont and 5 return sailings to Fetlar • The day vessel operates 12:30 (Hamarsness) to 17:25 (Hamarsness) Mondays, 08:20 to 17:25 Tuesday - Saturday • In winter Sunday morning services operate on a bookings only basis • The Council provide the Fetlar and Unst communities with a community hire allocation which is generally equivalent to about 8 hires each island (2011). These are delivered as and when required through non contractual overtime. <p>2. Yell Sound: Two vessels provided a 24 hours 365 day service:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Day vessel operates a timetable providing 9 return sailings Monday to Saturday from 07.45 (Ulista) to 17.20 (Toft) • Shift vessel operates a timetable providing 15 scheduled daily sailings from 06.15 (Ulista) to 22.00 (Toft), 2 (from 3) late evening bookings only sailings and 1 early morning bookings only sailing. • Sunday service is provided by a single vessel operating the Shift vessel timetable. This facilitates the requirement to withdraw each vessel from service for a period of weekly maintenance. • During the Festive period at Christmas and New Year the service is also reduced to a single vessel. • The shift vessel is crewed overnight and crew are therefore available to provide a response to Bluelight emergencies. • Crew retained overnight also carry out routine maintenance, planned maintenance and fabric maintenance on both vessels. • The service does not provide a ‘community hire’ service. However, a portion of the ‘community hire’ budget is allocated to the service to part fund the overnight service. <p>3. Skerries: One vessel provides a service on 6 days each week 52 week year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monday 1 return service from Vidlin to Skerries • Tuesday & Thursday 1 return service Skerries to Lerwick • Friday & Saturday 3 return sailings Skerries to Vidlin • Sunday 3 return sailings Skerries to Vidlin and 1 sailing Skerries to Symbister • The vessel is not crewed overnight and there is no obligation to provide any emergency cover
--------------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council provide the Skerries community with a community hire allocation which is generally equivalent to about 6 hires (2011). These are delivered as and when required through non contractual overtime. • With the exception of the Skerries to Lerwick sailings all other sailings are bookings only. <p>4. Whalsay: Two vessels provide up to a 16.5 hours 365 day service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The timetable provides for 18 return sailings from 06:30 (Symbister) to 23:10 (Laxo) Monday to Saturday and 14 return sailings from 06:30 (Symbister) to 22:35 (Laxo) on Sunday • The day boat operates 07:00 to 17:50 Monday to Saturday and 10:30 to 17:50 on Sunday • The vessel is not crewed overnight and there is no obligation to provide any emergency cover • The Council provide the Whalsay community with a community hire allocation which is generally equivalent to about 8 hires (2011). These are delivered as and when required through non contractual overtime. <p>5. Papa Stour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided with 8 return sailings per week (4 of these only operate if booked by the previous day). • The Council provide the Papa Stour community with a community hire allocation which is generally equivalent to about 4 hires (2011). These are delivered as and when required through non contractual overtime. <p>6. Bressay: One vessel provides a 16 hour service Sunday to Thursday and a 18 hour service Friday and Saturday:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The timetable provides up to 24 daily return sailings Monday to Sunday from 07:00 (Bressay) to 23:00/01:00 (Lerwick) • When vehicular traffic exceeds the deck capacity the service provides additional sailings. • Sunday timetable is reduced to allow the crew additional time to perform weekly maintenance. • During the Public holidays at Christmas and New Year the vessel operates a reduced service. • The vessel is not crewed overnight. However, crew are retained on standby and are therefore available to provide a response to Bluelight emergency call out. • The Council presently provide the Bressay community a community hire allocation which is generally equivalent to about 8 hires (2011). These are delivered by crew through non contractual overtime. <p>7. Foula:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One island based vessel provides 3 return sailings per week
--	--

	<p>in summer (with a fortnightly sailing to Scalloway instead of Walls) and 2 return sailings per week in winter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council provide the Foula community with a community hire pot which is generally equivalent to about 4 hires (2011). These are delivered as and when required through non contractual overtime. <p>8. Fair Isle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One island based vessel provides 3 return sailings per week in summer (with a fortnightly sailing to Lerwick instead of Grutness) and 1 return sailing per week in winter The Council provide the Fair Isle community with a community hire pot which is generally equivalent to about 4 hires (2011). These are delivered as and when required through non contractual overtime.
<p>Terminals & Piers</p>	<p>1. Bluemull Sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gutcher: Single linkspan with the berthing face of timber pile construction, braced to the shore. This terminal has retained the original (1970s) length and provides the ability to berth overnight, however the second generation vessel overhang the berthing face. No lift on, lift off facilities. Four lanes for queuing vehicles provide adequate waiting capacity on for most days. A waiting room with adjacent toilets is available. Belmont: Single linkspan with the berthing face being timber pile construction, braced to the shore. No lift-on lift-off facilities. Lanes for queuing vehicles adequate for light loads but can easily be over-full when loads are high. A waiting room with adjacent toilets is available. Hammars Ness: Single linkspan constructed in 2003 to provide access for Daggri / Dagalien class vessels. Construction of an improved breakwater is to provide additional shelter and permit safer overnight berthing is underway. Berth jetty is of a suspended pier concrete construction which will allow lift-on lift-off facilities if required, however the fendering system makes make this unadvisable for use as a regular feature. There is adequate vehicle waiting lanes for most eventualities. A waiting room with adjacent toilets is available, however, no fresh water is available and the toilets and hand wash facilities have sea water only. <p>2. Yell Sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ulsta: Single linkspan constructed in 2003 to provide access for Daggri / Dagalien class vessels. Berth jetty is of

	<p>a suspended pier concrete construction which will allow lift-on lift-off facilities if required, however the fendering system makes make this unadvisable for use as a regular feature. . Fresh water is available. Additional moorings points provided to allow day vessel to lay-by on NE face of the berth jetty. Vehicle marshalling lanes are constrained in area which although adequate is complex to unfamiliar users. A toilet block is available, however, no waiting room is provided. Vehicle parking is available around the perimeter of the vehicle marshalling area. The Ulsta Booking office, which is manned Monday to Saturday through the year, is housed adjacent to the toilet block.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Toft: Single linkspan constructed in 2003 to provide access for Daggri / Dagalien class vessels. Berth jetty is of a suspended pier concrete construction which will allow lift-on lift-off facilities if required, however the fendering system makes make this unadvisable for use as a regular feature. . Fresh water is available. The original 1970 terminal, but not linkspan, remains in existence, however it is poor condition. Two waiting lanes can often be filled with booked and unbooked vehicles backing up the access road. A waiting room and toilet block with a large, unlined, parking area is available. <p>3. Skerries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out Skerries: Ferry berth not sufficiently strong to allow all weather overnight berthing. Dredging plans for the South Mouth is at the tendering stage, when dredged it will open the channel for occasional diversion in controlled conditions. Toilets and a waiting room is available, however, the waiting room facility is in need of refurbishment or replacement. • Vidlin: Ro-ro facility. Single linkspan with the berthing face being timber pile construction, braced back to the shore. No crane/freight handling or refrigeration facilities (Skerries ferry vessel has a crane and refrigerated holds). The marshalling area is adequate to meet the needs for the Skerries service. However, when Whalsay service diverted to Vidlin waiting traffic tailing back into the single track road access causing congestion problems when discharging vehicles from the two Whalsay ferries. A new waiting room and toilet block with disabled access and facilities, hot water and heating was constructed in 2002. There is limited unlined, parking available adjacent to the toilet block • Lerwick linkspan: Single linkspan alongside a fendered, suspended concrete pier. The pier is owned by Lerwick Port Authority and leased by SIC. The marshalling area is adequate for Skerries Service needs. However, the facility
--	--

	<p>is shared with the Bressay Service and marshalling is restricted by Bressay traffic and by vehicles parking in the boarding lanes. A waiting room is provided in the adjacent LPA building and there are public toilets with disabled facilities some 300m distant. There can be significant delays disembarking vehicles on to the busy Esplanade road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lerwick Hays Dock: The service vessel berths at Hays Dock while loading and discharging non ro-ro cargo and freight. This is a private facility owned by Hay & Co Buildbase who charge SIC for each tonne loaded or discharged. Additional charges are levied for the use of a forklift and vessel tonnage dues. The normal service vessel used a shipboard crane to load and discharge cargo. There are no passenger facilities. <p><i>The Skerries service vessel pays port dues and pilotage dues (2 per visit) to the LPA each time it uses the harbour. There are additional annual fees applied to SIC for all Masters and Mates required to hold Pilots Exemption Certificates. Charges are also levied by LPA if linesmen are required when fuel bunkering, for the use of a harbour tug and for the supply of fresh water.</i></p> <p>4. Whalsay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Symbister: Single linkspan with a fendered berthing face on a concrete suspended pier. The pier is of adequate strength to allow overnight berthing of Linga. The opposite side is used as lay-by berth for M/ Hendra at the outer end and small fishing vessels at the inner end. A waiting room and toilets are provided, however, they are at some distance from the linkspan and accessed up a steep slope not easily accessed by disabled. Vehicle waiting lanes were designed for the volume of traffic in the 1980's and are now very restrictive. There is no car parking facility. • Laxo: Single linkspan with the berthing face being timber pile construction, braced to the shore. No lift-on lift-off facilities. Lanes for queuing vehicles adequate for most loads. But can back up some considerable distance at peak times. A waiting room with toilet block and a lined parking area is available. • Vidlin: This port acts a secondary or diversionary port for the Whalsay Service. Single linkspan with the berthing face being timber pile construction, braced back to the shore. The marshalling area is insufficient for the Whalsay service when diverted to Vidlin with waiting traffic tailing back into the single track road access causing congestion problems
--	--

	<p>when discharging vehicles. A new waiting room and toilet block with disabled access and facilities, hot water and heating was constructed in 2002. There is limited unlined, parking available adjacent to the toilet block</p> <p>5. Papa Stour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papa Stour: A berthing facility with a recycled linkspan was constructed in 2005. This provides a ro-ro facility capable of accommodating vessels up to 35m long. A waiting room with disabled toilet facility is available. • West Burrafirth: A berthing facility with a recycled linkspan was constructed in 2005. This provides a ro-ro facility capable of accommodating vessels up to 30m long. A waiting room facility is available, complete with toilets and shower. There is lockable cargo storage space and a fork lift is garaged at the terminal to assist cargo handling. <p>6. Bressay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leiranness: Single linkspan with a fendered berthing face of timber pile construction, braced to the shore. The terminal was lengthened and upgraded in 1995 to accommodate the present service vessel. Additionally the breakwater has been heightened and extended to provide additional shelter while berthing and for overnight berthing. No lift-on lift-off facilities. Vehicle marshalling lanes are adequate for most crossings but can back up a considerable distance on the main commuter runs. There is a bus shelter, toilet block and bicycle shelter with an adjacent lined car parking area, however, this is located some distance from the linkspan terminal. • Lerwick. Single linkspan alongside a fendered, suspended concrete pier. The pier is owned by Lerwick Port Authority and leased by SIC. The marshalling area is limited in size and the lack of space is exacerbated by vehicles parking in the boarding lanes. A waiting room is provided in the adjacent LPA building, this is locked outwith service hours. There are public toilets with disabled facilities some 300m distant. There can be significant delays disembarking vehicles on to the busy Esplanade road. <p>7. Foula:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ham Voe: No ro-ro facilities. Constrained by vessel size with maximum practical limit of 25m. Ferry currently berthed by lifting the service vessel out of the water at Ham. Vehicles and plant can be offloaded from a suitably sized vessel but is dependant on weather and tidal conditions.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walls: A new pier and terminal is presently under construction, there is no provision for ro-ro facilities. Present berthing is to a fendered face on a suspended concrete pier. There is a shore crane to facilitate cargo handling and a secure store with adjacent toilet facilities is provided on the pier. • Scalloway: Use of Council owned and operated facility. No ro-ro facility. All port amenities are available and there are public toilets some distance away. There is no waiting room. <p>8. Fair Isle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Haven, Fair Isle: Limited room and the max practical vessel size is 40m length. No ro-ro facility. Some issues with subsidence of pier surface and poor standard of waiting room/toilets. • Grutness: No ro-ro facilities. Pier structure requires stabilisation. Berthing face requires lengthening and deepening. New waiting room and toilets required. • Lerwick: Berthing at Hays Dock which is owned by Hay & Co Buildbase, presently no charges are levied. No pilotage dues are paid to LPA, however, the vessel is charged Port Dues each visit. There are charges levied by LPA for use of linesmen, use of Harbour tug, fuel bunkering and charges the supply of fresh water. There are no passenger facilities and passengers are generally embarked at Victoria Pier in the town centre. <p>9. Sellaness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concrete suspended piers under the management of Ports and Harbours Operations. The port is manned 24 hours a day. Berths allocated to ferries for long-term lay-by have shore power and are adequately sheltered. If two vessels off service at same time space is limited – usually requiring vessel to double-bank. Fresh water is available.
--	---

Other Inter Island Transport provided by or through Shetland Islands Council

Aircraft	Foula, Fair Isle, Papa Stour and Skerries are currently serviced by a fleet of 2 PBN <i>Islander</i> aircraft based at Tingwall. The <i>Islander</i> is a single pilot twin propeller aircraft with capacity for 6 passengers. It has a take off weight of 2994 kg.
Service provision – air service	<p>All services are provided by SIC and operated under contract by Directflight Ltd under a Public Service Obligation arrangement. Air service primarily provided from Tingwall air strip on the Shetland mainland (except Summer service from Sumburgh to Fair Isle).</p> <p>Some constraints on operations at Tingwall (and each of the island airstrips) in the form of the limited navigational aids and the incidence of snow which even when cleared can create disruption due to European regulations on take-off performance.</p>
Timetable – air service	<p>Fair Isle: In summer, two return flights on 4 days a week (Monday, Wednesday, Friday & Saturday with flights on Saturday to Sumburgh & Tingwall). In winter, two return flights on 3 days a week (Monday, Wednesday & Friday).</p> <p>Foula: In summer, one return flight on 2 days a week (Monday & Tuesday) and two return flights on 2 days a week (Wednesday & Friday). In winter, one return flight on 3 days a week (Monday, Tuesday & Wednesday) and two return flights on 1 day a week (Friday).</p> <p>Papa Stour: In summer & winter, two return flights on one day per week (Tuesday).</p> <p>Skerries: In summer & winter, one return flight on 2 days a week (Monday & Wednesday) and two return flights on 1 day a week (Thursday).</p>
Infrastructure - airstrips	<p>Fair Isle: Managed by National Trust Scotland, CAA licence.</p> <p>Foula: Operated as a charity, no CAA licence.</p> <p>Papa Stour: Owned by SIC, no CAA licence.</p> <p>Skerries: Owned by SIC, no CAA licence. Short runway requires a headwind of c10 knots to allow safe landing.</p> <p>Flights in darkness hours are not possible due to limited facilities at each airstrip.</p>
Regulation & Franchising	Unlicensed air strips at Foula, Papa Stour & Out Skerries

User Costs	Qualitative evidence from consultations indicates that the cost of freight transport by bus is considered reasonable but by other means (e.g. private haulage) is expensive. Ferry and air service travel for passengers is currently subsidised (by SIC) but community consultation indicates that users generally consider fares to be expensive (particularly for Foula and Fair Isle).
-------------------	--

3. Lifeline Service – Definition

Definition of ‘Lifeline’ Ferry Service

A ferry service may be defined as ‘lifeline’ in circumstances where there is no realistic alternative method of transporting, people, vehicles and goods to or from an Island. Lifeline services aim to support economic activity across the islands and to allow island populations access to basic services, such as health care, education and employment opportunities. And where removal or reduction would;

- restrict or deny inhabitants access to medical facilities
- restrict or deny inhabitants access to educational opportunities
- deny inhabitants access to employment or economic opportunities
- damage the viability of island based businesses
- deny inhabitants access to social and leisure opportunities

The following section defines what the Shetland Islands Council will do taking into account the statement above and the Council’s economic circumstances

4. Present cost distribution of Ferry Service

Vessel/Route	Population served	Ferry Service cost (2012/13)

Bluemull Sound	Unst & Fetlar	£2,487,617
Yell Sound	Yell	£3,760,569
Yell Sound	Yell, Unst & Fetlar	£3,760,569
Yell Sound & Bluemull Sound	Yell, Unst & Fetlar	£6,248,186
Skerries	Skerries	£1,491,142
Whalsay	Whalsay	£2,788,021
Bressay	Bressay	£1,359,161
Papa Stour	Papa Stour	£595,528
Fair Isle	Fair Isle	£460,286

5. Options for Appraisal Sections

Section 1 – Bluemull Sound Services

Options 1.1 – 1.4

Section 2 – Yell Sound Service

Options 2.1 – 2.4

Section 3 – Skerries Service

Options 3.1 – 3.8

Section 4 – Whalsay Service

Options 4.1 – 4.3

Section 5 – Papa Stour Service

Options 5.1 – 5.3

Section 6 – Bressay Service

Options 6.1 – 6.3

Section 7 – Foula Service

Options 7.1 – 7.2

Section 8 – Fair Isle Service

Options 8.1 – 8.5

Section 9 – Fares Collection and Revenue

Options 9.1 – 9.6

Section 10 – Booking Service

Options 10.1 – 10.2

Section 11 – Engineering Support

Options 11.1 – 11.4

Section 12 – Management Structure

Options 12.1

Section 13 – Administration Support

Options 13.1

Section 14 – All vessels/routes

Options 14.1 – 14.23

Definitions of terms used in the following options:

Operational Change 1, this means a change that can be accomplished by the council without adversely affecting or impacting on:

- The numbers staff employed in established posts
- The custom and practice of staff in established posts
- The terms and conditions of staff in established posts
- Existing Policy & Procedures
- Equality

- The present level of service to the Communities and Stakeholders
- The environment

Operational Change 2, this means a change that can be accomplished by the council without adversely affecting or impacting on:

- Equality
- The present level of service to the Communities and Stakeholders
- The environment

But may impact on:

- The number of established posts
- The custom and practice of staff in established posts
- The terms and conditions of staff in established posts
- Existing Policy & Procedures

Any changes at this level will require consultation with, a) the staff involved, b) their unions, c) other Council agencies

Service Change 1, this means a change that can be accomplished by the council that might inconvenience regular users, is not expected to detract from overall service provision but might increase the cost to irregular or seasonal users. However, it should not:

- Increase the cost to regular commuters
- Reduce the number or frequency of timetabled crossings
- Inconvenience island residents and other stakeholders

Any changes at this level will require the council to consult with Community Councils and may require consultation with staff, their unions and other Council agencies.

Service Change 2, this means a change that would be expected to reduce commuter choice and opportunity and would be expected to increase the cost to users, but will not:

- Withdraw service provision
- Remove key timetabled service runs
- Restrict commuter opportunity to travel

Any changes will require consultation with, a) Communities and Stakeholders, b) staff and their unions, c) emergency services, d) other council agencies.

Service Change 3, this means a change that might remove user choice, significantly increase cost to travel, withdraw some or all of the present service provision, these changes might:

- Threaten island community sustainability
- Threaten continued viability of service provision

Changes of these magnitudes may require consultation with the Scottish Executive in addition to consultants for Service Change 2 above.

Section 1 – Bluemull Sound Services

Option No: 1.1 Delete 2 posts		Effective period:
Brief description: Remove cost centre from 2 vacant posts on M/V Bigga		Type: Operational Change 1
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 2.1
Assessment Required:	None	
Consultation Required:	None	
Origin:		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Service Review <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This means the permanent deletion of 2 posts that had been retained to support the reintroduction of fares on the Bluemull Sound service Consideration of impact of reintroduction of fares on Bluemull Sound <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manning review Project savings analysis 	
Impact on capacity:	None
Impact on frequency:	None
Impact on journey duration:	None
Impact on user cost:	None
Impact on cost to Council:	Ongoing additional annual saving of: c £8k Attached details of Project savings analysis
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	Reintroduction of fares – option 1.3. May impact on staff ability to collect fares
<p>At their meeting of 9 Feb Council approved implementation of this Option and budgets for the period 2012/13, and subsequent years have been permanently reduced by £74,025</p> <p>Because of the Council decision this Option can now be removed from further consideration. However, the difference between the proposed savings and the savings estimate will now form part of the Review Project saving for 2012/13</p>	

Option No: 1.2 Delete 1 post on M/V Bigga		Effective period:	
Brief description: Reduce the crew compliment of M/V Bigga from 15 to 14		Type: Operational Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 2.2	
Assessment Required:	None		
Consultation Required:	Sea staff union(s)	Support Services	Individuals when Identified
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Service review <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation with staff and union Notice period to individual <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change of manning arrangements on Yell Sound Redundancy, Early Retirement and Redeployment Policies <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manning review Project savings analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	None		
Impact on frequency:	None		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Ongoing annual saving of: c £40k Attached details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	Yes Reintroduction of fares – 1.3 Extend fare collection to pensioners – 9.4 Staff interchangeability arrangements – 14.21 Manage Sea Staff Leave – 14.3		
<p>At their meeting of 9 Feb Council agreed that this Option should form part of the efficiency savings. However, Council approved that this option should be further 'assessed' in order to be implemented. The Project/Service now needs to follow Council Policies and established methodology in order to achieve implementation.</p>			

Option No: 1.3 Reintroduce fares on Bluemull Sound services		Effective period:	
Brief description: Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All fares Partial fares Vehicle Only 		Type: Service Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 3.1	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact		Social Inclusion
Consultation Required:	Community Councils	Users & Stakeholders	Sea staff union(s)
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ways to Save Operational Service Review Staff Consultation <p>Commentary/Specification: Consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unst and Fetlar CC Stakeholders Crew and union <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ticket machine availability Sufficient time to collect fares <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic impact assessment (2007) [KD] Various Council reports [Project] Aborted fares review 2007/08 [MC] Project savings analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	Yes – higher fares may discourage travel		
Impact on frequency:	None		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	Yes – service is presently exempt from fares		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No	Yes		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	Review of fare structure 9.6 Introduction of Pensioner fare 9.4		

Option No: 1.4 Delete 1 post on M/V Geira		Effective period:	
Brief description: Reduce the crew compliment of M/V Geira from 6 to 5		Type: Service Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Service Review	
Assessment Required:	None		
Consultation Required:	Sea staff union(s)	Support Services	Individuals when Identified
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service review <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation with staff and union Notice period to individual <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Geira Timetable Change of manning arrangements on Yell Sound Redundancy, Early Retirement and Redeployment Policies <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manning review Project savings analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	None		
Impact on frequency:	None		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Ongoing annual saving of: c £37k Attached details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	Yes Reintroduction of fares – 1.3 Extend fare collection to pensioners – 9.4 Staff interchangeability arrangements – 14.21 Manage Sea Staff Leave – 14.3		

Section 2 – Yell Sound Service

Option No: 2.1 Remove overnight manning		Effective period:	
Brief description: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove all overnight manning 		Type: Service Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 1.3	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	
Consultation Required:	Community Councils	Users & Stakeholders	Sea staff union(s)
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ways to Save Service Review Staff consultation <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This means that crew shut down vessel and end shift after last sailing <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriately skilled, certificated and competent staff Appropriate infrastructure Sufficient watch keeping arrangements Identify timetable options with removed manning Alternative emergency arrangements Consequences for the safety of the ships Consequences for crewing of remaining services (off island crew for example) Consequences for Bluemull timetable Consequences for maintenance and cleaning of the vessels The requirements of the Sullom Voe Harbour Bylaws Purpose of Journey <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shetland Transport Strategy (Project) Carryings data (identify sailings affected) Economic impact assessment (2007) Sullom Voe Harbour Bylaws Survey of users Spend to save vessel monitoring system Project savings analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	Yes -		
Impact on frequency:	Yes – regular overnight runs will be discontinued		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Ongoing annual saving of: c £460k Attached details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	<p>Yes</p> <p>All other Options for Yell service</p> <p>Option 14.1 – remove underused runs</p> <p>Option 14.7 – reduce crew hours and timetables</p> <p>Option 14.11 – Community runs</p> <p>Option 14.3 - Manage Sea Staff Leave</p>		

Option No: 2.2 Single Ship Operation, two Ships over morning commuter runs on Yell Sound		Effective period:	
Brief description: Includes through-night manning		Type: Service Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Staff Consultation	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	
Consultation Required:	Community Councils	Users & Stakeholders	Sea staff union(s)
Origin: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Consultation Commentary/Specification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only 2 vessels for up to 6 hours day Add essential requirements/criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify timetable options with removed manning Consequences for Bluemull timetable Purpose of Journey Existing Information or required information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shetland Transport Strategy (Project) Carryings data (identify sailings affected) Economic impact assessment (2007) Survey of users Project savings analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	TBC		
Impact on frequency:	Yes		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	Yes All other Options for Yell service Option 14.1 – remove underused runs Option 14.7 – reduce crew hours and timetables Option 14.11 – Community runs		

Option No: 2.2a Two Ships each operating 12 hour day on Yell Sound		Effective period:	
Brief description: 4 crews each working 12 hours week on week off 2 ships operated each manned 12 hours day		Type: Service Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Staff Consultation	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	
Consultation Required:	Community Councils	Users & Stakeholders	Sea staff union(s)
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Consultation <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This means that service reduces to a maximum of 18 hours And only 2 vessels for up to 6 hours day <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate infrastructure Sufficient watch keeping arrangements Identify timetable options with removed manning Alternative emergency arrangements Consequences for the safety of the ships Consequences for crewing of remaining services (off island crew for example) Consequences for Bluemull timetable Consequences for maintenance and cleaning of the vessels The requirements of the Sullom Voe Harbour Bylaws Purpose of Journey <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shetland Transport Strategy (Project) Carryings data (identify sailings affected) Economic impact assessment (2007) Survey of users Sullom Voe Harbour Bylaws Project savings analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	TBC		
Impact on frequency:	Yes – regular overnight runs will be discontinued		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No • If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	Yes All other Options for Yell service Option 14.1 – remove underused runs Option 14.7 – reduce crew hours and timetables Option 14.11 – Community runs		

Option No: 2.3 Operate Yell Service with 4 crews on a 21 day 48 hour average week cycle		Effective period:	
Brief description: 8 dayshifts @ 12 hours followed by 8 backshifts @ 6 hour followed by 5 days off		Type: Service Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Member input - Staff Consultation	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	
Consultation Required:	Community Councils	Users & Stakeholders	Sea staff union(s)
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Member input following staff comments <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This means that crew would work average of 48 hours/week Service reduces to cover 18 hours a day <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate infrastructure Sufficient watch keeping arrangements Identify timetable options with removed manning Alternative emergency arrangements Consequences for the safety of the ships Consequences for crewing of remaining services (off island crew for example) Consequences for Bluemull timetable Consequences for maintenance and cleaning of the vessels The requirements of the Sullom Voe Harbour Bylaws Purpose of Journey <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shetland Transport Strategy (Project) Carryings data (identify sailings affected) Economic impact assessment (2007) Sullom Voe Harbour Bylaws Survey of users Project savings analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	Yes – service reduced to 18 hours		
Impact on frequency:	Yes – regular overnight runs will be discontinued		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No	Yes		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	All other Options for Yell Service Option 14.1 – remove underused runs Option 14.7 – reduce crew hours and timetables Option 14.11 – Community runs		

Option No: 2.4 Single Vessel Service Yell Sound		Effective period:	
Brief description: Operate 1 vessel on Yell Sound on a peak time quick turn round timetable operation. Sell or Mothball second vessel.		Type: Service Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Members Views	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact		
Consultation Required:	Community Councils	Users & Stakeholders	Sea staff union(s)
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members views Service Review <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This means that only 1 of two vessels would remain in operation Two shifts 24 hour manning One of two vessels would be sold or laid up and not immediately available for use <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crew rest and breaks Consequences for Bluemull timetable Is there sufficient capacity at peak times on a single vessel? Cover required during Docking Period & breakdown contingency <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shetland Transport Strategy (Project) Carryings data (identify sailings affected) Economic impact assessment (2007) Users survey statistics Project savings analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	Yes – less journeys		
Impact on frequency:	Yes – overall less crossings		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Ongoing annual saving of: c £696k Attached details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No • If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	Yes All other Yell Sound Options Option 14.1 – remove underused runs Option 14.7 – reduce crew hours and timetables Option 14.11 – Community runs Option 14.3 - Manage Sea Staff Leave		

Section 3 – Skerries Service

Option No: 3.1 Base Skerries Ferry in Skerries			Effective period:	
Brief description: Base the ferry in Skerries which means operating from and crewing from the island.			Type: Service Change 2	
			Source document Ref: Workshop 3 - 1.1	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	Environmental Impact	Staff Equality
Consultation Required:	Community Councils	Users & Stakeholders	Sea staff union(s)	
<p>Origin: Ways to Save Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Views of the Skerries community perceived increase in economic and employment opportunities service improvement through removal of dead legs <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This means base the ferry in Skerries which means operating from and crewing from the island. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria: This requires consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of adequate all-weather berth Relocation/recruitment of ferry crews Sustainability of ferry crews Cover for crew Maintenance problems Timetable restructure Provision of accommodation Appropriately skilled, certificated and competent staff Appropriate infrastructure <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shetland Transport Strategy (Project) Outer Isles Stag Skerries Service Relocation Paper (CM) Response to WtoS (KD) 				
Impact on capacity:	None			
Impact on frequency:	None			
Impact on journey duration:	Yes – eliminate positioning runs			
Impact on user cost:	None			
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis			
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No	Yes			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	Base ferry on Mainland 3.2 Skerries/Lerwick runs 3.3 Base ferry in Lerwick 3.7			
<p>Based on the Option assessment below the Project Board agreed to remove this option from further consideration.</p> <p>Min reference Ferry Review Project Board 26 March 2012</p>				

Option No: 3.2 Base Skerries Ferry on Mainland			Effective period:	
Brief description: Base Skerries ferry on Mainland which means changing the base of the crews to a mainland terminal.			Type: Service Change 2	
			Source document Ref: Workshop 3 - 1.2	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	Environmental Impact	Staff Equality
Consultation Required:	Community Councils	Users & Stakeholders	Sea staff union(s)	
<p>Origin: Ways to Save Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anonymous suggestion from public <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Base Skerries ferry on Mainland which means changing the base of the crews to a mainland terminal. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate infrastructure Provision of adequate all-weather berth: Vidlin Toft Relocation/recruitment of ferry crews Sustainability of ferry crews Timetable restructure <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shetland Transport Strategy (Project) Outer Isles Stag (MC) Skerries Service Relocation Paper (CM) Whalsay Stag (MC) Whalsay Ferries and Terminal Project (MC) 				
Impact on capacity:		None		
Impact on frequency:		None		
Impact on journey duration:		Yes – eliminate some positioning runs		
Impact on user cost:		None		
Impact on cost to Council:		Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No		Yes		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 		Base ferry in Skerries 3.1 Skerries/Lerwick runs 3.3 Base ferry in Lerwick 3.7		

Based on the Option assessment below the Project Board agreed to remove this option from further consideration.

Min reference Ferry Review Project Board 26 March 2012

Option No: 3.3 Change Skerries to Lerwick sailings to alternative port		Effective period:	
Brief description: Reduce costs of delivering service by sailing to alternative port instead of Lerwick		Type: Service Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 3.7	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	Environmental Impact
Consultation Required:	Community Councils	Users & Stakeholders	Sea staff union(s)
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Review Staff Consultation <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce costs by sailing to nearer port instead of Lerwick Potential to reinforce Whalsay service <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate infrastructure. Provision of public transport Symbister, Vidlin & Toft Port costs LPA (pilotage and harbour dues) Port costs Hays (berthing, tonnage and fork truck) Pilotage exemptions Fuel costs Reduced running hours Ability for lift-on/lift-off cargo at alternative port Public transport Additional potential freight costs Timetable restructure <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shetland Transport Strategy (Project) Outer Isles Stag (MC) Carryings data Whalsay Stag (MC) Whalsay Ferries and Terminal Project (MC) Project savings analysis 			
Impact on capacity	None		
Impact on frequency:	Yes – opportunity for more runs Tue/Thu		
Impact on journey duration:	Yes – journey times will considerably shorter		
Impact on user cost:	Yes – delivery charge on goods from Lerwick		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No	No		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 			

Option No: 3.4 Remove positioning runs from Skerries service		Effective period:
Brief description: Reduce costs of delivering service by reconfiguring service or redesignate deadlegs as timetabled services.		Type: Service Change 1
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 3.8
Assessment Required:	Social Inclusion	Environmental Impact
Consultation Required:	Whalsay Community Council	Skerries Community Council
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Staff Consultation <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce costs of delivering service by reconfiguring service or redesignate positioning runs as timetabled services with savings in fuel and crew time Increase in potential to reinforce Whalsay service <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate infrastructure. Provision of public transport <p>This requires consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amending capacity constraints on Whalsay service Link span conflict Will sailings be used? Fuel costs Reduced running hours Public transport Fare structure PRM Timetable restructure <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shetland Transport Strategy (Project) Outer Isles Stag (MC) Whalsay Community Survey [MC] Carryings data (Whalsay & Skerries) Whalsay Stag (MC) Whalsay Ferries and Terminal Project (MC) Project savings analysis 		
Impact on capacity:	None	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	Re-configuration of timetable may impact of user expectation	
Impact on user cost:	None	
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No	Yes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	Re locate the operation base for M/V Filla 3.1, 3.2, 3.7 Change Lerwick/Skerries sailings 3.3	

Option No: 3.5 Re-engine M/V Filla		Effective period:
Brief description: Replace current engines on Filla with more fuel efficient engines		Type: Operational Change 1
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 6.5
Assessment Required:	Environmental Impact	
Consultation Required:	None	
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Service Review <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace current engines on Filla with more fuel efficient engines – the current engines are considered too powerful for the hull size Dependant on the availability of suitable alternative engines and the resale value of the existing engines <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lloyds and MCA approvals Appropriate Cost Benefit Analysis Impacts on existing monitoring equipment and systems. Propeller design/ efficiency <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vessel design documentation (Sella Ness) Current Engine Specs Project savings analysis 		
Impact on capacity:	None	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	Vessel speed will decrease therefore journey times will increase	
Impact on user cost:	None	
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No	Yes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	Savings envisaged are based on maintaining the status quo. However, savings will decrease if other changes at 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.7 & 3.8 are adopted and as a result alter spend to save viability	

[Collate work done in 2008 and reconsider in light of reduced resale value of present engines and availability of replacement engines – if no savings over an agreed reference period recommend withdrawing this option]

Option No: 3.6 Reduce crew on M/V Filla		Effective period:	
Brief description: Reduce each of two crews from 5 to 4		Type: Operational Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – Addendum 2	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact		
Consultation Required:	Sea staff and union(s)	Support Services	Individuals when Identified
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Service review <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explore possibility to reduce the crew complement from 5 to 4 crew on duty by reducing from 2 deckhands to 1 <p>Add essential requirements/criteria: This requires consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reconfiguration of life saving appliances (LSA) Consequential approval by MCA of reduced crew numbers Implications for handling loose cargo (timetable issues) Reposition FRC Remove FRC overhang – vessel will fit local drydock (with updated cradle) <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Passenger Safety Certificate Proposal for LSA reconfiguration Existing spend to save application Project savings analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	None		
Impact on frequency:	None		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Ongoing annual saving of: c £87k Attached details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	Yes Manage Sea Staff Leave – 14.3		

Option No: 3.7 Base Skerries Ferry in Lerwick			Effective period:	
Brief description: Base the ferry in Lerwick which means operating from and crewing from Lerwick			Type: Service Change 2	
			Source document Ref: None	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	Environmental Assessment	Staff Equality
Consultation Required:	Community Councils	Users & Stakeholders	Sea staff union(s)	
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Consultation Exercise <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Base the ferry in Lerwick which means operating from and crewing from Lerwick <p>Add essential requirements/criteria: This requires consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of adequate all-weather berth Relocation/recruitment of crew Sustainability of ferry crew Cover for crew Timetable restructure Provision of accommodation Appropriately skilled, certificated and competent staff Appropriate infrastructure <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shetland Transport Strategy (Project) Outer Isles Stag (MC) Skerries Service Relocation Paper (CM) Whalsay Stag (MC) Whalsay Ferries and Terminal Project (MC) Project savings analysis 				
Impact on capacity:		None		
Impact on frequency:		None		
Impact on journey duration:		Yes – eliminate some positioning runs		
Impact on user cost:		None		
Impact on cost to Council:		Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No		Yes		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 		Base ferry in Skerries 3.1 Base ferry on Mainland 3.2 Skerries/Lerwick runs 3.3		

Based on the Option assessment below the Project Board agreed to remove this option from further consideration.

Min reference Ferry Review Project Board 26 March 2012

Option No: 3.8 Replace M/V Filla			Effective period:	
Brief description: Sell Filla and replace with Snolda or similar sized vessel			Type: Service Change 2	
			Source document Ref: Project Board	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	Environmental Assessment	Staff Equality
Consultation Required:	Sea staff and union(s)	Support Services	Individuals when Identified	
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Consultation Exercise Project Board <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Filla was designed and built to service a trade that has never materialised. A smaller vessel will reduce operating costs A smaller vessel will be easier to man (qualifications & crew numbers) <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <p>This requires consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resale value of Filla Availability of suitable alternative vessel Availability of new build Availability of replacement for Snolda Impact on community of reduced passenger capacity Appropriately skilled, certificated and competent staff Staff consultation Community/Stakeholder consultation <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Passenger carryings Snolda upgrade study Market research (alternative vessel[s]) Project savings analysis 				
Impact on capacity:		Yes – Snolda limited to 12 pax		
Impact on frequency:		Yes – smaller vessel more weather dependant		
Impact on journey duration:		Yes – alternative vessel slower and smaller		
Impact on user cost:		None		
Impact on cost to Council:		Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No		Yes		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 		Option 5.3 – Papa Stour All other Skerries options		

Based on the Option assessment below the Project Board agreed to remove this option from further consideration.

Min reference Ferry Review Project Board 10 April 2012

Section 4 – Whalsay Service

Option No: 4.1 Create a Route Master		Effective period:
Brief description: Create a Route Master based in Whalsay		Type: Operational Change 1
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 2.4
Assessment Required:	None	
Consultation Required:	None	
Origin: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Commentary/Specification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A single person in charge of Whalsay based vessels (3) will allow more effective and efficient management of crews leading to reduced service costs. Add essential requirements/criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriately skilled, certificated and competent staff Existing Information or required information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manning review Spend to save application Overtime analysis 		
Impact on capacity:	None	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	None	
Impact on user cost:	None	
Impact on cost to Council:		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No	Yes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	If there is a mind to adopt option(s) 4.2, 12.1, 14.9, 14.18,	

At their meeting of 9 Feb Council agreed that this Option should form part of the efficiency savings. However, Council approved that this option should be further 'assessed' in order to be implemented. The Project/Service now needs to follow Council Policies and established methodology in order to achieve implementation.

Savings of £12,000 have been identified and form part of the efficiency savings for the period 2012/13, and subsequent years.

Because of the Council decision this Option can now be removed from further consideration, no further work is required

Option No: 4.2 Reduce Whalsay service to 2 x 12 hours vessels		Effective period:	
Brief description: 2 vessels operating 12 hour days		Type: Service Change 3	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 3.6	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	Environmental Impact Staff Equality
Consultation Required:	Whalsay Community Council	Community & Stakeholders	Staff and union(s)
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each of the 2 vessels would operate 12 hour days with one working a straight 12 hour shift and the second would operate a split shift pattern to give the longest achievable overall service day. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriately skilled, certificated and competent staff Effects on employment contracts and T&Cs Consultation with staff and unions Community/ stakeholder consultation Recruitment and retention issues Timetabling issues Journey purpose <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited work from cost cutting measures November 2010 Carryings Data (Short-shipped traffic data) Project savings analysis Survey of users (to be designed and carried out) 			
Impact on capacity:	Yes – may create capacity problems during social events		
Impact on frequency:	Yes – less scheduled runs during the day		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	No		

Option No: 4.3 Swap Linga and Hendra		Effective period:	
Brief description: Change of Shift/Day Vessels on Whalsay Route		Type: Service Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Staff Review Workshop	
Assessment Required:	Environmental Impact		
Consultation Required:	Whalsay Community Council	Community & Stakeholders	Staff and union(s)
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff Consultation • Service Review <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the Hendra to be Shift Vessel instead of Linga. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriately skilled, certificated and competent staff • Effects on employment contracts and T&Cs • Consultation with staff and unions • Community/ stakeholder consultation • Recruitment and retention issues • Timetabling issues • Journey purpose <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited work from cost cutting measures November 2010 • Carrying Data (Short-shipped traffic data) • Project savings analysis • Survey of users (to be designed and carried out) 			
Impact on capacity:	Yes – may create capacity problems during social events		
Impact on frequency:	None		
Impact on journey duration:	Minor – slightly slower vessel in evenings		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No	Yes		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	Reduce Whalsay service to 2 x 12 hours vessels		

Section 5 – Papa Stour Service

Option No: 5.1 Remove 1 return sailing		Effective period:	
Brief description: Remove one, unspecified, sailing per week.		Type: Service Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – Addendum 4	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	Environmental Impact
Consultation Required:	Walls and Sandness CC	Community & Stakeholders	Staff and union
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members Finance Review Workshop – suggestion from Members. Service review <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove one currently unspecified return sailing per week. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crew retention and recruitment Crew consultation and unions Community/ Stakeholder consultation Timetabling Purpose of Journeys Relationship with air service <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shetland Transport Strategy Draft Scottish Ferries Plan (applies to all service options) Carryings Data Outer Isles STAG Survey of users Project savings analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	None		
Impact on frequency:	Yes – remove return sailing		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	Yes, Review of air services		

Option No: 5.2 Combine Outer Isles service			Effective period:	
Brief description: A means of providing services to Fair Isle, Foula and Papa Stour using a single vessel			Type: Service Change 3	
			Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 3.9	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	Environmental Impact	Staff Equality
Consultation Required:	Community Council	Community & Stakeholders	Staff and union(s)	
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Ways to save (Combine Foula and Papa Stour) <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a view offered that the services to Fair Isle, Foula and Papa Stour could be provided from a base on Mainland Shetland with a single suitable vessel. Detail to be developed. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vessel Type and performance Timetabling and journey times Crewing implications (dependent on vessel type, size, base port, etc) Consultation with staff/ unions Community/ stakeholder consultation Ability to deal with weather disruptions Infrastructure requirements (particularly Foula) Relationship with Inter Island Air Service Impacts on existing Foula Ferry contract <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shetland Transport Strategy Outer Isles STAG Draft Scottish Ferries Plan Carryings data (freight) Work done considering this previously Survey of Purpose of Journey 				
Impact on capacity:		None		
Impact on frequency:		Yes – probable change to timetable		
Impact on journey duration:		Yes – may reduce or increase sailing times		
Impact on user cost:		None		
Impact on cost to Council:		Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No		Yes		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 		Externalise the Fair Isle service 8.2 Combining services 7.1 & 8.1		

The work undertaken through the “Outer Isles STAG” review covers this particular option. The Project Board agreed to defer further consideration of this option to the Outer Isles STAG process.

Min reference Ferry Review Project Board 26 March 2012

Option No: 5.3 Replace existing V/L			Effective period:	
Brief description: Alternative vessel and/or alternative service			Type: Service Change 3	
			Source document Ref: Project Board	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	Environmental Impact	Staff Equality
Consultation Required:	Community Council	Community & Stakeholders	Staff and union(s)	
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service review • Project Board <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assign Snolda to Skerries service and replace with alternative v/l • Assign Snolda to Skerries service and combine with Foula Service • Dispose of Snolda and replace with workboat <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vessel Type and performance • Timetabling and journey times • Crewing implications (dependent on vessel type, size, base port, etc) • Consultation with staff/ unions • Community/ stakeholder consultation • Ability to deal with weather disruptions • Foula and Fair Isle requirements • Relationship with Inter Island Air Service • Purpose of Journey <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shetland Transport Strategy • Outer Isles STAG • Draft Scottish Ferries Plan • Carryings data (freight) • Work done considering this previously • Project savings analysis 				
Impact on capacity:			None	
Impact on frequency:			Yes – probable change to timetable	
Impact on journey duration:			Yes – may reduce or increase sailing times	
Impact on user cost:			None	
Impact on cost to Council:			Attach details of Project savings analysis	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No			Yes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Externalise the Fair Isle service 8.2 Combining services 7.1 & 8.1 	

**Based on the Option assessment above for Option 3.8 the Project Board agreed to remove this option from further consideration.
Min reference Ferry Review Project Board 10 April 2012**

Section 6 – Bressay Service

Option No: 6.1 Reduce Leirna crew from 5 to 4		Effective period:		
Brief description: Reduce crew complement from 17 to 14		Type: Service Change 1		
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 3.2		
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact			
Consultation Required:	Support Services	Sea staff and union(s)	Individuals when identified	Bressay CC
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Service review <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It may be possible to reduce the duty crew from 5 to 4 through sailing with one less deckhand on each shift. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriately skilled, certificated and competent staff Impact on passenger numbers that can be carried Recruitment and retention Consultation with staff/ unions Community/ stakeholder consultation Implications for fare collection Requirement for routine risk assessment to comply with MCA approval Do we need a booking system to manage demand? Consideration increased risks of delays in certain conditions due to MCA requirements <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shetland Transport Strategy (Project) Bressay STAG studies Carryings data Passenger Safety Certificate Number of Sailings in excess of 50 Passengers Project savings analysis Future Developments (Bressay Local Plan) 				
Impact on capacity:		Yes – passenger carrying capacity will reduce		
Impact on frequency:		Yes – to compensate for reduced capacity additional runs will be required at peak times		
Impact on journey duration:		None		
Impact on user cost:		None		
Impact on cost to Council:		Ongoing annual saving of: c £157 k Attached details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No		Yes		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 		Introduction of pensioner fares - 9.4 Alteration in staff hours - 14.7 Manage Sea Staff Leave - 14.3		

Option No: 6.2 Replace ferry with Chain Ferry			Effective period:	
Brief description: Replace existing service with a Chain Ferry			Type Service Change 3	
			Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – Addendum 1	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	Environmental Impact	Staff Equality
Consultation Required:	Community Council	Community & Stakeholders	Staff and union(s)	
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ways to Save <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace the Leirna with a chain ferry crossing at an appropriate point in the harbour. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriately skilled, certificated and competent staff Impacts on harbour operations and the LPA's position regarding this alternative Appropriate new shore infrastructure Appropriate consents MCA approval Consultation with staff/ unions Community/ stakeholder consultation Timetabling Relief arrangements – how can the service be maintained when vessel is on refit or broken down? <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shetland Transport Strategy (Project) Bressay STAG studies MCA Categorisation of Waters [CR] Project savings analysis 				
Impact on capacity:		None		
Impact on frequency:		Yes – more frequent service		
Impact on journey duration:		Yes – shorter sea journey but generally longer road journey		
Impact on user cost:		None		
Impact on cost to Council:		Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No		No		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 				

Option No: 6.3 Decision on Fixed Link			Effective period:	
Brief description: Replace existing service with a Fixed Link			Type Service Change 3	
			Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 5.5	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	Environmental Impact	Staff Equality
Consultation Required:				
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service Review • Members suggestion <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shetland Transport Strategy (Project) • Bressay STAG studies 				
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend removal from consideration – outwith scope of review • A positive decision would still require retention of a ferry service for 5-6 years and year on year savings would still be required during this period • Project Board decision 22 Feb 2012 	
Impact on capacity:	Yes			
Impact on frequency:	Yes			
Impact on journey duration:	Yes			
Impact on user cost:	Yes			
Impact on cost to Council:	Yes			
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	Yes			

Rejection at stage 2 having considered that decision is outwith the remit of the Project and that savings will still have to be achieved even if a positive decision is made

Section 7 – Foula Service

Option No: 7.1 Combine Outer Isles service			Effective period:	
Brief description: See Option 5.2			Type: Service Change 3	
			Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 3.9	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	Environmental Impact	Staff Equality
Consultation Required:	Community Council	Community & Stakeholders	Staff and union(s)	
Origin: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Ways to save (Combine Foula and Papa Stour) Commentary/Specification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a view offered that the services to Fair Isle, Foula and Papa Stour could be provided from a base on Mainland Shetland with a single suitable vessel. Detail to be developed. Add essential requirements/criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vessel Type and performance Timetabling and journey times Crewing implications (dependent on vessel type, size, base port, etc) Consultation with staff/ unions Community/ stakeholder consultation Ability to deal with weather disruptions Infrastructure requirements (particularly Foula) Relationship with Inter Island Air Service Impacts on existing Foula Ferry contract Existing Information or required information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shetland Transport Strategy Outer Isles STAG Draft Scottish Ferries Plan Work done considering this previously 				
Impact on capacity:		None		
Impact on frequency:		Yes – probable change to timetable		
Impact on journey duration:		Yes – may reduce or increase sailing times		
Impact on user cost:		None		
Impact on cost to Council:		Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No		Yes		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 		Externalise the Fair Isle service 8.2 Combining services 5.2 & 8.1		

The work undertaken through the “Outer Isles STAG” review covers this particular option. The Project Board agreed to defer further consideration of this option to the Outer Isles STAG process.
Min reference Ferry Review Project Board 26 March 2012

Option No: 7.2 Discontinue Summer Sailings to Scalloway		Effective period:
Brief description: Replace fortnightly Summer sailings to Scalloway with sailings to Walls		Type: Service Change 1
		Source document Ref:
Assessment Required:	None	
Consultation Required:	Community & Stakeholders	Staff and union
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service review <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discontinue Scalloway sailings • Replace with Walls • Shorten operating day – reduce hours • Synergies with Skerries sailings to Lerwick <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Onward travel expectations of Scalloway passengers • Volume of freight carried <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passenger carryings • Project savings analysis 		
Impact on capacity:	None	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	None	
Impact on user cost:	There may be an additional cost in transporting freight or loose cargo to Walls	
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No	Yes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	Combining outer isles 5.2, 7.1 & 7.2	

Section 8 – Fair Isle Service

Option No: 8.1 Combine Outer Isles services			Effective period:	
Brief description: See Option 5.2			Type: Service Change 3	
			Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 3.9	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	Environmental Impact	Staff Equality
Consultation Required:	Community Council	Community & Stakeholders	Staff and union(s)	
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Ways to save (Combine Foula and Papa Stour) <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a view offered that the services to Fair Isle, Foula and Papa Stour could be provided from a base on Mainland Shetland with a single suitable vessel. Detail to be developed. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vessel Type and performance Timetabling and journey times Crewing implications (dependent on vessel type, size, base port, etc) Consultation with staff/ unions Community/ stakeholder consultation Ability to deal with weather disruptions Infrastructure requirements (particularly Foula) Relationship with Inter Island Air Service Impacts on existing Foula Ferry contract <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shetland Transport Strategy Outer Isles STAG Draft Scottish Ferries Plan Work done considering this previously 				
Impact on capacity:		None		
Impact on frequency:		Yes – probable change to timetable		
Impact on journey duration:		Yes – may reduce or increase sailing times		
Impact on user cost:		None		
Impact on cost to Council:		Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No		Yes		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 		Combining services 5.2 & 7.1		

The work undertaken through the “Outer Isles STAG” review covers this particular option. The Project Board agreed to defer further consideration of this option to the Outer Isles STAG process.

Min reference Ferry Review Project Board 26 March 2012

Option No: 8.2 Externalise service to Fair Isle		Effective period:	
Brief description: See Options 5.2 & 7.1		Type: Service Change 3	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – Addendum 5	
Assessment Required:	Staff Equality		
Consultation Required:	Dunrossness CC	Community & Stakeholders	Staff and union(s)
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ways to Save <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopt the same model as the Foula Ferry Service i.e. tender the service to a private operator. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation with staff/ unions Community/ stakeholder consultation Service specification Experience from Foula Ferry Tendering process Relevant procurement legislation and Council policies Relationship with Foula contract <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Foula Ferry Contract Comparison of costs carried out on Foula service Draft Scottish Ferries Plan Project savings analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	None		
Impact on frequency:	None		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
<p>Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	<p>Yes</p> <p>Combining outer isles 5.2, 7.1 & 7.2</p>		

Option No: 8.3 Replace Good Shepherd		Effective period:
Brief description: Replace the present vessel with a purpose built vessel.		Type: Service Change 3
		Source document Ref: Staff Consultation
Assessment Required:	None	
Consultation Required:	Community & Stakeholders	External Agencies
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service review - Staff consultation <p>Commentary/Specification: Replace MV Good Shepherd with a new purpose built vessel which would allow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> During planning, construction and commissioning spend less on upkeep of present vessel Fit within "Workboat" criteria Design vessel to be operated by 3 crew only Design vessel to provide overnight accommodation for 3 crew Design and equip vessel to shorten passage times <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Availability of funds – Capital Programme Service specification Relevant procurement legislation and Council policies Vessel replacement programme <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Scottish Ferries Plan Project savings analysis 		
Impact on capacity:	None	
Impact on frequency:	Yes – new vessel faster in fair weather	
Impact on journey duration:	Yes – take advantage of weather windows	
Impact on user cost:	None	
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No	Yes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	Combining outer isles 5.2, 7.1 & 7.2	

[Seek external funding including assistance from the National Trust for Scotland]

[This option would be best considered as part of the Outer Isles STAG study presently nearing completion. Report to Project Board to consider deferring this option to that study]

Option No: 8.4 Negotiate subsidy from National Trust for Scotland		Effective period:
Brief description:		Type: Operational Change 1
		Source document Ref: Staff Consultation
Assessment Required:	None	
Consultation Required:	Community & Stakeholders	External Agencies
Origin: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service review - Staff consultation Commentary/Specification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add essential requirements/criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant legislation and Council policies Existing Information or required information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Scottish Ferries Plan Project savings analysis 		
Impact on capacity:	None	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	None	
Impact on user cost:	None	
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No	Yes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	Combining outer isles 5.2, 7.1 & 7.2	

[In addition to suggestion to ask NTS to contribute to the cost of a replacing present vessel]

Option No: 8.5 Discontinue Summer Sailings to Lerwick		Effective period:
Brief description: Replace fortnightly Summer sailings to Lerwick with sailings to Grutness		Type: Service Change 1
		Source document Ref:
Assessment Required:	None	
Consultation Required:	Community & Stakeholders	Staff and union
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service review <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discontinue Lerwick sailings Replace with Grutness Shorten operating day – reduce hours Synergies with Skerries sailings to Lerwick <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Onward travel expectations of Lerwick passengers Volume of freight carried Income from Lerwick – Fair Isle freight Costs to LPA and Hay & Co Buildbase <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Passenger carryings Project savings analysis 		
Impact on capacity:	None	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	Shorter crossing, passengers will need to find onward transport if not going to airport	
Impact on user cost:	There will be an additional cost in transporting freight or loose cargo to Grutness	
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No	Yes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	Combining outer isles 5.2, 7.1 & 7.2	

Section 9 – Fares Collection and Revenue

Option No: 9.1 Increase Income through advertising			Effective period:	
Brief description: Sell advertising space through various media			Type: Operational Change 1	
			Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 2.5	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	Environmental Impact	Staff Equality
Consultation Required:	Support Services			
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational <p>Commentary/Specification: There is an opportunity to sell advertising space by various means e.g.:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On board vessels and on side of ferries Variable message signs at terminals Advertising boards at terminals SMS messaging Emails Websites Back of tickets <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance with various safety and operational considerations Legal and moral issues around advertising (what are the Council views on what is appropriate?) Robust terms and conditions Market demand? Procurement <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service Business Plan 				
Impact on capacity:		None		
Impact on frequency:		None		
Impact on journey duration:		None		
Impact on user cost:		None		
Impact on cost to Council:		Detailed Business Plan showing sustainable revenue increase needs to be attached here		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No		No		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 				

At their meeting of 9 Feb Council approved implementation of this Option and income budgets for the period 2012/13, and subsequent years have been permanently increased by £10,000. Consequently no further consideration or Project input is required.

Option No: 9.2 Ticket Machine maintenance	Effective period:
Brief description: Replace the current ticket machines from alternative supplier with more beneficial maintenance arrangements	Type: Operational Change 1
	Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 2.6
Assessment Required:	None
Consultation Required:	Support Services
Origin: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Commentary/Specification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing maintenance contract is expensive and machines are inherently unreliable to maintenance costs are high. Machines are also obsolete and don't have required functionality therefore risks increase with passage of time. Market research shows there are better products available with lower maintenance costs. Add essential requirements/criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of requirements is lengthy and is contained in existing information. Compatibility with current and future fare strategies. Existing Information or required information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National and Shetland Transport Strategy sections on integrated ticketing Ticketing project PID Spend to save application Lean Project documentation Project savings analysis SMART cards study [MC] 	
Impact on capacity:	None
Impact on frequency:	None
Impact on journey duration:	None
Impact on user cost:	None
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	Yes

At their meeting of 9 Feb Council approved implementation of this Option and budgets for the period 2013/14, and subsequent years have been permanently reduced by £45,000.

Consequently no further direct consideration or Project input is required. However, consideration of options will be reviewed in Option 9.6 – review entire Fare Structure.

Option No: 9.3 Increase revenue security		Effective period:
Brief description: Able to demonstrate that all revenues due are collected and accounted for.		Type: Operational Change 1
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 3.3
Assessment Required:	None	
Consultation Required:	Support Services	
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Ways to Save <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish and evaluate appropriate systems and processes that can demonstrate that all revenue due is secured and/or collected. This could include vending machines, fares, customer accounts, advertising revenue, etc. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Processes Technological solutions Audit compliance Appropriate HR policies/ processes <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal Audit report Lean Project Electronic log book project Project saving analysis SMART cards study [MC] 		
Impact on capacity:	None	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	None	
Impact on user cost:	None	
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	No	

Option No: 9.4 Replace pensioner concessionary fares with 50% charge		Effective period:
Brief description: Introduce a pensioner fare		Type: Service Change 3
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 3.5
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion
Consultation Required:	Relevant Community Councils	Communities & Stakeholders
Origin: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operations • Senior Management Commentary/Specification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce a 50% concessionary fare for pensioners Add essential requirements/criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to pay • Ability to access essential services • Discount scheme Existing Information or required information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service usage statistics • Project saving analysis 		
Impact on capacity:	Yes – may discourage travel	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	None	
Impact on user cost:	Yes – introduce a charge	
Impact on cost to Council:	Revenue generation - Attach details of Project savings analysis	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No	Yes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	Review Fare Structure 9.6	

At their meeting of 9 Feb Council approved implementation of this Option and income budgets for the period 2012/13, and subsequent years have been permanently increased by £33,000.

However, there are conflicting issues with implementation and synergies with other options such as overall fares review, reduction in manning on Bressay, Bluemull Sound. Consequently further consideration and Project input is required.

Following the CMT decision this option is amalgamated with Option No 9.6. Project Board min ref 26 March.

Option No: 9.5 Higher fares on Public Holidays		Effective period:
Brief description: Charge those that are using the services on public holidays a premium fare		Type: Service Change 2
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 8.2
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion
Consultation Required:	Relevant Community Councils	
Origin: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Commentary/Specification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should include this option as one of the issues to be considered in the overall review fares Add essential requirements/criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires feedback from Project Board? Existing Information or required information:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option is amalgamated into option 9.6 “Review entire Fare Structure” Project Board decision 22 Feb 2012 		
Impact on capacity:	None	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	None	
Impact on user cost:	Yes – more expensive to travel	
Impact on cost to Council:		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 		

Rejection at stage 2 having considered that the option should be covered within an overall review of fares – Option 9.6 Review entire Fare Structure

Option No: 9.6 Review entire Fare Structure		Effective period:
Brief description: Explore all appropriate fare configurations to maximise revenue generation		Type: Service Change 3
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – Addendum 6
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion
Consultation Required:	Staff and union	Relevant Community Councils
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Ways to Save Finance Review Panel Staff Consultation <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are opportunities to reconfigure the fare structure to lever income from different sources. The most obvious is how we can exploit the willingness and ability of tourists (both visitors and local tourists) to pay higher fares. The fare structure also need to consider the setting for appropriate fares for different travel needs and purposes. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is it about Social and Economic priorities? Is it about revenue generation principally? Ability to collect fares – crewing levels can have a bearing Ability of ticketing infrastructure to accommodate various fare structures Community/stakeholder consultation Council policies – e.g. community planning EU Competition and State Aid legislation? Include option to vary fares on Public Holidays <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shetland Transport Strategy Fares study by Ekos Fares elasticity work by BM Consulting and Reference Economics Draft Scottish Ferries Plan Impact assessment on Bluemull Sound Fares Project savings analysis SMART cards study [MC] 		
Impact on capacity:	Yes – might discourage usage	
Impact on frequency:	Yes – might reduce capacity	
Impact on journey duration:	None	
Impact on user cost:	To be determined	
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No	Yes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, which option(s) or requirements 	Pensioner fare 9.4	

Section 10 – Booking Service

Option No: 10.1 Single Booking Office		Effective period:	
Brief description: Locate the booking services in a single location that provides booking services for all appropriate routes		Type: Service Change 1	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 1.5	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact		
Consultation Required:	Community Councils	Staff and union	Individuals
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Service review Ways to Save Staff Consultation <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a view that a single centralised booking service can adequately cover all relevant routes reducing the number of people required overall and hence costing less money. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriately skilled and competent staff Appropriate infrastructure Identify the most appropriate service location (Infrastructure or Development?) Geographical location for booking service – jobs dispersal may be relevant Consultation with staff/ unions Consultation with communities/ stakeholders Consideration to be given to whether different islands need different booking services e.g. is Fair Isle treated the same as Yell. <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shetland Transport Strategy (Project) EU Passenger Rights Legislation Project saving analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	None		
Impact on frequency:	None		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Ongoing annual saving of: c £27 k Attached details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	Yes Discontinue Booking Service 10.2		

Option No: 10.2 Discontinue Ro-Ro Booking Service		Effective period:	
Brief description: Stop providing a booking service for Ro-Ro services.		Type: Service Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – Addendum 3	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact		
Consultation Required:	Community Councils	Staff and union	Individuals
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review Project Staff consultation <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That the ferries booking service covering Yell Sound, Bluemull Sound, Whalsay, Skerries and Papa Stour is discontinued. The service to Fair Isle would need to continue due to the specific nature and requirements of the service. Alternative arrangements to confirm usage of bookings only runs needs to be developed as an alternative <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to take bookings for “bookings only” sailings Impacts on tourist information provision Impacts on management of demand Will marshalling areas require reconfiguration? Who has priority? – Set of rules required for users and the ferry crew <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shetland Transport Strategy Project savings analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	Yes – anticipate congestion on peak commuter runs on Bluemull Sound		
Impact on frequency:	None		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Ongoing annual saving of: c £103 k Attached details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	Yes Options Yell & Whalsay 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 & 4.2, especially any option including a reduction in capacity. Single centralised Booking Office 10.1		

Section 11 – Engineering Support

Option No: 11.1 Review Engineering support		Effective period:	
Brief description: This is a broad area that could cover the Engineering function in Ferry Operations and Ports and Harbours Operations – see Commentary/ Specification		Type: Operational Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 6.2c	
Assessment Required:	None		
Consultation Required:	Staff and union(s)	Executive Managers	External Agencies
Origin: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Staff Consultation Commentary/Specification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are Engineering Services in Ports and Harbours, Ferry Operations, Fleet Management, Waste to Energy, Scord Quarry, building maintenance etc which to greater or lesser degrees share common disciplines and skills. There should be opportunities to rationalise these areas to create more efficient and effective use of resources overall. Crew to carry out more onboard maintenance of their own vessels and reduce workload on engineering support staff Examine use of contracted services versus own staff. Reduce works required at dockings Add essential requirements/criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriately skilled and competent staff Appropriate infrastructure Existing Information or required information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ports for the Future Ports Project FMU review Project saving analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	None		
Impact on frequency:	None		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	To be quantified		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	Yes Maintenance levels – 11.2 Drydock contracts – 11.3		
<p>The discretion to expand this option to include examination of synergies and associated options applicable to services outwith the Ferry Service was not approved. Decision of Board 22 Feb 2012</p>			

Option No: 11.2 Review maintenance of ferries and terminals		Effective period:
Brief description: This option covers all aspects of ferry and terminal maintenance and how it is currently carried out. Procurement of parts and supplies.		Type: Operational Change 1
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 5.3
Assessment Required:	None	
Consultation Required:	Executive Managers	
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Staff consultation <p>Commentary/Specification: To consider two principal issues: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the current levels of maintenance correct (is it too high or inefficient?) Are the current processes and practice in maintaining ferries the most efficient (e.g. is out sourcing an alternative?). Look at procurement of parts (pattern parts/alternate suppliers) Look at in conjunction with other services. Roads/DLO take over terminal and jetty lighting maintenance/repairs <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriately skilled, certificated and competent staff Appropriate infrastructure Appropriate plans and processes Appropriate compliance with class and flag state Impacts on reliability; short and long term Stores, spares, procurement of – separate option? Impacts on services? <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gremista Stores Review PID Corporate/ Infrastructure Management Restructure Project saving analysis 		
Impact on capacity:	None	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	None	
Impact on user cost:	None	
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	No	

Option No: 11.3 Review Drydocking contractual arrangements	Effective period:
Brief description: Review the way in which the Council procures the services of ship yards to carry out docking of vessels.	Type: Operational Change 1
	Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – Appendix 7
Assessment Required:	None
Consultation Required:	Executive Managers
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Project review Staff Consultation <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the way in which the Council procures the services of ship yards to carry out docking of vessels. The requirement is to match the efficient procurement of docking services with the procurement regulations of the Council. Crew to carry out more onboard maintenance in order to reduce dry docking charges. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance with EU and Council procurement regs. and standing orders Adequate quality of service and skills from yards Dockings need to be carried out at times to suit service delivery and operational constraints and/ or imperatives. <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work carried out so far between Ferries and Port Engineering and Procurement Project saving analysis 	
Impact on capacity:	None
Impact on frequency:	None
Impact on journey duration:	None
Impact on user cost:	None
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	Yes Reduce time spent at docking will reduce the need to need to retain 2 relief ferries, Option 14.10

Option No: 11.4 Construct a Drydock Facility		Effective period:
Brief description: Construct Drydock for Council and External use		Type: Operational Change 1
		Source document Ref: Staff Consultation
Assessment Required:	None	
Consultation Required:	External Agencies	Support Services
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Consultation <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct Drydock for Council and External use <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance with EU and Council procurement regs. and standing orders Adequate quality of service and skills in Shetland Support from within local fishing and marine industry Support from other ferry services, i.e. Orkney Ferries <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work carried out by Development Department 		
Impact on capacity:	None	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	None	
Impact on user cost:	None	
Impact on cost to Council:	Significant capital cost	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	Yes Reduce time spent at docking will reduce the need to need to retain 2 relief ferries, Option 14.10	

Section 12 – Management Structure

Option No: 12.1 Review Management support		Effective period:	
Brief description: Is the Sella Ness management resource appropriate for the services delivered?		Type: Operational Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 6.2a	
Assessment Required:	None		
Consultation Required:	Executive Managers	Support Services	Staff and union(s)
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project review • Operational • Staff Consultation <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are possible synergies within the Sella Ness site that may be available but not yet developed. This is not limited to Ferry Operations but also includes Ports and Harbours Service. • Review the links and synergies with Ports and Harbours Operation • Encourage paperless communications as far as possible. • Electronic Timesheets • Retain training officer. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriately skilled, certificated and competent staff • Appropriate infrastructure and systems • Review of ICT policies <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ports For the Future PID • Ferry Service Management Review Study 2005 [KD] • Project saving analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	None		
Impact on frequency:	None		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	No		

Require the discretion to expand this option to include examination of synergies and associated options applicable to Ports & Harbours Operations
Decision of Board 22 Feb 2012

Section 13 – Administration Support

Option No: 13.1 Review Administration support		Effective period:	
Brief description:		Type: Operational change 2	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 6.2b	
Assessment Required:	None		
Consultation Required:	Executive Managers	Support Services	Staff and union(s)
Origin: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project review Commentary/Specification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a departmental business support review underway and it is anticipated that it will include Ferry Operations Seek direction from Project Board Add essential requirements/criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriately skilled, certificated Appropriate infrastructure Existing Information or required information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project saving analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	None		
Impact on frequency:	None		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	No		

- Recommend that this option should be excluded from consideration in this Project and instead considered as part of the Project - Infrastructure Business Support Review.**
- There are also a further two reviews already being undertaken (by Finance and Human Resources) that will examine tasks and duties presently undertaken by support staff**
- Project Board decision 22 Feb 2012**

Recommend rejection at stage 2 having considered that other wider reviews already underway will duplicate and frustrate this process

Section 14 – All vessels/Routes

Option No: 14.1 Remove late/underused runs		Effective period:	
Brief description: This option looks at taking late evening runs (after 1900hrs) and underused runs out of the timetable		Type: Service Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 1.4	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	Environmental Impact
Consultation Required:	Community Councils	Stakeholders & Communities	Staff and union(s)
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ways to Save • Project • Staff Consultation <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is recognised that ferries do not have a consistent level of usage and that there may be some sailings that are consistently showing low usage and there may be an opportunity to take out some sailings from timetables and/ or making some sailings bookings only. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to understand the nature of the usage and not just focus on numbers but also why journeys are or aren't necessary. • Consultation with staff/ unions • Consultation with communities/ stakeholders <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shetland Transport Strategy • Draft Scottish Ferries Plan • Carrying data • Purpose of Journey Survey • Project savings analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	Yes – improve usage of remaining runs		
Impact on frequency:	Yes – remove certain runs		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	No		

Option No: 14.2 Review weather forecast charges		Effective period:
Brief description: There may be different means of securing weather information that are more cost efficient		Type: Operational Change 1
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 1.6
Assessment Required:	None	
Consultation Required:	None	
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Ways to Save <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There may be different means of securing weather information that are more cost efficient. This is also relevant to Ports and Harbours service <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance with MCA requirements <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing contract data Project saving analysis 		
Impact on capacity:	None	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	None	
Impact on user cost:	None	
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	No	

Option No: 14.3 Manage sea staff leave	Effective period:	
Brief description: This option looks at what can be achieved through a prescriptive approach to assigning leave periods to staff.	Type: Operational Change 2	
	Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 2.3	
Assessment Required:	Staff Equality	
Consultation Required:	Staff and union(s)	Support Services
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service Review <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option looks at what can be achieved through a prescriptive approach to assigning leave periods to staff. It will include detailed plans to provide cover for leave that ensures minimum use of overtime to cover leave. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation with staff/ unions • Clear understanding of current policies • Constraints of employee numbers and certification <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council policies • Manning spreadsheets • Overtime analysis • VTS, Pilot, Launch Crew schedules 		
Impact on capacity:	None	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	None	
Impact on user cost:	None	
Impact on cost to Council:		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	Yes Any crew reductions through other options will impact positively	

At their meeting of 9 Feb Council approved implementation of this Option and the occasional overtime budgets for the period 2012/13, and subsequent years have been permanently reduced by £50,000.

However, consultation is still required with staff and staff unions in order to implement this saving

Option No: 14.4 Review Fuel Procurement		Effective period:
Brief description: Find a sustainable source of fuel oil for the ferry fleet at rates and terms that cost less than present.		Type: Operational Change 2
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 2.7
Assessment Required:	None	
Consultation Required:	External Agencies	Executive Managers
Origin: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ways to Save • Operational • Staff Consultation Commentary/Specification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review must consider service resilience • Consider the larger picture, Council wide and Shetland wide • Construct own tanks at Sella Ness or alternative location. Add essential requirements/criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source must be sustainable • Quality & grade must meet specifications Existing Information or required information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service analysis already undertaken • Work undertaken by other services – Development, Ports & Harbours 		
Impact on capacity:	None	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	None	
Impact on user cost:	None	
Impact on cost to Council:		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	No	

At their meeting of 9 Feb Council approved implementation of this Option and the budgets for the period 2012/13, and subsequent years have been permanently reduced by £90,000.

Because of the Council decision this Option can now be removed from further consideration

Option No: 14.5 Reduced timetable on Public Holidays		Effective period:	
Brief description: Run reduced level of service on Up Helly Aa holiday and Easter Monday and reconsider the level of service given over the festive holidays		Type: Service Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 3.4	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	
Consultation Required:	Community Councils	Stakeholders & Communities	Staff and union(s)
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Service review Ways to Save <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Run a reduced level of service on Up Helly Aa holiday and Easter Monday and reconsider the level and frequency of service given over the festive holidays Council to review incorporating Up Helly Aa holiday and Easter Monday into annual leave <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community/ stakeholder consultation Is there a corporate review of public holidays? Consultation with staff/ unions. <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carryings data and cost data for existing running on public holiday Project savings analysis Purpose of Journey Survey 			
Impact on capacity:	Possibly		
Impact on frequency:	Possibly		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	No		

Option No: 14.6 Reduce sea staff hours to 37 and increase staff		Effective period:
Brief description: All sea staff that are currently contracted on >37 hours are reduced to 37 hours and additional crew recruited to maintain service levels and length of service day.		Type: Operational Change 2
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 3.10
Assessment Required:	Staff Equality	
Consultation Required:	Staff and union(s)	Support Services
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members • Senior Management <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All sea staff that are currently contracted on >37 hours are reduced to 37 hours and additional crew recruited to maintain service levels and length of service day. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruitment and retention of staff • Overall costs • Logistics of crew scheduling • Consultation with staff/ unions • Accommodation problems on islands <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manning review and subsequent work • Project savings analysis 		
Impact on capacity:	None	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	None	
Impact on user cost:	None	
Impact on cost to Council:	Additional £58k – Attach details of Project savings analysis	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	No	

Option No: 14.7 Reduce staff hours to 37 and reduce timetables			Effective period:	
Brief description: All sea staff that are currently contracted on >37 hours are reduced to 37 hours and service timetables are designed to fit with what can be done with this level of resource			Type: Service Change 3	
			Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 4.1	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	Environmental Impact	Staff Equality
Consultation Required:	Staff and union(s)	Support Services	Community Councils	Communities & Stakeholders
Origin: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members Senior Management Commentary/Specification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All sea staff that are currently contracted on >37 hours are reduced to 37 hours and service timetables are designed to fit with what can be done with this level of resource Add essential requirements/criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruitment and retention of staff Overall costs Logistics of crew scheduling Consultation with staff/ unions Community/ stakeholder consultation Timetable impacts Existing Information or required information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manning review and subsequent work Project savings analysis 				
Impact on capacity:		Yes – less frequent runs		
Impact on frequency:		Yes – less frequent runs		
Impact on journey duration:		None		
Impact on user cost:		None		
Impact on cost to Council:		Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements				

Option No: 14.8 Service succession planning		Effective period:
Brief description: Develop a long term succession plan taking into regard Officer Cadet sponsorship, market forces and industry training requirements and opportunities		Type: Operational Change 1
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 3.11
Assessment Required:	None	
Consultation Required:	Support Services	
Origin: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service review • Operational Commentary/Specification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the continuation of directly sponsored officer cadets and develop a succession plan which will look at least 5 years ahead • Review the arrangement and opportunities to support and tailor the craft apprentice scheme to meet future needs • Identify if there are opportunities to provide entry level training Add essential requirements/criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industry training providers • Ability and willingness of others to take up Council draft of cadets • If service remains in house Existing Information or required information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulations and policies • Qualifications and standards • Modern Marine Apprentice Scheme • Information regarding MNTB rating training (KM) • Project saving analysis 		
Impact on capacity:	None	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	None	
Impact on user cost:	None	
Impact on cost to Council:	Ongoing annual saving after 3 years of: £48k Attached details of Project savings analysis	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	No	

At their meeting of 9 Feb Council approved implementation of part of this Option and budgets for the period 2012/13, and subsequent years have been permanently reduced by £16,000

Option No: 14.9 Externalise service(s)		Effective period:	
Brief description: Explore the various permutations to externalise as a whole or in part, or in conjunction with other Council marine services		Type: Service Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 4.2	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Staff Equality	
Consultation Required:	Staff and union(s)	Support Services	External Agencies
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ways to Save • Service review • Members • Senior Management • Staff Consultation <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permutations to consider for externalisation are covered in the sub option sheets following <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community/ stakeholder consultation • Consultation with staff/ unions. • Relevant legislation, Policies and European Rules <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northlink benchmarking exercise • Ports for the Future – tendering options • Project saving analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	Unknown		
Impact on frequency:	Unknown		
Impact on journey duration:	Unknown		
Impact on user cost:	Unknown		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	Unknown		

Decision of Board 22 Feb 2012 to expand this option to expand this option to identify for assessment the various permutations to externalise the service activities in whole or in part or in conjunction with other marine activities

Option No: 14.9 a Contract out Sea Staff Manning		Effective period:	
Brief description:		Type:	
		Source document Ref: Project Board	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Staff Equality	
Consultation Required:	Staff and union(s)	Support Services	External Agencies
<p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community/ stakeholder consultation • Consultation with staff/ unions. • Relevant legislation, Policies and European Rules <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northlink benchmarking exercise • Ports for the Future – tendering options • Project saving analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	Unknown		
Impact on frequency:	Unknown		
Impact on journey duration:	Unknown		
Impact on user cost:	Unknown		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	Unknown		

Option No: 14.9 b Contract out Engineering Support		Effective period:	
Brief description:		Type:	
		Source document Ref: Project Board	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Staff Equality	
Consultation Required:	Staff and union(s)	Support Services	External Agencies
<p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community/ stakeholder consultation • Consultation with staff/ unions. • Relevant legislation, Policies and European Rules <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northlink benchmarking exercise • Ports for the Future – tendering options • Project saving analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	Unknown		
Impact on frequency:	Unknown		
Impact on journey duration:	Unknown		
Impact on user cost:	Unknown		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	Unknown		

Option No: 14.9 c Contract out entire service		Effective period:	
Brief description:		Type:	
		Source document Ref: Project Board	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Staff Equality	
Consultation Required:	Staff and union(s)	Support Services	External Agencies
<p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community/ stakeholder consultation • Consultation with staff/ unions. • Relevant legislation, Policies and European Rules <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northlink benchmarking exercise • Ports for the Future – tendering options • Project saving analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	Unknown		
Impact on frequency:	Unknown		
Impact on journey duration:	Unknown		
Impact on user cost:	Unknown		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	Unknown		

Option No: 14.9 d Contract out in conjunction with Ports and Harbour vessel operations		Effective period:	
Brief description:		Type:	
		Source document Ref: Project Board	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Staff Equality	
Consultation Required:	Staff and union(s)	Support Services	External Agencies
<p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community/ stakeholder consultation • Consultation with staff/ unions. • Relevant legislation, Policies and European Rules <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northlink benchmarking exercise • Ports for the Future – tendering options • Project saving analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	Unknown		
Impact on frequency:	Unknown		
Impact on journey duration:	Unknown		
Impact on user cost:	Unknown		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/N If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	Unknown		

Option No: 14.9 e Externalise entire Council Marine function		Effective period:	
Brief description:		Type:	
		Source document Ref: Project Board	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Staff Equality	
Consultation Required:	Staff and union(s)	Support Services	External Agencies
<p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community/ stakeholder consultation • Consultation with staff/ unions. • Relevant legislation, Policies and European Rules <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northlink benchmarking exercise • Ports for the Future – tendering options • Project saving analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	Unknown		
Impact on frequency:	Unknown		
Impact on journey duration:	Unknown		
Impact on user cost:	Unknown		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	Unknown		

Option No: 14.9 f Externalise individual routes or combinations of routes		Effective period:	
Brief description:		Type:	
		Source document Ref: Project Board	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Staff Equality	
Consultation Required:	Staff and union(s)	Support Services	External Agencies
<p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community/ stakeholder consultation • Consultation with staff/ unions. • Relevant legislation, Policies and European Rules <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northlink benchmarking exercise • Ports for the Future – tendering options • Project saving analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	Unknown		
Impact on frequency:	Unknown		
Impact on journey duration:	Unknown		
Impact on user cost:	Unknown		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	Unknown		

Option No: 14.9 g Hand over responsibility to Scottish Government		Effective period:	
Brief description:		Type:	
		Source document Ref: Project Board	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Staff Equality	
Consultation Required:	Staff and union(s)	Support Services	External Agencies
<p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community/ stakeholder consultation • Consultation with staff/ unions. • Relevant legislation, Policies and European Rules <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northlink benchmarking exercise • Ports for the Future – tendering options • Project saving analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	Unknown		
Impact on frequency:	Unknown		
Impact on journey duration:	Unknown		
Impact on user cost:	Unknown		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	Unknown		

Option No: 14.10 Review need to retain relief vessels		Effective period:	
Brief description: Consider the relative costs and benefits of retaining the existing 2 relief ferries.		Type: Service Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 5.1	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	Environmental Impact
Consultation Required:	Communities & Stakeholders		Community Councils
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SIC currently retains 2 Ro-Ro ferries that are not permanently deployed on routes. They are utilised for overhaul reliefs, breakdown cover and ad hoc other work such as charters. The requirement for relief vessels will be greater in coming years with the planned life extension programme for all ferries. This work should consider the balance of cost versus operational benefits. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria inc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilisation of relief vessels in recent years Life extension programme Future changes in legislation Availability of suitable vessels to charter Consultation with Communities <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recent utilisation Ship deployment spreadsheet – Colin Reeves Ship overhaul programme Life extension programme Work done by CR c 2009 Project savings analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	None		
Impact on frequency:	Yes – if a ferry breaks down or is removed to cover another service during a breakdown		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Ongoing annual saving of c £125k Attached details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	No		

Option No: 14.11 Community Runs		Effective period:	
Brief description: Either do not deliver community hires in the future or fund them through different means.		Type: Service Change 3	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 5.2	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	Environmental Impact
Consultation Required:	Communities & Stakeholders		Staff Equality
Consultation Required:		Community Councils	
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service review <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently each island is allocated “runs” or extensions to existing service based on available budget and these are funded from the Rural Transport budget. The aim of this option is to examine the impacts of removing this practice altogether or finding a method of alternative funding/ delivery i.e. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> full cost recovery through fares reduced scheduled service deliver as part of an overall service package <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community/ stakeholder consultation Relationship with air services as an alternative Impacts on freight runs to small isles Unravel the linkage between through night manning and community runs on Yell Sound <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council reports/ policy? Single Status Collective Agreement Project savings analysis 			
Impact on capacity:		None	
Impact on frequency:		Yes – reduce service	
Impact on journey duration:		None	
Impact on user cost:		None	
Impact on cost to Council:		Attach details of Project savings analysis	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements		No	

Option No: 14.12 Review Uniforms and PPE		Effective period:
Brief description: To review the issue of uniforms and PPE to sea staff		Type: Operational Change 1
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 5.4
Assessment Required:	Staff Equality	
Consultation Required:	Executive Managers	
Origin: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Service review Commentary/Specification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To review the issue of uniforms and PPE to sea staff To review the procurement of uniforms and PPE Add essential requirements/criteria inc <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a statutory requirement to issue adequate PPE for the jobs performed Stop providing uniforms? Corporate Image Authority – ability to recognise rank Emergency – ability to recognise individuals as crew and their rank Rationalise H & S Visible – ability to differentiate between crew and passengers on deck and in marshalling areas Control of the issuing of uniforms £34,000 Budget £23,000 Usual spend Existing Information or required information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kevin Main's Spreadsheet Stores study – Stephen Cooper Project savings analysis 		
Impact on capacity:	None	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	None	
Impact on user cost:	None	
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	No	

Option No: 14.13 Review delivery costs to drydocks		Effective period:	
Brief description: Review crewing and other requirements when taking vessels from the service route to/ from a refit yard either within or outwith Shetland		Type: Operational Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 5.6	
Assessment Required:	None		
Consultation Required:	Staff and union(s)	Support Services	External Agencies
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service review <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review crewing and other requirements when taking vessels from the service route to/from a refit yard either within or outwith Shetland. • Determine impacts on effectiveness of liaison with Class and Flag State Surveyors. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitably qualified and experienced crew • Ability to satisfy MCA at exercise (requires fully familiarised crew) • Ability to liaise with Class and MCA surveyors to expedite work/ refit • Potential consequence on NAFC income <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion document prepared by Colin Reeves • Exemption from overtime moratorium document • Project savings analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	None		
Impact on frequency:	None		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	Yes Drydock contracts – 11.3		

Option No: 14.14 Review crewing levels all routes		Effective period:	
Brief description: Review manning of each vessel on a duty crew basis and on a total crew basis.		Type: Operational Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 5.7	
Assessment Required:	None		
Consultation Required:	Staff and union(s)	Support Services	External Agencies
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service review • Ways to Save <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review manning of each vessel on a duty crew basis (i.e. number of personnel on board at any one time) and on a total crew basis (i.e. total crew allocated to that vessel). <p>Add essential requirements/criteria inc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet statutory requirements: Bigga – 4 crew Dagalien – 5 crew (6 when pax >95) Daggri – 5 crew (6 when pax >95) Filla – 4 crew, 5 on risk assessment (possible spend to save reduction to 4) Fivla – 4 crew (5 in categorised waters) Geira – 4 crew (5 in categorised waters) Good Shepherd IV – 2 crew but compliance with MGN 280 required) Hendra – 5 crew Leirna – 5 crew (4 possible with restrictions) Linga – 5 crew Snolda – 2 deck officers, one engineer plus requirements of MSN 1767 Thora – 4 crew <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MCA certification for each vessel • Qualification document (CR) • Manning spreadsheet (CM) • Project savings analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	None		
Impact on frequency:	None		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	Yes All options concerning vessel crewing		

Option No: 14.15 Crew qualification, re-validation & training		Effective period:	
Brief description: Review the qualifications required for each rank on each vessel on each route.		Type: Operational Change 2	
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 6.1	
Assessment Required:	Staff Equality		
Consultation Required:	Staff and union(s)	Support Services	External Agencies
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service review • Staff Consultation <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justify a rank and pay structure • Justify revalidation and costs • Establish base line for recruitment and agree processes for future staff development • Examine synergies with other Council marine function needs <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation with staff and union • Ways to Save negotiations with SS staff <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payment of Professional Fees Policy • Training & Development policy • CR previous works – Qualification Levels of Crew on SIC Ferries • Project savings analysis 			
Impact on capacity:	None		
Impact on frequency:	None		
Impact on journey duration:	None		
Impact on user cost:	None		
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis		
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	No		

Option No: 14.16 Examine fuel consumption and vessel speeds		Effective period:
Brief description: Examine if vessels can operate at a lower speed to save fuel		Type: Operational Change 1
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 6.3
Assessment Required:	Environmental	
Consultation Required:	None	
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Ways to Save Service review <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examine if vessels can operate at a lower speed to save fuel. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Timetable considerations Relationship between engine performance and manufactures requirement and fuel savings. <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General Fleet Circular 17/09 Project savings analysis 		
Impact on capacity:	None	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	If vessels slow down journey times will increase	
Impact on user cost:	None	
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	<p>Yes</p> <p>Vessels deployment, re-engining M/V Filla and changes to timetables through adoption of other options</p>	

Option No: 14.17 Review standby and call-out provision		Effective period:		
Brief description: Review the present arrangement and payments made to covering standby and call-out duties in the ferry service, afloat and ashore		Type: Operational Change 2		
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 6.4		
Assessment Required:	Staff Equality			
Consultation Required:	Staff and union(s)	Support Services	External Agencies	Executive Managers
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service review <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider what has changed since arrangements were first put in place recognising changes in technology and requirements Establish synergies and potential resource sharing opportunities with Ports and Harbours Operations and other Council services Establish a requirement based on present need using up-to-date risk assessment Research need for out of hours emergency cover and alternative means of delivering and funding. <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation with staff and union Consultation with staff and their union(s) in other marine areas Consultation with stakeholders e.g. blue light services, Emergency Planning Ways to Save negotiations with SS staff <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SS collective agreement Existing arrangement with Scottish Ambulance Service Usage statistics Project savings analysis 				
Impact on capacity:	None			
Impact on frequency:	None			
Impact on journey duration:	None			
Impact on user cost:	None			
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis			
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	No			

Option No: 14.18 Review all vessel deployment		Effective period:
Brief description: Consideration of the current deployment of the SIC inter island ferries (incl. reliefs) to see if the match of capability and demand is optimised.		Type: Service Change 1
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 7.1
Assessment Required:	Environmental	
Consultation Required:	External Agencies	Relevant Community Councils
Origin: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Commentary/Specification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option will consider the capacity requirements and classification of the routes and compare this with the vessel capacities and other capabilities. Add essential requirements/criteria inc <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires consideration of policy for deploying relief vessels for planned maintenance and breakdowns. Implications for overall fuel consumption. Existing Information or required information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic Carryings Known changes in demand Vessel capacities Certification requirements of routes Certification of vessels Project savings analysis 		
Impact on capacity:	Yes – dependant on vessel	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	None	
Impact on user cost:	None	
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	Yes Any options which relate to vessel capacity	

Option No: 14.19 Review ENG1 and ML5 revalidation costs		Effective period:		
Brief description: Establish a Council wide procedure of when and when not the Council will reimburse the costs associated with ENG1 and ML5 revalidations.		Type: Operational Change 2		
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 7.2		
Assessment Required:	Staff Equality			
Consultation Required:	Staff and union(s)	Support Services	External Agencies	Executive Managers
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service review <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possession of a valid ENG1 is an essential requirement therefore all employees should be in possession of a valid ENG1 at the commencement of their employment (ML5 for workboats and pilot boats etc.) • Establish a robust procedure clearly specifying the circumstances where the Council will or will not cover the costs of revalidation • Consider effect on other Council services e.g. HGV drivers, VTS, Pilots <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation with staff and union • Consultation with staff and their union(s) in other marine areas • Ways to Save negotiations with SS staff • Ensure understanding of the four elements of cost <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Time ○ Travel ○ Fees ○ Relief cover <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payment of Professional Fees Policy • Statistical records • Project savings analysis • External Information on Industry Practice [CR/KD] 				
Impact on capacity:	None			
Impact on frequency:	None			
Impact on journey duration:	None			
Impact on user cost:	None			
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis			
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	No			

Option No: 14.20 Stop certain routes			Effective period:	
Brief description: Explore if it is practicable to cease delivery of services on certain routes.			Type: Service Change 3	
			Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 7.3	
Assessment Required:	Economic Impact	Social Inclusion	Environmental Impact	Staff Equality
Consultation Required:	Staff and union(s)	Support Services	External Agencies	
Origin: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service review 			<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; width: fit-content; margin: auto;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require decision from the Project Board on the recommendation below Decision of the Board on 22 Feb 2012 is to replace this option with a specific option to review the level of service presently provided to Papa Stour </div> <h1 style="font-size: 4em; opacity: 0.5; margin-top: 20px;">Return to Board</h1>	
Commentary/Specification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explore the Council’s statutory duties and consider if services are actually required 				
Add essential requirements/criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legislative definition of Local Authority Understanding if an alternative would develop if Council did not provide a transport link. Community/ stakeholder consultation. 				
Existing Information or required information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport Act 1985 Section 63(2) Check this Transport (Scotland) Act 2005 Project savings analysis 				
Impact on capacity:	Yes			
Impact on frequency:	Yes			
Impact on journey duration:	Yes			
Impact on user cost:	Yes			
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis			
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	No			

- Recommend rejection at stage 2 having considered the obligations placed on local authorities by the Scottish Government**
- Superseded by Option 5.3 Review Level of Service – Papa Stour**

Option No: 14.21 Staff interchangeability arrangements		Effective period:		
Brief description: Develop a process whereby the present Council process can be set aside, by passed or amended to allow transfer of staff from vessel to vessel or crew to crew without being subjected to a recruitment process.		Type: Operational Change 2		
		Source document Ref: Workshop 3 – 7.1		
Assessment Required:	Staff Equality			
Consultation Required:	Staff and union(s)	Support Services	External Agencies	Executive Managers
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service review <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current interpretation of present Council policy is perceived to be restrictive • The service needs to be able to divert appropriately skilled and certificated staff to duties or vessels or routes that better meet geographic or skilling needs • Develop a robust procedure that can sit alongside or compliment existing policies <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriately skilled, certificated and competent staff • Staff retention and recruitment • Consultation with staff/ unions • Succession plan <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruitment and Selection policy • Equalities legislation • Other Council policies • Project savings analysis 				
Impact on capacity:	None			
Impact on frequency:	None			
Impact on journey duration:	None			
Impact on user cost:	None			
Impact on cost to Council:	Attach details of Project savings analysis			
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	No			

Option No: 14.22 Remove Public radio and television viewing options from vessels		Effective period:
Brief description: Remove Performing Rights Society licences from all vessels. Remove capability of televisions to receive or broadcast and remove the need to have television licences.		Type: Operational Change 1
		Source document Ref: Management consultation
Assessment Required:	None	
Consultation Required:	None	
Origin: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service review – management consultation Commentary/Specification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove Performing Rights Society licences from all vessels. Remove capability of televisions to receive or broadcast Remove the need to have television licences on Yell Sound and Skerries services Add essential requirements/criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow passengers to use own portable equipment Advise charterers to obtain own licences Existing Information or required information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revenue estimates Project savings analysis 		
Impact on capacity:	None	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	None	
Impact on user cost:	None	
Impact on cost to Council:	Ongoing annual saving of: c £2.5k Attached details of Project savings analysis	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	No	

Option No: 14.23 Remove budget support to Infrastructure Review Team 2013/14		Effective period:
Brief description: Cease funding the post of Acting Ferry Services Manager.		Type: Operational Change 2
		Source document Ref: Service Review
Assessment Required:	None	
Consultation Required:	Staff union	Individual
<p>Origin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service review • Operational <p>Commentary/Specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At end of Infrastructure Review Projects disband review team • Remove support funding <p>Add essential requirements/criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess remaining work to implement changes introduced by Project(s) <p>Existing Information or required information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue salary estimates • Project savings analysis 		
Impact on capacity:	None	
Impact on frequency:	None	
Impact on journey duration:	None	
Impact on user cost:	None	
Impact on cost to Council:	Ongoing annual saving of: c £58k Refer attached details of Project savings analysis	
Might this option depend on another option or requirement? Yes/No If Yes, which option(s) or requirements	No	