

THE BOATER

*The National Association of
Boat Owners*

THE BOATER

ISSUE 3

MARCH 1992

CONTENTS

	Page
Welcome to The Boater.....	1
Editorial.....	1
Committee Report.....	2
What has NABO ever done for me?.....	3
Transport and Works Bill.....	4
BW General Powers Bill.....	5
Broads Authority Byelaws.....	6
More members needed.....	6
Relations with others.....	6
Boat Standards Update.....	7
NABO meeting with BW.....	9
A reply to BW's Integrated Business Strategy..	12
News for Boaters?.....	14
Financial Report.....	15
Back copies of the Boater.....	15
NABO Sweatshirts.....	16
Complaint Form.....	17

Whilst every care is taken to ensure that the contents are factually correct, we accept no liability for any direct or consequential loss arising from any action taken by anyone as a result of reading anything contained in this publication.

Welcome to the Boater

An awful lot has happened in the last few weeks as you will be able to read elsewhere in this issue of the Boater. We have deliberately delayed finalising this issue since a number of important things have happened in the first few days of March and your committee believes that it is of fundamental importance to keep you as up to date as possible with developments. You are likely to hear from us on waterways issues in advance of any other source unless of course you are actively involved in the events yourself. The four important events in the early days of March were a meeting with BW on boat standards, a meeting between NABO and BW on a wide range of other issues, the third reading of the Transport and Works Bill in the House of Commons and the third reading debate in the House of Lords on the British Waterways Bill. All of these matters are reported in this issue. Do please read them carefully, let us have your views and take action where appropriate. If you have dealings with the Board, NRA, MPs et al on these or other related issues, do please keep us informed.

Dave Green, Chairman

EDITORIAL

My name is Vic Brown. I have taken on the awesome task of editing The Boater, and whilst I have an unenviable reputation of speaking my own mind, I will make sure the expletives are replaced by suitable alternatives! Although you may well not agree with my viewpoints, I hope you will still write to me with your views, queries and suggestions. Don't forget that unless we know about your problems we can't help you. I intend The Boater to furnish you with the details of NABO's activities, the facts about current issues, and the opportunity for you to air your views.

The Committee are in the throws of collating a file on problems encountered throughout the system. In the back of the Boater you will find a form on which we request simple details to be sent to the appropriate waterways manager - and please send a copy to your NABO area representative, or to me. Please help us to help you. If you do get stuck or have a problem, phone "freephone canals" to get the hit squad to help. It is a service you pay for so you might as well use it. As from the next issue we are hoping to feature the exploits of Dozie and Dim, a couple of dummies who have kindly given us their permission to share some of their problems and adventures on the waterways of Britain.

NABO Committee Report

March 1992.

NEWS from the Committee Meeting held on the 22nd February 1992.

The Treasurer presented her Report and a Budget. A design for a car/boat sticker was approved to be passed to the printer. Sales of a NABO Sweatshirt were agreed to help with fund raising. We are looking at the possibility of pennants/burgees. Our first speaking engagements were reported. These had been well received and resulted in an increase of membership.

Considerable concern was expressed by members about the state of the track. Work is to start on a leaflet which, with your help, will be used to build up an overall picture of the 'lack of compliance' with the specification of each canal.

It was agreed that we should ask for an exemption for vessels travelling between Teddington and Brentford or vis-versa, for the need for VHF radio equipment.

BW Leisure and Tourism Strategy (draft) was discussed at some length. Some of this document had been amended between Sept and Oct 91. Many deadlines had apparently been exceeded. A full report on our officers' talks with BW appear elsewhere in this issue.

It was reported that the BW Bill had been temporarily halted at the Lords 3rd Reading Stage. A report on the current state of play is included in this issue. It appears that waterway user groups have obtained some safeguards from the DOE regarding the Transport and Works Bill. This Bill is not now seen as so much of a threat to our futures. Again, a report is included in this issue.

We are also meeting BW to discuss our stance on the Standards for Compliance. Our position on standards is that we have asked and will continue to ask for evidence of accidents which have been caused by failure of equipment which may be checked. We do not appear to have received a response so far. However the result of our latest discussions appear elsewhere in this issue.

A paper suggesting that we adopt a Committee Structure was tabled for discussion at the next meeting

NABO comes to you. Committee members will put in an appearance at Titford, Anglesey Basin, Ashby, Coventry Basin and Stafford early this year.

What has NABO ever done for me?

Since its formation less than a year ago NABO has

1. Lobbied against the British Waterways Bill in the House of Lords and produced four pages of suggested amendments for consideration by their Lordships in the Third Reading debate scheduled for 4th March. We have advised BW's solicitor of our concerns (and received a 7 page response which is now being considered by the committee.) We have produced a draft petition for presentation to the House of Commons when the Bill reaches that House.
2. Lobbied, successfully, for changes in the provisions affecting waterways in the Transport and Works Bill and provided detailed comments to the Department of the Environment on proposed rules for the making of orders under the Bill and for the making of objections to applications for orders.
3. Been involved in detailed consultations with BW over Boat standards.
4. Provided detailed evidence to a Department of the Environment Review of the Navigation functions of NRA and BWA. NABO has supported the idea of a single navigation authority but only if appropriate safeguards for boat owners can be built in.
5. Arranged a meeting with BW to discuss their unpublished draft Leisure and Tourism Strategy Document which covers many issues of concern to members including dredging and mooring policy, signing etc. This meeting took place on the 3rd March. A report appears elsewhere in this issue of The Boater.
6. Offered to assist with a Department of Transport inquiry being carried out by the Director General of the Law Society into vessel safety.
7. Established consultee status with the NRA (With particular reference to charges on the Thames)
9. Had discussions and exchanged correspondence on a range of issues with IWA, IWAAC, AWCC, RYA, and FINCH.
10. Kept you, the members informed through newsletters, and the Boater.

Yes but apart from all that, what has NABO ever done for me? (With apologies to Monty Python!)

Transport and Works Bill

Following negotiations with the Department of the Environment, a number of changes have been made to the Bill which meet many of our objections. We have also been consulted on a Statutory Instrument which will apply detailed rules for the making of applications under the Act and also rules for the making of objections to applications. We have sent detailed comments to the DoE. The Bill completed its third reading in the Commons on 4 March and has been passed to the House of Lords. No timetable is yet available for its progress through the Lords.

The Committee of NABO would like to thank every one who wrote voicing their concern to members of the Select Committee. Your response had a positive effect! Below are some extracts from the House of Commons Official Reports on that Committee.

10.12.91 - Mr Cryer ' Various inland waterways associations, such as the National Association of Boat Owners and the Inland Waterways Amenity Advisory Council, have made it clear that they feel strongly that consultation should have taken place and that the inclusion of the clauses affecting waterways is ill judged.'

- Mr Barnes ' I find it unusual that I have received handwritten letters among the representation that have been made to me as well as formal representations from organisations.'

19.12.91 - Ms Walley'It has led many people who care about inland waterways to write to members of the Committee and stress that, although the Government have disregarded their views so far, they wish those views to be taken into account.'

- Mr Fearn ' The National Association of Boat Owners and many other owners of small boats who use the canals are worried about what is happening on the waterways'

The British Waterways Bill

The Bill should have completed its third reading debate in the House of Lords on 27 January. In the event this did not happen due to pressure of time in their Lordships house and the debate on proposed amendments was rescheduled to 4 March. In the meantime NABO attended a meeting with interested Lords together with other user groups in order to make clear our worries. As a result of this meeting, a number of Lords agreed to table additional amendments. (NABO supplied them with four pages of suggestions.)

Four of your committee members attended the 4 March debate in the Lords (at their own expense) and a fascinating debate it was. A number of amendments were accepted, the main ones having the effect of allowing entry on to land for carrying out specified operations only if "it would not be reasonably practicable for the operations" to be carried out without entry to the land and then the operations will have to be started and ended promptly and compensation will have to be paid.

Importantly for boat owners an amendment was accepted in relation to mooring (clause 16) which reads "The Board shall not exercise the powers of this section to prohibit or regulate mooring other than so far as may be reasonably necessary for the purposes of (a) securing safety or (b) preventing congestion or (c) ensuring that vessels do not remain at short stay moorings after the expiry of the period for which they are permitted to be there." This was an amendment suggested by NABO.

In respect of the extinguishment of rights that have not been exercised since 1900, amendments were agreed requiring the Board to set up a register in which anyone claiming such rights can register their interest. This does not necessarily mean the Board will accept the claims made but prevents the wholesale extinguishment of rights without recourse. The register will be open for one year from the date that the Bill becomes law. Further amendments excluded Lochs Lochy, Oich, Ness and Dochfour on the Caledonian Canal from the Bill entirely.

At the end of the debate a significant number of Lords gave vent to deep felt criticism of the Board and the way in which it has treated its customers. There must be a message in this for the Board to take to heart. They must change old attitudes and the way in which they are perceived by their customers, they surely cannot afford such open and hostile criticism as was laid on thick and fast by a number of their Lordships. The Board will only achieve this by listening to and taking notice of what their customers are saying to them. Perhaps the more open approach adopted by the Board in their meeting with NABO (reported elsewhere) is a sign of a better future. We shall see.

There is still a great deal wrong with the Bill in NABO's view. It has now moved to the House of Commons where NABO will be petitioning against many aspects of the Bill. Our Petition will be deposited in the next few days although the Second Reading will be delayed by the Dissolution of Parliament. Members will be kept informed of progress.

Broads Authority Byelaws

The Broads Authority have issued a revision of their byelaws for consultation. NABO will be commenting on the proposals and would welcome comments from any members with boats based on the Broads. Any member who would like a copy of the consultation document should send a large stamped addressed envelope (Capable of holding 17 sheets of A4 paper to the usual NABO address.

Comments must reach the Broads Authority by 17th April.

More members needed

We are working hard to increase the size of our membership base. This is being done by advertising (thanks are due to Canal and Riverboat), distributing leaflets (thanks to Michael Stimpson for including them with insurance renewal notices) and speaking at boat club meetings. We have recently written to rally organisers asking if they would be prepared to put our membership application form in their rally packs. Can you help? If you would like a supply of forms to distribute or if you would like us to organise a speaker for one of your club meetings please let us know.

Relations with others

The relationship between NABO and other user organisations is excellent. In particular we have worked closely with IWA over both the British Waterways Bill and the Transport and Works Bill (although it must be said that we have differing policies over the BW Bill - see elsewhere in this issue). We have also agreed to co-operate with AWCC where our policy interests coincide and we have agreed to support FINCH (Fair Inland Navigation Charges) in their campaign to oppose unreasonable new pricing structures on the river Thames.

BOAT STANDARDS

This latest meeting at 1 Queen Annes Gate London on the 3rd March was attended by a large number of surveyors, boat builders and user representatives. A major aim of BW's is to have standards in common with the NRA (which includes the Thames Authority) and Broads authorities. These UK Harmonised Standards are the ones now under discussion. The agreement of the NRA (Thames) and Broads is of paramount importance with BW. Users' agreement seems to come some way down the list of priorities.

We believe that the UK Harmonised Standards go beyond the essential minimum safety requirements which existing vessels must comply with. We consider therefore that existing boat owners who are customers of the British Waterways Board should be given the choice between complying with minimum safety requirements and complying with the UK Harmonised Standards.

We, in conjunction with the IWA proposed to BW that a Minimum Safety Certificate be made available for existing vessels which comply with the appropriate minimum safety requirements. BW turned this down out of hand and without explanation.

It is almost certain that there will not be any major concessions for existing vessels.

Changes have been made to the Standards so that some previously considered vital rules are now out, and some new apparently vital rules are now in. Remember, even if you have got a certificate (and perhaps have had work done to comply with the deleted rules), the next time your boat needs a certificate you will have to comply with the new rules, which will probably mean more work, money and worry.

We recommend that anyone wanting to get a certificate of compliance should wait until the updated standards are published before deciding whether to go ahead on the old system or wait for the new.

What is also becoming clear is that the cost of getting a boat tested using the new checklist system and incorporating the new standards could well be considerably higher than it was under the old surveyor system - despite some of the sillier items being removed that were in the old standards.

As usual BW refused to take account of what we consider to be the most important issue of all which is that evidence should be sought to determine the need for each particular standard.

Instead of sensibly conducted objective research providing the basis of standards, we have rushed meetings of large groups of individuals, all with vested interests, providing anecdotal evidence - and a volume of personal opinions - which result in a hotch potch of poorly thought out standards.

Although there is a considerable amount of experience represented in the meetings, the unscientific means by which the meetings are conducted and the way that results of the meetings are being considered and incorporated into standards, ensures that effectively all we end up with is a mixed bag of personal opinions - which is why the standards are changing.

The extraordinary stance taken by BW that they will not accept evidence of need as a basis of provision of standards seems to be derived from an emotive fear of standing up in a coroners court and being blamed for the accidental death of someone. The remoteness of the probability of a particular event occurring is, they think, immaterial. The mere possibility of its occurring is a sufficient basis for legislation.

Any reasonable person understands that with any activity there is a degree of risk involved which is balanced by the cost of minimising that risk. There has to be a balance between the two, but that balance can only be achieved when the risks are known.

Apart from the benefit of determining the level of risk, research into accidents and their causes may well indicate areas of previously unidentified significant risk, as well as areas of minimal risk previously thought to be significant. This would ensure greater safety and would probably be cheaper to comply with.

Until BW approach standards sensibly we will oppose them. Overall this is a very depressing state of affairs. If you are concerned with what is happening, why not phone or write to David Allison at BW, Greycaine Rd, Watford WD2 4JR Tel: 0923 226422, or write to the Editor with your views?

Meeting with BW

Dave Green reports on an important consultative meeting with BW officials.

On 3 March NABO had a meeting, which it had requested, with BW at their Watford headquarters. The meeting was attended by BWs Commercial director, Ian Valder together with Jim Kelly and Ken Dodd. NABO was represented by Dave Green, Jon Darlington, Phil Bland and Vic Brown. It was agreed that the meeting would not discuss standards or the BW Bill since these are the subject of separate negotiations (see elsewhere in this issue of the Boater). Instead the meeting covered a lot of ground of general interest to members and based on the Board's draft Leisure and Tourism Strategy document.

The Board officials said that they were committed to consultation and included NABO in that process. They saw consultation as a two way process in which the views and aspirations of both sides could be discussed. Whilst they confirmed that they would carefully consider the points made by us and other user bodies they made it clear that final decisions were a matter for them - "It's what we are paid to do" they said. There would be an annual meeting for all user groups with the Board's Chairman and two meetings at least between NABO and Jim Kelly. Additionally the Board said they were ready to meet us at any time or address the NABO committee if requested.

The Board have devolved a great deal of decision making to their 28 local waterway managers. We pointed out that whilst this worked well in some areas, it also let to divergent decisions being taken in different areas and that there needed to be a national framework within which the managers worked and a transparent and independent mechanism through which boaters could appeal against local decisions. The officials said there was guidance from the centre and that each waterway manager would by now be in the final stages of preparing individual business plans covering the next four years for their areas. Managers were expected to consult users in their area and it was open to customers to ask managers what plans they had for such matters as dredging, mooring, towpath maintenance etc. A complaints mechanism existed under which boaters could appeal against the decision of a waterways manager, first to the regional manager and then to Brian Dice the chief executive. NABO pointed out that this still meant that BW was the final arbiter and acted as judge and jury. In response the Board stated that they were committed to establishing an independent body to which complaints could finally be referred if the boater was still unsatisfied. This final level of appeal is not yet in place.

As a result of this discussion NABO will undoubtedly want to contact the 28 managers to ask about their plans and, in many cases will want to arrange meetings with the managers together with members from the individual areas. **If you would like to be involved in such a meeting with your area manager please write and let us know.**

BW pointed out that the yellow covered glossy document which they launched at the London boat show entitled "Caring for our customers" is **not** their customers charter. It is apparently an initial statement of their general intent. The customers charter will be issued later and, in particular, after the Board have considered responses to their draft leisure and tourism strategy.

The Board said that they had been suffering from a reducing government grant in real terms over the last 20 years and anticipated that a situation might eventually be reached when they would have to generate half of their total income from their own resources (including boat licence and mooring fees). To move towards this they had reached an unusual agreement with the Treasury under which they were allowed to sell off **non operational** property and to reinvest the proceeds in order to generate ongoing revenue.

NABO expressed its concern that this need for BW to generate more of its own resources would lead to substantial increases in charges particularly when taken with such phrases in the strategy document as "A national pricing policy will continue increasing fees to an appropriate market level". It was pointed out to BW that as they effectively hold a monopoly of inland waterways, the application of free market pricing policies are not appropriate. They denied that they are anything like a monopoly, since people could choose whether they bought a boat, a caravan or a new car etc.. It was explained to them that the monopoly concept was normally restricted to the provision of a particular service or product!

Another phrase in the document says the Board will "attract additional boats of high quality to our system". Taken together these two statements indicated to NABO that there was a strong possibility that many boaters could be priced off the system. BW categorically denied this intention.

They said that elsewhere in the document there is a stated intention to increase total boat numbers by 1 - 2% per annum. To achieve this they would have to operate a sensitive pricing policy.

This is a matter of fundamental importance to NABO members and one which we shall be watching very closely. The Board are seeking to generate an additional £10m income by 1996 **but not from boaters**. They claimed to have identified £4m of this so far, chiefly from the development at Paddington for which planning permission has now been granted and from the laying of telecommunications cables.

NABO pointed out its concern that the essential character of the waterways was changing under BW management as a result of inappropriate signing and other matters. BW said that they wished to preserve the industrial heritage aspects of the system within safety constraints and suggested that problems arising in a particular area should be discussed initially with the Waterways Manager concerned.

NABO raised the possibility of reclassifying some waterways to Cruiseway (Transport Act 1968) status and mentioned the particular difficulties on the Kennet and Avon Canal. The Board said that reclassification could work against boaters interests since no further grant would be forthcoming and reclassification would mean that local authorities would no longer feel obliged to make financial contributions. This is a matter to which NABO will need to give further consideration.

The question of water sales was raised. BW assured us that no water extraction contract would be agreed if the water extraction was likely to have a detrimental effect on navigation. On the question of extraction by farmers for watering fields, BW stated that many of these agreements dated back to the original building of the waterway and such rights could not be extinguished. They pointed out, however, that despite appearances the amount extracted for this purpose was relatively insignificant.

On moorings, the Board said that there was no intention in the Waterways Code document to imply that boaters should not moor temporarily in any area to which restrictions did not apply. BW agreed to take on board a NABO comment that at popular sites there should be provision for both overnight **and** 14 day moorings to meet the needs of weekend boaters.

The discussion was frank and far reaching. Your committee will consider carefully the points that were made and will revert to BW with further questions and concerns. We will also respond, by the end of March, in detail to the draft Tourism and Leisure Strategy. We will follow up the four year plans being prepared by the individual Waterway Managers. Your views and comments on all the matters raised would be most welcome.

A REPLY TO BW'S INTEGRATED BUSINESS STRATEGY

David Ingman explained BWs integrated business strategy in February's Waterways World with the now familiar exclamation that it is totally misunderstood, that a few ill informed critics are trying to stop progress whatever BW do - when all they are doing is trying to improve the canals for our benefit. They say they are customer orientated, that they consult, that they provide information and respond to customer needs; in short, that they put the customer first. What is wrong with that? Have we misunderstood them? So what is it about their business strategy that seems to upset the critics? I shall briefly outline some - and this is only some - of the problem areas that we are concerned with.

The first component of BWs business plan is apparently to improve the safety, integrity and appearance of the waterways. A report on Boat Standards is included elsewhere in this Boater. Incidentally, as recently as 1987 BW published a booklet "Boating on the Waterways" which stated that existing private boats would "continue to be exempt" from Standards!

In an interview with Mr. Ingman by the Daily Telegraph, (21st September 1991) it was reported that cost controls such as reducing maintenance on little used sections of waterway have been introduced. I'm sure we can all think of frequently used sections of waterway where these cost controls seem to have been introduced! So much for maintaining the integrity of the system. In the same interview Mr Ingman went on to say "The core of our business is the aesthetic appeal of inland waterways." Is it a case of appearance before integrity? It is certainly a case of appearance before navigation.

The second component of BWs strategy is the plan to maximise the use of the waterways for the benefit of the Nation. Mr Ingman makes mention that there have been many years of underfunding which have created a large engineering backlog, and that the social benefits of the waterway network are many times greater than the annual Government grant. It seems incredible therefore that BW are not making the increase of this grant a major objective of their policies. The impression is that they are actually trying to reduce it! The scale of the grant is in

fact very small indeed. Did you know that the City of Birmingham alone supports leisure and tourism to the tune of £91m per annum? Compare that to the paltry £49.7m Government grant to BW in 1990/91.

The 3rd component is the plan to continue to move to a more businesslike and dynamic management of the waterways. Is this why BW have raised prices substantially in real terms over the last 4 years and this year are raising prices by approximately 7.9% despite an agreement with IWAAC that prices would be in line with the RPI (5.5%)? The 2.5% increase in VAT is not the real reason for the difference since the RPI takes into account the VAT increase in April 1991. Mooring fees have also been substantially increased. For example those at Knowle on the GU have risen by 39% in 2 years. Prices look to continue to rise until the poorer boater is forced off the canal. Whether deliberate or not, this will be the effect of BWs income maximising policies. But for BW to engage in these free market income maximising policies when they are effectively operating as a monopoly is quite unacceptable. We, their customers have no statutory protection from these aggressive policies, and no choice where to shop.

What then about consultation, providing information, customer care, etc?. Well, did BW consult user groups before introducing the moratorium for houseboats? No, they did not. Did they allow NABO into their initial consultation meeting over boat standards? No, they did not - though they have since relented.

When it comes to providing information, BW are equally inept. Their customers charter "Caring for our Customers" is remarkable in that it says nothing at all, whereas the News for Boaters is full of misleading information. A separate article appears elsewhere in this issue on the News for Boaters.

Despite all the "customer first" talk, it appears that in the same way BR complained last winter that they had the wrong type of snow, BW seem to have the wrong type of customer; people who don't want to be run as a big business, or want fancy signs and pretty locks but virtually no water in the canal. All they want to do is quietly enjoy their own boats on their own waterways without big business bullies making pawns of them in a commercial game. These people, many of them NABO members, do not fit into BW's modern waterways scene.

News for Boaters?

BW's "News for Boaters" compares 1991 Navigation Expenditure (£42.4m) with 1991 boat licence income (£4.7m), graphically showing the large difference between the two figures and stating in bold letters "Boat licence income contributes 11p in every £1 we spend on providing navigation." Why do BW make this statement? Could it be to justify higher licence fees? But a closer look at the figures making up Navigation Expenditure shows that they are not all navigation costs.

1. The £13.6m on major engineering works are, according to the 1990/91 Annual Report, the total spent on engineering works. These are not just for the provision of navigation but are also for:

(a) works on all buildings, and bridges as required by statute, (I believe s117 of the Highways Act 1968 is one of them), and as such are not directly a cost of navigation but a general cost of maintaining the system which would have to be met one way or another whether boats navigated the canals or not.

(b) Some of the engineering works in the £13.6m are bound to include some works to towing paths which are not directly used for navigation.

(c) Perhaps most galling is that the major engineering works are necessary in order to catch up on the massive backlog of essential maintenance, for which BW gets a specific grant allocated. It is quite misleading to match current licence income with a expenditure which results from a backlog of years of neglect.

2. Pollution and water control are hardly navigation expenses, most pollution coming from neighbouring land owners. The control would therefore have to be undertaken in any case.

3. Provision of picnic sites is again not a navigation expense but is included as such.

Apart from some of these specific costs (and there are others not detailed here), there are a number of general costs which are common to navigation as well as to other activities and sources of income. For example:

1. The provision of water supply and land drainage is a major function of the canal system. The Chairman of BW told the House of Commons Environment Committee that its "value" was between £20m and £25m. The engineering works particularly benefit this aspect of

the canal's activity as well as navigation. Although BW do not charge for most of these items, they are a very significant aspect of their functions

2. A large number of the costs involved are common with the provision of fishing or of just providing the environment which attracts the 20 million visitors' days out every year to the waterways.

So, boat licence income provides 11p in every £1 BW spend on providing navigation AND A LOT OF OTHER ACTIVITIES AS WELL!

The other aspect of News for Boaters which causes concern is the statement regarding the General Powers Bill that "quite simply, the principal aim of the Bill is to improve the safety of those who use canals or live and work beside them." For a Bill to have only 2 of its 36 clauses related to its principal aim is odd. In reality the effect of the Bill is simply to allow BW to more effectively control its customers.

Financial Report

Our income to date has virtually all come from the subscriptions of our 600 members. (Now 700 and still growing). Small amounts are received from donations, and sales of back issues of "The Boater".

The main item of expenditure is printing (The Boater, newsletters and membership forms) with the accompanying postage. A collection is taken at every committee meeting as a contribution to room hire. Travelling costs are kept to a minimum, but journeys to attend various meetings do take their toll, as does room hire (e.g. AGM), and advertising.

In common with many voluntary organisations, we do benefit from hidden donations in the form of some free photocopying, stationery, postage, telephone calls and unclaimed travelling expenses etc.

If members would like to be provided with copies of our budget or have any queries please write enclosing a large s.a.e to:

Penny Barber,

Back copies of The Boater.

Back issues of The Boater are available. Price 75p
From Melanie Darlington.

Cheques should be made payable to the National Association of Boat Owners.

NABO Sweatshirts

We are now able to offer members sweatshirts (Crew of Collar neck) or with hooded tops with the initials N.A.B.O. on the front and if required your boat name printed on the back. Jogging bottoms to match are available.

Colours: Black, Navy, Grey, Burgundy or White.

Sizes: Small, Medium, Large or Extra Large.

Prices (Incl. Post and Packaging)

Printed with N.A.B.O front only:-

Sweatshirt - Crewneck	£ 8.99
" - Collar	£ 9.99
" - Hooded top with front pouch pocket	£10.99

Printed with Boat name on back:-

Sweatshirt - Crewneck	£ 9.75
" - Collar	£10.75
" - Hooded top with front Pouch pocket	£11.75

Jogging bottom to match £ 6.99

Cash with order.

Please make cheques payable to National Association of Boat Owners and send your orders to N.A.B.O,

=====
N.A.B.O. SWEATSHIRT ORDER FORM

Please send me..... Size.....

Colour..... with N.A.B.O. printed on front.

and.....printed on the back.

Also.....pair(s) of matching jogging bottoms.

Cheque for £..... enclosed.

Name..... Address.....

.....
If you do not wish to cut up your Boater, plain paper orders will be acceptable.

Complaints on the canals

As BW have requested feed back from users and user groups on problems encountered in the system, we would suggest that members become more vigilant and inform

BW of any problems encountered.

The form printed below can be used as a guide for complaint to the relevant manager(s).

Look out for: lack of dredging, dangerous or missing lock gear, poor attitudes from staff, missing or non usable facilities, lack of suitable mooring, or anything you consider that should be there, but isn't!

Remember complain immediately. Don't forget BW are obliged to reply within 14 days.

Please send a copy of the Complaint to NABO. so we can build up a file on all the problems which our members have encountered. This will enable us to identify and provide evidence of any major problem areas to raise with BW.

=====

Complaint Form

Name..... Date.....

Address.....

.....

Defect or Complaint.....

.....

Waterway and location.....

.....

Waterways Manager contacted.....

Please ensure that details are clear and correct and send to the appropriate B W Manager, with a copy to NABO.

For NABO use only, please let us have the length and draft of your boat.