

## SSMEI Sound of Mull Inshore Fishing Meetings

### **Input from**

John Hermse – Mallaig and Northwest Fishermen’s Association

Nick Turnbull – Mull Aquaculture and Fisheries Association

Alasdair MacLean – Mull Fishermen’s Association

Sarah Cunningham (SC) – Project Officer

### **Activity 1 – Sector Interactions**

Before the meeting SC had collated comments received on the interactions matrix sent out summarising current and potential interactions between inshore fishing and other sectors/interests in the Sound of Mull (SOM). SC had individual meetings with the stakeholders listed above due to a low number of interested parties and problems in arranging a suitable date. It was discussed at these meetings whether the interactions identified were appropriate and relevant to the SOM any Future Management Requirements that were felt to be required.

The stakeholders were asked to categorise the interactions in to one of 4 types current interactions or the potential for there to be:

- **Positive** – Interest/sector has a positive effect on recreation and tourism
- **Neutral** - Interest/sector has neither a positive or negative effect on recreation and tourism
- **Competitive** – Interest/sector competing for the same resource (e.g. space, species) that is either managed or unmanaged
- **Incompatible** - Interest/sector is not compatible with recreation and tourism and this is not manageable

Each interaction was categorised into one of the 4 types from input from those listed above by the MAFA/MFA representative. A summary of the interaction matrix is provided in Table 1 incorporating the categorisations.

## **Activity 2 – Opportunities, Constraints and Mechanisms**

Participants were asked to identify up to 3 opportunities and 3 constraints for inshore fishing within the SOM. They were also asked to identify up to 3 mechanisms that would allow these opportunities to be developed or constraints overcome. These were collated and grouped into similar types and are given below:

### **Opportunities for Inshore Fishing in the SOM**

#### **Infrastructure and transport for landing and moving catch**

- Development of deep water landing facility (pier) within harbour that can be accessed by vivier lorries e.g. Tobermory. Would be beneficial to boats in proximity to Sound, Coll and Tiree (creel fishing boats frequently use Tobermory).
- Improvement in handling of catches – vivier lorries unable currently to access piers/landing areas so are based at Craignure/Oban and are fed by small vans meaning catches can be handled and boxed upto 3 times in a day. This has time implications and associated costs. Pier and improved road facilities would reduce this burden.
- Larger fishing vessels find it easier to land in Oban but results in them losing fishing time steaming up and down SOM but as catches handled only once better prices are possible.

### **Constraints for Inshore Fishing in the SOM**

- Constraints that affect the sector on a regional/national scale but area out of local control e.g. Fuel prices, Price for produce/catches, Credit crunch
- Market – However, current oversupply of crab and downturn in market could pose a problem
- Facilities – landing pier, roads and associated infrastructure
- Not take zones/ closed areas – opposed to closed areas. There is no part of the SOM that is not fished at some time of the year and any closure would have an economic impact especially in the winter when it is mainly used. Could be argued SOM is effectively voluntarily closed and is self regulated until it is genuinely needed (i.e. in winter months/bad weather). As far as sector is aware there is virtually no conflict between fishing and other activities and therefore no need for zoning/closures.

### **Mechanisms for Inshore Fishing in the SOM**

- Future planning should include infrastructure as a priority – help to sustain current fleet and potentially encourage efficiencies and growth in sector within the area
- Access funding e.g. European funding to enable infrastructure developments e.g. Kallin Harbour, Grimsay Isle

- Joint venture (co-op) on fuel prices on Mull but large island and fishing fleet diverse and spread out. Hard to get consensus amongst local fishermen on this.
- Mull/Morvern close to mainland and have had little problem in attracting continental markets with the use of local buyers. Potential for improvement in joint marketing ventures to work against downturn in market and current oversupply in crab. Could also work for prawns e.g. other areas have joined together to fly out prawns to continent.

The stakeholders were then asked their views on the following questions:

**Should we identify areas to be developed or in need of safeguarding in relation to fishing in the SOM?**

- Whole of SOM needs safeguarding for fishing to protect an important winter and bad weather fishing area

**Activity 3 – Plan format and Contents**

The stakeholders were provided with relevant documents prior to the meeting and on the day that outline a draft of the plan content and potential format options. They were shown a draft layout of the contents of general sections which could be in the final plan, e.g. background to SSMEI, marine spatial planning, Sound of Mull. They were also shown two options of plan format – sectoral based and zone based. They were asked the following questions and their responses were noted on flipcharts.





**What plan option or combination of approaches would be best for the Sound of Mull/ Inshore Fishing? Are there any alternatives?**




- Fishing industry would prefer a sector based plan
- Zoning not felt to be required – as far as industry is aware there is virtually no conflict between fishing and other activities and therefore no need for zoning/closures.
- Concerns over economic impact of closures and effect of zoning other activities on current use of the SOM for fishing







**If zones are preferred, how should they be defined?**








- N/a – zones not preferred option by sector






**Contents of plan – do we need everything listed in documents? Should anything else be included?**

Table 1. Subgroup agreed interaction matrix with changes and Future Management Recommendations incorporated. Interaction categories are indicated by a coloured square: Positive  Neutral  Competition  Incompatible  Where the group had not all categorised the interaction into the same category, the majority was used and where a majority decision was not evident (there were equal votes for two categories) both categorises are indicated.









SECTOR	INTERACTION WITH INSHORE FISHING	CURRENT MANAGEMENT	FUTURE MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS
<b>Inshore fisheries</b> Nephrops trawl, Scallop dredging, Creel, Diving	 Mobile vs Static - Nephrops: The potential for conflict for space/resource and gear damage between trawling and creeling reported elsewhere is low/non-existent in the SoM because creeling is the dominant form of fishing in the SoM and trawl areas are few (ground extent & deep water areas not suitable) <sup>1,2,5</sup> .	Mull & Small Isles IFG when established	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current measures sufficient</li> </ul>
	 Mobile vs Static - Edible crab/scallop: The potential for conflict for space and towing of static gear between edible crab creeling & scallop dredging reported elsewhere on Mull, is low/non-existent in the SoM as there are no suitable edible crab grounds to be fished <sup>2,5</sup> .	Agreement between MAFA and MNWFA; Mull & Small Isles IFG when established	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current measures sufficient</li> </ul>
	 Mobile vs Static - Scallop: The potential for conflict for space/resource between dredging and diving reported elsewhere, is low in the SoM as dredging generally only occurs in bad weather and there is little diving currently occurring <sup>1,2,5</sup>	Mull & Small Isles IFG when established	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current measures sufficient</li> </ul>





SECTOR	INTERACTION WITH INSHORE FISHING	CURRENT MANAGEMENT	FUTURE MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS
<b>Aquaculture</b> Finfish, Shellfish	 Loss of ground/resource when farm established or expanded and presence of important fishing grounds can aquaculture constrain development <sup>1,3</sup>	Pre-application consultation between developer and fishing associations/MAFA or Mull & Small Isles IFG when established; response to Local Authority on development consent (LA consult with FRS who contact associations); consulted by SFPA for navigation on Coast Protection Act Section 34 consent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current measures are sufficient</li> <li>• Although potential for improvement through Sound of Mull aquaculture framework plan</li> </ul>
	 Potential impacts of salmon farming on water quality, seabed habitats and biodiversity <sup>1</sup>	Planning consent (consultation with public & statutory consultees including SNH); SEPA CAR consent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not felt to be an issue in SOM</li> </ul>
	 Creel fishermen targeting areas around edge of farms <sup>1</sup>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current measures sufficient</li> </ul>
<b>Shipping</b> Cargo, Tankers, Ferries	 Potential to compete for space with other vessels <sup>1</sup>	International Regulations for Prevention of Collision at sea, Merchant Shipping Regulations, MCA, AIS tracking for ships over 300GT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current measures sufficient</li> </ul>
	 Potential for shipping lanes to close static gear areas <sup>1</sup>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not felt to be an issue in SOM – no lanes in SOM and no need as not large volumes of traffic like English Channel</li> </ul>
	 Potential for static gear to be placed in shipping/ferry routes routes <sup>5</sup>	Local knowledge of shipping routes and ferry routes and liaison; The Sea Fishing (marking and identification of passive fishing gear and beam trawls) Scotland Order 2006; Glensanda have previously voluntarily offered payouts to vessels that have had static gear towed by their vessels in other areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not felt to be an issue in SOM</li> <li>• Current measures sufficient</li> </ul>

SECTOR	INTERACTION WITH INSHORE FISHING	CURRENT MANAGEMENT	FUTURE MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS
<b>Infrastructure &amp; Anchorages</b> Marinas/harbours, Piers/jetties/pontoons Slipways, Moorings	 Presence of piers, jetties, harbours beneficial and development of non-tidal pier for catch landing would be beneficial <sup>1,5</sup>	Tobermory Harbour Association, Mull Fishermen's Association (Fishermen's Pier), Lochaline, Kilchoan	
	 Potential for other sectors (sailing, ferries) to squeeze out fishing vessels from harbours <sup>1</sup>	Management & liaison with Harbour Association/Authority e.g. fishing representation on the Tobermory Harbour Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current measures sufficient</li> </ul>
	 Loss of ground due to moorings /anchorages <sup>1,3</sup>	Liaison between mooring associations/RYA and fishing sector/ Mull & Small Isles IFG when established, fishing associations consulted by SFPA for navigation on Coast Protection Act Section 34 consent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current measures sufficient</li> </ul>
<b>Cables &amp; Pipelines</b> Electricity & Telecoms	 Potential for mobile gear to get entangled/caught on cables/pipelines <sup>3</sup>	Marked on Admiralty Charts, Fishing Associations consulted at present on new installations	
<b>Natural environment</b> Intertidal, Sea bed Bird areas, Mobile species Coastal habitats, Landscape/seascape	 Potential to damage habitats and associated species. This is of concern where the habitat/species is vulnerable to physical damage and/or of biodiversity interest e.g. maerl, eelgrass beds, horse mussel beds, file shell beds, sea pens <sup>1,3</sup>	None, unless habitat/species/location protected by designation under current legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan could present location of sensitive species and identify areas where sensitive spp and fishing occur i.e. areas that are vulnerable to damage. Voluntary agreements if necessary?</li> </ul>
	 Harvesting of shellfish from intertidal zone has potential to disturb habitats and birds <sup>1</sup>	None, unless habitat/species/location protected by designation under current legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not felt to be an issue in SOM</li> </ul>
	 Current SAC and SPA designations do not currently interfere with fishing grounds as they are terrestrial <sup>2</sup>		

SECTOR	INTERACTION WITH INSHORE FISHING	CURRENT MANAGEMENT	FUTURE MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS
Natural environment Intertidal, Sea bed Bird areas, Mobile species Coastal habitats, Landscape/seascape	 Potential for expansion of current and establishment of new designations to constrain fishing grounds <sup>1,5</sup>	Consultation with fishing sector and when Mull & Small Isles IFG when established	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current measures sufficient</li> </ul>
	 Potential risk of entanglement over shipwreck sites leading to damage to gear and the shipwreck. However, it is noted that it is not in the interests of vessels to fish over/in close proximity to sites due to the risks involved.	Protection of Wrecks Act 1973 certain activities within protected area require licence from Historic Scotland, some wrecks in SoM marked on charts, local fishermen have good knowledge of wreck locations and mapped using OLEX, fishermen coming from outwith area would generally check with local fishermen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mark all to safeguard</li> <li>• Making widely available SOMAP mapping data relating to the extent of known wrecks in the SOM so that fishermen can more accurately target their activities to avoid these sites – such information could usefully be made available not only for local boats, but those visiting from further afield.</li> </ul>
Cultural Heritage Coastal monuments & archaeology, Marine archaeology	 Wrecks provide refuge for species targeted by creelers		
	 Current Protected Wreck designations (2 designated wreck sites) do not interfere with fishing grounds		
	 Potential for expansion of current and establishment of new designations to constrain fishing grounds <sup>1</sup>	Consultation with fishing sector and when Mull & Small Isles IFG when established	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current measures sufficient</li> </ul>

SECTOR	INTERACTION WITH INSHORE FISHING	CURRENT MANAGEMENT	FUTURE MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS
<b>Water quality &amp; Waste Biological/bacterial/chemical quality, Trade effluent, Sewage</b>	<p>■ Potential for poor water quality e.g. high nutrient loading to result in harmful algal blooms and shellfish biotoxin accumulation.</p>	<p>Shellfish tested as an end product - Food Hygiene Regulations 2006 (Food Standards Agency/Local Authority); Environment and Water Services Scotland Act 2003 &amp; River Basin Planning; SEPA CAR consent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current measures sufficient</li> </ul>
	<p>■ Sewage and surface scum can affect creelers handing gear by hand<sup>1</sup></p>	<p>Environment and Water Services Scotland Act 2003 &amp; River Basin Planning; SEPA CAR consent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not felt to be a problem in SOM</li> </ul>
	<p>■ Litter and debris can clog and damage gear<sup>1</sup></p>	<p>The Green Blue(RYA &amp; British Marine Federation); Fishing For Litter (KIMO); Keep Scotland Beautiful &amp; Marine Conservation Society Campaigns; The GRAB Trust Beaches &amp; Marine Litter Project; National Aquatic Litter Group</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not felt to be a problem in SOM</li> <li>• Would welcome and be involved in more litter initiatives for reducing problem at source</li> <li>• An improvement of preventive measures and/or survey to identify the different waste streams of marine litter to help reduction at source.</li> </ul>
	<p>■ Potential for marine litter to originate from vessels<sup>1</sup></p>	<p>Fishing For Litter (KIMO); Merchant Shipping Regulations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would welcome and be involved in more litter initiatives for reducing problem at source</li> <li>• An improvement of preventive measures and/or survey to identify the different waste streams of marine litter to help reduction at source.</li> </ul>

SECTOR	INTERACTION WITH INSHORE FISHING	CURRENT MANAGEMENT	FUTURE MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS
<b>Recreation</b> Sailing, power boats, jet skis, kayaking, sailing, sea angling, diving	 Potential for boats to compete for space with other vessels <sup>1</sup>	International Regulations for Prevention of Collision at sea, UK regulations, MCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current measures sufficient</li> </ul>
	 Potential for powered vessels and jet skis to cause nuisance and safety risk <sup>1</sup>	Local byelaws, Harbour Association management, International Regulations for Prevention of Collision at sea, UK regulations, MCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current measures sufficient</li> </ul>
	 Potential for inexperienced recreational boat users being unaware of marine navigation and safety rules <sup>1,3</sup>	International Regulations for Prevention of Collision at sea, SOLAS V, Merchant Shipping regulations, MCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current measures sufficient</li> </ul>
	 Potential for fishing to deplete stocks of interest to sea anglers – non target species removal, habitat damage <sup>1</sup>	European Common Fisheries Policy quotas, local liaison between common skate taggers and commercial mobile gear vessels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current measures sufficient</li> </ul>
	 Inappropriately buoyed creels can pose a navigation hazard <sup>1</sup>	The Sea Fishing (marking and identification of passive fishing gear and beam trawls) Scotland Order 2006, SFPA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current measures sufficient</li> </ul>
	 Wash from powered vessels can pose a risk to creel boats retrieving gear <sup>1</sup>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not felt to be an issue in SOM</li> </ul>
	 Potential for mobile gear to damage seabed and habitats of interest to divers <sup>1</sup>		
	 Removal of species e.g. scallops via divers, who are now able to target deeper areas through rebreathers and mixed gas diving. Problem of consuming and passing on untested product		

SECTOR	INTERACTION WITH INSHORE FISHING	CURRENT MANAGEMENT	FUTURE MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS
Tourism Wildlife/Scenic Tours	 Opportunities for diversification of fishermen <sup>1</sup>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote marine tourism</li> </ul>
MOD Diving, Submarine exercise areas	 Potential to compete for space with other vessels <sup>1</sup>	International Regulations for Prevention of Collision at sea, Merchant Shipping regulations, MCA, local communications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current measures sufficient</li> </ul>
Marine Renewable Energy	 Loss of ground/resource when site established <sup>1</sup>	Consultation with fishing associations and when Mull & Small Isles IFG when established	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current measures sufficient</li> </ul>
	 Potential during construction/ operation/ decommissioning to affect target species/habitat via change in sediment load, loss of substratum, change in exposure and flow, barriers to species movement <sup>1</sup>	Strategic Environmental Assessment/ Environmental Impact Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current measures sufficient</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Source: SSMEI Clyde Pilot Sectoral Interactions in the Firth of Clyde

<sup>2</sup> Source: GIS maps for Sound of Mull

<sup>3</sup> Source: ICZM Loch Fyne Plan-Draft

<sup>4</sup> Source: Project officer

<sup>5</sup> Source: Discussions with local stakeholders, subgroups and working group