National Parks and Wildlife Service

Conservation Objectives Series

Roaninish SPA 004121



14 Mar 2025 Version 1 Page 1 of 10

National Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage,

90 King Street North, Dublin 7, D07 N7CV, Ireland.

Web: www.npws.ie E-mail: natureconservation@npws.gov.ie

Citation:

NPWS (2025) Conservation Objectives: Roaninish SPA 004121. Version 1. National Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage.

Series Editors: Maria Long and Colin Heaslip
ISSN 2009-4086

14 Mar 2025 Version 1 Page 2 of 10

Introduction

The overall aim of the Habitats Directive is to maintain or restore the favourable conservation status of habitats and species of community interest. These habitats and species are listed in the Habitats and Birds Directives and Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas are designated to afford protection to the most vulnerable of them. These two designations are collectively known as the Natura 2000 network.

European and national legislation places a collective obligation on Ireland and its citizens to maintain habitats and species in the Natura 2000 network at favourable conservation condition. The Government and its agencies are responsible for the implementation and enforcement of regulations that will ensure the ecological integrity of these sites.

A site-specific conservation objective aims to define favourable conservation condition for a particular habitat or species at that site.

The maintenance of habitats and species within Natura 2000 sites at favourable conservation condition will contribute to the overall maintenance of favourable conservation status of those habitats and species at a national level.

Favourable conservation status of a habitat is achieved when:

- its natural range, and area it covers within that range, are stable or increasing, and
- the specific structure and functions which are necessary for its long-term maintenance exist and are likely to continue to exist for the foreseeable future, and
- the conservation status of its typical species is favourable.

The favourable conservation status of a species is achieved when:

- population dynamics data on the species concerned indicate that it is maintaining itself on a long-term basis as a viable component of its natural habitats, and
- the natural range of the species is neither being reduced nor is likely to be reduced for the foreseeable future, and
- there is, and will probably continue to be, a sufficiently large habitat to maintain its populations on a long-term basis.

Notes/Guidelines:

- 1. The targets given in these conservation objectives are based on best available information at the time of writing. As more information becomes available, targets for attributes may change. These will be updated periodically, as necessary.
- 2. An appropriate assessment based on these conservation objectives will remain valid even if the targets are subsequently updated, providing they were the most recent objectives available when the assessment was carried out. It is essential that the date and version are included when objectives are cited.
- 3. Assessments cannot consider an attribute in isolation from the others listed for that habitat or species, or for other habitats and species listed for that site. A plan or project with an apparently small impact on one attribute may have a significant impact on another.
- 4. Please note that the maps included in this document do not necessarily show the entire extent of the habitats and species for which the site is listed. This should be borne in mind when appropriate assessments are being carried out.
- 5. When using these objectives, it is essential that the relevant backing/supporting documents are consulted, particularly where instructed in the targets or notes for a particular attribute.

14 Mar 2025 Version 1 Page 3 of 10

Qualifying Interests

* indicates a priority habitat under the Habitats Directive

004121 Roaninish SPA

A045 Barnacle Goose *Branta leucopsis* A184 Herring Gull *Larus argentatus*

14 Mar 2025 Version 1 Page 4 of 10

Supporting documents, relevant reports & publications

Supporting documents, NPWS reports and publications are available for download from: www.npws.ie/Publications

NPWS Documents

Year: 2013

Title: A review of the SPA network of sites in the Republic of Ireland

Author: NPWS

Series: Published Report

Year: 2019

Title: Irish wetland bird survey: waterbird status and distribution 2009/10-2015/16

Author: Lewis, L.J.; Burke, B.; Fitzgerald, N.; Tierney, T.D.; Kelly, S.

Series: Irish Wildlife Manuals No. 106

Year: 2021

Title: Estimated foraging ranges of the breeding seabirds of Ireland's marine special protected area

networl

Author: Power, A.; McDonnell, P.; Tierney, T.D.

Series: Published NPWS report

Other References

Year: 1973

Title: Population Dynamics of Barnacle Geese, Branta leucopsis, in Ireland

Author: Cabot, D.

Series: Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy. Section B: Biological, Geological, and Chemical

Science, 73, 415-443

Year: 1991

Title: The status of seabirds in Britain and Ireland

Author: Lloyd, C.; Tasker, M.L.; Partridge, K.

Series: Poyser Monographs Volume: 50

Year: 1995

Title: Impacts of hunting disturbance on waterbirds - a review

Author: Madsen, J.; Fox, A.D.

Series: Wildlife Biology 1(4):193-207

Year: 1999

Title: Managing grassland for wild geese in Britain: a review

Author: Vickery, J.; Gill, J.

Series: Biological Conservation, 89(1), pp.93-106

Year: 2003

Title: Implications for seaward extensions to existing breeding seabird colony Special Protection

Areas

Author: McSorley, C.A.; Dean, B.J.; Webb, A.; Reid J.B.

Series: JNCC Report No. 329

Year: 2004

Title: Seabird populations of Britain and Ireland

Author: Mitchell, P.I.; Newton, S.F.; Ratcliffe, N.; Dunn, T.E.

Series: Poyser, London

14 Mar 2025 Version 1 Page 5 of 10

Year: 2010

Title: How Representative is the Current Monitoring of Breeding Seabirds in the UK?

Author: Cook, A.S.C.P.; Robinson, R.A.

Series: BTO Research Report No. 573

Year: 2019

Title: Desk-based revision of seabird foraging ranges used for HRA screening

Author: Woodward, I.; Thaxter, C.B.; Owen, E.; Cook, A.S.C.P.

Series: BTO Research Report No. 724

Year: 2019

Title: Report under Article 12 of the Birds Directive Period 2013-2018

Author: EEA

Series: European Environment Agency. European Topic Centre on Biological Diversity. Pp 1-9.

https://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/Converters/run_conversion?

 $file = ie/eu/art12/envxztxxq/IE_birds_reports_20191031-130157.xml\&conv = 612\&source = remote$

Year: 2020

Title: Herring Gull (Larus argentatus), version 1.0. In Birds of the World (S. M. Billerman, Editor)

Author: Weseloh, D. V.; Hebert, C. E.; Mallory, M. L.; Poole, A. F.; Ellis, J. C.; Pyle, P.; Patten, M. A.

Series: Cornell Lab of Ornithology, Ithaca, NY, USA

Year: 2023

Title: Seabirds Count: a census of breeding seabirds in Britain and Ireland (2015-2021)

Author: Burnell, D.; Perkins, A.J.; Newton, S.F.; Bolton, M.; Tierney, T.D.; Dunn, T.E.

Series: Lynx Nature Books, Barcelona

Year: 2023

Title: Home range of a long-distance migrant, the Greenland Barnacle Goose *Branta leucopsis*,

throughout the annual cycle

Author: Doyle, S.; Cabot, D.; Griffin, L.; Kane, A.; Colhoun, K.; Redmond, C.; Walsh, A.; McMahon, B.J.

Series: Bird Study, 70(1-2), pp.37-46

14 Mar 2025 Version 1 Page 6 of 10

Conservation Objectives for: Roaninish SPA [004121]

A045 Barnacle Goose Branta leucopsis

To restore the Favourable conservation condition of Barnacle Goose in Roaninish SPA which is defined by the following list of attributes and targets:

| Attribute | Measure | Target | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|
| Winter population trend | Percentage change in number of individuals | Long term winter population trend is stable or increasing | The national population of wintering Barnacle Goose in Ireland has increased by 102% from 1993 - 2018 (Lewis et al., 2019) as monitored by the International Census of Greenland Barnacle Goose. During the baseline assessments to inform SPA designation, a population of 362 Barnacle Goose were estimated to be using Roaninish SPA and Inishkeel SPA (sum of 4 year mean of census counts for baseline period 1993 - 2003 for each SPA; see NPWS, 2013). More recent data showed a population of 335 Barnacle Goose used Roaninish SPA and Inishkeel SPA during the period 2018/19 - 2022/23 (4 year mean of peak winter counts across both Inishkeel and Roaninish; no data for winter 2021/22; NPWS internal files). This represents a population decrease of 8% since the baseline period in contrast to the national trend |
| Winter spatial distribution | Hectares, time and intensity of use | Sufficient number of locations, area, and availability (in terms of timing and intensity of use) of suitable habitat to support the population target | Distribution encapsulates the number of locations and area of potentially suitable habitat for the wintering population and its availability for use. The suitability and availability of habitat areas are likely to vary throughout the season, for example, due to variation in land management practices or the abundance of resources available (due to natural variation and other factors). This will affect the spatio-temporal patterns of use of the habitats by the wintering population |
| Disturbance at wintering site | Intensity, frequency, timing and duration | Disturbance occurs at levels that do not significantly impact the achievement of targets for population trend and spatial distribution | The impact of any significant disturbance (direct or indirect) to the wintering population will ultimately affect the achievement of targets for population trend and/or spatial distribution. Disturbance contributes to increased energetic expenditure which can result in increased likelihood of winter mortality or reduced fitness (if energy expenditure is greater than energy gain) and, in turn, negatively impact population trends (see, for example, Madsen and Fox, 1995). Factors such as intensity, frequency, timing and duration of a (direct or indirect) disturbance source must be taken into account to determine the potential impact upon the targets for population trend and spatial distribution |
| Barriers to connectivity and site use | | | Barriers limiting the population's access to this SPA or ecologically important sites outside the SPA will ultimately affect the achievement of targets for population trend and/or spatial distribution. Factors such as the number, location, shape and area of potential barriers must be taken into account to determine their potential impact. Access to ecologically important sites outside the SPA must also be considered as a single SPA may not satisfy all the ecological requirements of the wintering population, and it may require access to other SPAs or sites for certain activities, such as foraging when preferred foraging areas are unavailable due to disturbance, extensive flooding, or other factors |

14 Mar 2025 Version 1 Page 7 of 10

| Forage spatial distribution, extent and abundance | Location, hectares, and forage biomass | Sufficient number of locations, area of suitable habitat and available forage biomass to support the population target | This species is a grazing herbivore. Historically, in Ireland, foraging habitat included salt marsh, but currently the species is typically associated with open coastal pasture, mostly improved and semi-improved agricultural grasslands. Barnacle Goose grazes on leaves, stems, rhizomes, roots and seeds, with grass and <i>Plantago/Bellis/Festuca</i> swards comprising preferred food sources (Cabot, 1973). This species selects a preferred sward height of <10cm but birds can feed on swards >15cm if preferred areas are depleted (based on birds in Islay, see Vickery and Gill, 1999). Birds are highly likely to exhibit foraging site fidelity and may be found foraging on offshore islands as well as commuting to forage on the mainland. Maximum foraging distance is approximately 7km for wintering birds (Doyle et al., 2023) |
|---|---|--|--|
| Roost spatial distribution and extent | Location and hectares of roosting habitat | Sufficient number of locations, area and availability of suitable roosting habitat to support the population target | Roosting is a critical ecological requirement for the wintering population. When roosting, this species uses open habitats (primarily pastures) that provide wide sightlines for the birds and which are typically adjacent to water bodies; thus, offshore islands are commonly used. Birds exhibit strong roost site fidelity (Doyle et al., 2023). Daytime roosting is also a common behaviour, where birds minimise activity levels to conserve energy, while benefitting from the vigilance of other flock members. A lack of sufficient and suitable roosting habitats can result in increased mortality risk, whether indirectly (e.g. via increased energy expenditure travelling to/from roost sites) or directly (e.g. via increased predation risk), or reduction in site use; this would ultimately affect the achievement of targets for population trend and/or spatial distribution |
| Supporting habitat: area and quality | Hectares and quality | Sufficient area of utilisable habitat available in ecologically important sites outside the SPA | The wintering population can make extensive use of suitable habitats in important areas outside the SPA for foraging and roosting. The extent, availability and quality of these supporting habitats may be of importance for the resilience of the SPA population. Suitable supporting habitats include those highlighted in the attributes for foraging and roosting habitat |

14 Mar 2025 Version 1 Page 8 of 10

Conservation Objectives for: Roaninish SPA [004121]

A184 Herring Gull *Larus argentatus*

To restore the Favourable conservation condition of Herring Gull in Roaninish SPA, which is defined by the following list of attributes and targets:

| Attribute | Measure | Target | Notes |
|---|--|--|--|
| Breeding population size | Number of Apparently Occupied Nests (AON) | Long term SPA population trend is stable or increasing | The Herring Gull population in the SPA has been regularly surveyed since 1986 when a minimum of 250 pairs were estimated to be breeding there (Lloyd et al., 1991). From then until 2012 the population ranged between an estimated 125 and 363 pairs (NPWS internal files). The population peaked in 2013 with an estimated population of ove 400 pairs (NPWS internal files). Surveys in 2014 and 2016 yielded over 300 pairs (Burnell et al., 2023; NPWS internal files). Between 2000 and 2016 the population of Herring Gull was relatively stable at this site and had increased by 24%, in the same period the national population of natural-nesting Herring Gull increased by 94% (Burnell et al., 2023) However, in 2018 the SPA population declined markedly to 103 pairs and further declined to 54 pairs in 2022. The most recent population estimate of 41 pairs in 2023 is the lowest recorded at the SPA which indicates a significant population collapse, a decrease of 85% since 2000 |
| Productivity rate | Number of fledged young per breeding pair | Sufficient to maintain a stable or increasing population | There was no productivity data available for this species in this SPA. Cook and Robinson (2010) undertook Population Viability Analyses (PVA) of a selection of breeding populations in the UK. Over their study period, Herring Gull productivity at monitored nests was 0.75. Were this level to be maintained, Herring Gull populations would decline by 60% over 25 years. For the population to stabilise, breeding success would have to increase to 1.3 - 1.5 chicks per nest per year. A lack of comprehensive Irish data precludes the identification of a minimum productivity rate for this species at the site and at the national level |
| Distribution: extent of available nesting options within the SPA | Numbers and spatial distribution | Sufficient availability of suitable nesting sites throughout the SPA to maintain a stable or increasing population | Distribution encapsulates the number of locations and area of potentially suitable nesting habitat for the breeding population and its availability for use. The suitability and availability of habitat areas may vary through time. This will affect the spatiotemporal patterns of use of the habitats by Herring Gull. Typically, coastal Herring Gull colonies are located along rocky coastlines with cliffs, islets and offshore islands (Mitchell et al., 2004). The SPA comprises of a tight group of small, flat, low-lying, uninhabited islets surrounded by extensive intertida rocks, situated in Gweebarra Bay. The species typically nest on the east side of the main island |
| Forage spatial distribution, extent, abundance and availability | Location, hectares, and forage biomass | Sufficient number of locations, area of suitable habitat and available forage biomass to support the population target | Herring Gull is a generalist and opportunistic feeder and can forage over both terrestrial and aquatic habitats. Its diet includes fish, fish offal, bivalves, gastropods, crustaceans, squid, insects, other seabirds, small land birds, small mammals, terrestrial insects, earthworms, berries, carrion, and a wide variety of human refuse (Weseloh et al., 2020). Woodward et al. (2019) reviewed the foraging ranges of seabird species from over 300 studies including: direct tracking of birds; estimates based on flight speeds and time activity; survey observations; and speculative estimates. Woodward et al. (2019) provide estimates (i.e. overall mean, mean of maximum distances across all studies, and maximum distance recorded) of Herring Gull foraging ranges from the nest site during the breeding season, which are 15km, 59km, and 92km respectively (see Power et al., 2021) |

14 Mar 2025 Version 1 Page 9 of 10

| Disturbance at the breeding site | Intensity, frequency, timing and duration | Disturbance occurs at levels that do not significantly impact on birds at the breeding site | Disturbance events at the nest site/breeding colony level can result in a reduction of overall productivity and even lead to the abandonment of the breeding colony. The impact of any significant disturbance (direct or indirect) to the breeding population will ultimately affect the achievement of targets for population size and/or spatial distribution. Disturbance contributes to increased energetic expenditure, which can result in increased likelihood of mortality or reduced fitness (if energy expenditure is greater than energy gain) and, in turn, negatively impact population trends. Factors such as intensity, frequency, timing, and duration of a (direct or indirect) disturbance source must be taken into account to determine the potential impact upon the targets for population size and spatial distribution |
|---|--|---|---|
| Disturbance at areas ecologically connected to the colony | Intensity, frequency, timing and duration | Disturbance occurs at levels that do not significantly impact on breeding population | Seabird species can make extensive use of the marine waters adjacent to their breeding colonies for non site-specific maintenance behaviours (e.g. courtship, bathing, preening), as defined in McSorley et al. (2003). Additionally, some species may engage in maintenance behaviours outside of the breeding colony but not in the water |
| Barriers to connectivity | Number, location, shape, and area (ha) | Barriers do not significantly impact the population's access to the SPA or other ecologically important sites outside the SPA | require regular and efficient access to marine waters ecologically connected to the colony in order to |

14 Mar 2025 Version 1 Page 10 of 10

