# **National Parks and Wildlife Service**

# **Conservation Objectives Series**

## Galley Head to Duneen Point SPA 004190



21 Feb 2025 Version 1 Page 1 of 8

### 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: Galley Head to Duneen Point SPA 004190. Version 1. National Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage.

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

### 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.

21 Feb 2025 Version 1 Page 3 of 8

### **Qualifying Interests**

\* indicates a priority habitat under the Habitats Directive

004190 Galley Head to Duneen Point SPA

A346 Chough Pyrrhocorax pyrrhocorax

21 Feb 2025 Version 1 Page 4 of 8

### Supporting documents, relevant reports & publications

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

#### **NPWS Documents**

**Year**: 2010

Title: The seasonal distribution and foraging behaviour of Red-billed Choughs *Pyrrhocorax* 

pyrrhocorax in Counties Waterford and Cork, February 2008 to January 2009

Author: Trewby, M.; Carroll; D.; Mugan, N.; O'Keeffe, D.; Newton, S.

Series: Unpublished BirdWatch Ireland Report to National Parks & Wildlife Service

Year: 2024

Title: Status and distribution of Chough in Ireland: results of the 2021 survey

Author: Colhoun, K.; Rooney, E.; Collins, J.; Keogh, N.P.; Lauder, A.; Heardman, C.; Cummins, S.

Series: Irish Wildlife Manuals No. 151

#### **Other References**

**Year:** 1965

Title: The status of the Chough in Ireland

Author: Cabot, D.

Series: Irish Naturalists' Journal 15: 95-100

Year: 1983

Title: The chough in Britain and Ireland

Author: Bullock, I., Drewett, D.; Mickleburg, S.

Series: British Birds, 76: 377–401

Year: 1993

Title: The second international chough survey in Ireland, 1992

Author: Berrow, S.D.; Mackie, K.L.; O'Sullivan, O.; Shepherd, K.B.; Mellon, C.; Coveney, J.A.

Series: Irish Birds, 5: 1-10

Year: 1993

Title: Seasonal variations in numbers and levels of activity in a communal roost of Choughs

Pyrrhocorax pyrrhocorax in central Spain

Author: Blanco, G.; Fargallo, J.A.; Cuevas, J.A.

Series: Avocetta, 17: 41-44

Year: 2003

Title: The status and distribution of choughs Pyrrhocorax pyrrhocorax in the Republic of Ireland

2002/03

Author: Gray, N., Thomas, G., Trewby, M.; Newton, S.F.

Series: Irish Birds, 7, 147-156

Year: 2005

Title: Choughs Pyrrhocorax pyrrhocorax breeding in Wales select foraging habitat at different spatial

scales

Author: Whitehead, S.; Johnstone, I.; Wilson, J.

**Series**: Bird Study, 52:2, 193-203

Year: 2006

Title: The breeding season foraging behaviour of choughs Pyrrhocorax pyrrhocorax in three Irish

chough important bird areas

Author: Trewby, M., Gray, N., Cummins, S., Thomas, G. & Newton, S.

Series: Unpublished BirdWatch Ireland Report, Kilcoole, Wicklow

 Year: 2006

Title: Linking territory quality and reproductive success in the chough (Pyrrhocorax pyrrhocorax):

implications for conservation management of an endangered population

Author: Kerbiriou, C.; Gourmelon, F.; Jiguet, F.; Le Viol, I.; Frédéric Bioret, F.; Julliard, R.

**Series**: Ibis, 148 (2), pp.352-364

Year: 2011

Title: Aspects of the feeding ecology and breeding biology of the red-billed chough (Pyrrhocorax

pyrrhocorax) in Ireland

Author: Boylan, M.

Series: PhD Thesis, National University of Ireland, Cork.

Year: 2018

Title: Breeding status of red-billed choughs Pyrrhocorax pyrrhocorax in the UK and Isle of Man in

2014

Author: Hayhow, D.B.; Johnstone, I.; Moore, A.S.; Mucklow, C.; Stratford, A.; Šúr, M.; Eaton, M.A.

**Series :** Bird Study, 65(4), 458-470

Year: 2019

Title: Adverse effects of routine bovine health treatments containing triclabendazole and synthetic

pyrethroids on the abundance of dipteran larvae in bovine faeces

Author: Gilbert, G.; MacGillivray, F.S.; Robertson, H.L.; Jonsson, N.N.

Series: Nature Scientific Reports 9, 4315

Year: 2022

Title: Chough Pyrrhocorax pyrrhocorax counts at a Waterford coastal roost

Author: McGrath, D.

Series: Irish Birds 44: 103-107

21 Feb 2025 Version 1 Page 6 of 8

### Conservation Objectives for : Galley Head to Duneen Point SPA [004190]

### A346 Chough *Pyrrhocorax pyrrhocorax*

## To maintain the Favourable conservation condition of Chough in Galley Head to Duneen Point SPA, which is defined by the following list of attributes and targets:

Attribute	Measure	Target	Notes
Population size	Number of breeding pairs	No significant decline	A review of 1992 and 2002/03 national survey data, including count units and survey methods applied, was undertaken (NPWS internal files). The range of population estimates for the SPA are set out using 'confirmed and probable' breeding pairs only and 'al breeding pair' categories for each national survey since 1992, with 7 - 11 in 1992; 2 - 11 in 2002/03 and 7 - 8 in 2021. Applying stricter 2021 survey criteria (Hayhow et al., 2018; Colhoun et al., 2024) retrospectively to 1992 and 2002/03 records, which exclude records with no breeding evidence (NBE) as per Colhoun et al. (2024), updates these original estimates to 0 - 10 (1992), 2 - 8 pairs (2002/03), and 7 - 8 pairs (2021). Of note, Trewby et al. (2010 estimated 11 - 14 pairs for the SPA in 2008/09 with more intensive survey effort through the annual cycle
Population trend	Percentage change	Population trend stable or increasing	The breeding component of the population, as opposed to non-breeding flock birds, is considered a more reliable metric to reflect population change (Trewby et al., 2006). Using available data from the 1992 (Berrow et al., 1993), 2002/03 (Gray et al., 2003) and 2021 (Colhoun et al., 2024) national surveys, the population trend for the site is considered stable in the short term (i.e. 2002/03 - 2021) and stable in the longer term (1992 - 2021) based on assessments of change in the numbers of known 'confirmed' and 'probable' pair records only; and including all 'possible' breeding pair records for the site, applying 2021 criteria (Colhoun et al., 2024). For the county, the population is broadly stable, with pair totals of 73 - 98 in 1963 (Cabot, 1965); 148 - 153 in 1983 (Bullock et al., 1983); 282 in 1992 (Berrow et al., 1993); 257 in 2002/03 (Gray et al., 2003); and 228 (excluding NBEs) in 2021 (Colhoun et al., 2024)
Productivity rate	Number of fledged young per confirmed pair	Sufficient to maintain population size target	Most of the population nest along coastal cliffs or in sea caves. In most instances, due to the inaccessible nature of nesting locations, estimates of breeding productivity and success are based on numbers of fledged young seen with adults post-fledging, unless records are for man-made/artificial sites e.g. cattle sheds, old buildings and castles etc. Some studies have provided estimates of productivity and/or success, (e.g. Berrow et al., 1993; Gray et al., 2003 Boylan, 2011; Trewby et al., 2006), and for this SPA combined with the local Seven Heads SPA (Co. Cork), a figure of 1.62 fledglings in 2009 per successful pair was estimated by Trewby et al. (2010), using data from 13 breeding pairs. Howeve this estimate is based on one year's data, and may not be sufficiently representative for the SPA, and wider. Overall, there is a lack of robust representative Irish data to determine a more quantitative target for breeding productivity

 Foraging habitat: Hectares (ha) Maintain sufficient quality Studies in Ireland (e.g. Trewby et al., 2006), Wales (e.g. Whitehead et al., 2005) and elsewhere (e.g. quality and and quantity of coastal quantity grassland and other Kerbiriou et al., 2006) have shown that breeding relevant habitats to Chough spend most of their time foraging near nest sites (April - June inclusive). Coastal pairs tend to support the population of Chough at the level of commute along the coast from breeding sites, rather than inland (Trewby et al., 2006). Proximity of breeding pairs referred to in the attribute above suitably-sized feeding areas to nest sites is likely to positively support breeding success (Kerbiriou et al., 2006). Monthly transects for SPAs in Co. Cork had 60% of ground observations within 300m of mean high water (Trewby et al., 2010). Grazed habitats with short swards of <5cm are typically preferred, and areas of bare ground, where soils are easier to probe e.g. paths, along with earth banks and stone banks. Maritime vegetation on cliffs, especially in spring, is also favoured. Thus, sufficient foraging habitat within 350m of the coastline, where Chough are known to breed, is essential to support breeding Food availability: Quantity per unit area Maintain adequate levels of Chough feed largely on invertebrates (e.g. ants, prey biomass prey biomass (including spiders, worms, insect larvae such as crane fly preferred invertebrate prey larvae, leatherjackets and dung beetles), at or near items such as the soil surface where prey items are more leatherjackets, dung accessible. In warmer weather, Chough can be seen picking off surface active insects, e.g. spiders, beetles, etc.) including from heather plants (Trewby et al., 2010). The dosing of livestock with veterinary parasiticide treatments (including anthelmintics) has knock-on consequences with respect to invertebrate density in grasslands on which Chough depend (Gilbert et al., 2019) Distribution of Spatial distribution The distribution of Post-breeding, Chough are highly social, forming mobile flocks that can travel several kilometres to roosting sites preferred roosts is feed (McGrath, 2022). Family groups form 'nursery' maintained flocks in July, returning to nest sites to roost. By late summer, these flocks, along with non-breeding subadults, begin to converge pre-dusk at communal roost sites, departing post-dawn (Trewby et al., 2010; Blanco et al., 1993). Roosts are usually near good foraging habitats, like grazed dune systems, with peak attendance in late summer or early autumn, post-breeding. The largest communal roost identified near this SPA, and of note nationally, is at the Old Head of Kinsale, with a maximum of 73 birds recorded in July 2008 (Trewby et al., 2010), and over 100 birds observed in some years. In this SPA, Galley Head and Keameen/Ringlea Point attracted birds prior to roost before they dispersed over a wide area to roost (Trewby et al., 2010) Factors such as intensity, frequency, timing, Disturbance Intensity, timing, Disturbance occurs at duration of a (direct or indirect) disturbance source frequency and duration levels that do not significantly impact upon and location (e.g. if access to preferred food sources Chough in the SPA is restricted), must be taken into account to determine the potential impact upon the targets for population size, population trend, productivity rate and distribution of roosting sites. Further, site fidelity (e.g. pairs to nest sites while breeding, or flocks to roost sites at other times), weather (e.g. prolonged cold spells) and predation/competition should also be factored in. Coastal breeding pairs spend up to 80% of their time within 350m of the nest site (Trewby et al., 2006). In Co. Cork, 60% of all foraging observations were within 300m of mean high water (Trewby et al., 2010). Impacts are likely to be highest near nest sites (e.g. on coastal cliffs where available foraging habitats are more limited in total area) and at roost sites

21 Feb 2025 Version 1 Page 8 of 8

