

## Site 26 – Lough Nagreaney to Gortnatraw

### Site description

The area of sand dunes at Lough Nagreaney is located in a valley between two rocky outcrops on the Fanad Peninsula and is designated as Lough Nagreaney Dunes SAC (SAC 000164). All the sub-sites are within the SAC boundary.

Based on the currently available mapping, seven coastal Annex I habitats occur within Horn Head and Rinclevan SAC and all are listed as Qualifying Interests (*Table 1*).

*Table 1. Annex I habitats present at Lough Nagreaney Dunes SAC, the area they occupy (based on the most recent mapped available) and status as a Qualifying Interest of the SAC. An asterisk denotes a priority Annex I habitat and habitats that were not the target of this survey are excluded.*

| Habitat Code                    | Area (ha) | Qualifying Interest? |
|---------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|
| 2110 Embryonic shifting dunes   | 0.707     | Yes                  |
| 2120 Marram dunes (white dunes) | 1.737     | Yes                  |
| *2130 Fixed dunes (grey dunes)  | 35.447    | Yes                  |
| *2150 Decalcified dune heath    | 0.003     | Yes                  |
| 2170 Dunes with creeping willow | 4.522     | Yes                  |
| 2190 Humid dune slacks          | 1.514     | Yes                  |
| *21A0 Machairs                  | 28.676    | Yes                  |

The site is accessed through private farmland, with no car-park associated with it, so it is relatively undisturbed by visitors. The majority of the sand dune system is managed as farmland and some agricultural improvement has taken place.

No habitat losses were recorded.

Conservation assessments were carried out within one sub-site occupying a total area of 53.17 ha (*Table 2*). Two habitats (**2110 Embryonic shifting dunes** and **2120 Marram dunes (white dunes)**) were in Favourable condition and the remainder were in Unfavourable condition, mainly due to overgrazing and offroad driving.

*Table 2: Summary of Conservation Status for all habitats assessed at Lough Nagreaney to Gortnatraw.*

| Subsite               | Habitat | Area                | Structure and Functions                | Future Prospects          | Overall assessment                       |
|-----------------------|---------|---------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| 26.01 Lough Nagreaney | 2110    | Favourable (Stable) | Favourable (Stable)                    | Favourable                | Favourable (Stable)                      |
| 26.01 Lough Nagreaney | 2120    | Favourable (Stable) | Favourable (Stable)                    | Favourable                | Favourable (Stable)                      |
| 26.01 Lough Nagreaney | *2130   | Favourable (Stable) | Unfavourable - Inadequate (Stable)     | Unfavourable - Inadequate | Unfavourable -Inadequate (Stable)        |
| 26.01 Lough Nagreaney | 2170    | Favourable (Stable) | Unfavourable - Inadequate (Decreasing) | Unfavourable-Inadequate   | Unfavourable -Inadequate (Deteriorating) |
| 26.01 Lough Nagreaney | 2190    | Favourable (Stable) | Unfavourable - Inadequate (Stable)     | Favourable                | Unfavourable -Inadequate (Stable)        |
| 26.01 Lough Nagreaney | *21A0   | Favourable (Stable) | Unfavourable - Inadequate (Stable)     | Unfavourable - Inadequate | Unfavourable -Inadequate (Stable)        |

## Sub-site 1. Lough Nagreaney

### Summary Information

**Survey Date:** 02 July 2022

**Water Framework Directive Waterbody:** not applicable

**Previous survey identifiers:** CMP169

### Current survey details:

*Table 3: Current survey details for Annex I habitats at Lough Nagreaney*

| Habitat Code                    | Area  | Monitoring stops |
|---------------------------------|-------|------------------|
| 2110 Embryonic shifting dunes   | 0.707 | 4                |
| 2120 Marram dunes (white dunes) | 0.704 | 5                |
| *2130 Fixed dunes (grey dunes)  | 9.127 | 8                |
| 2170 Dunes with creeping willow | 1.962 | 8                |
| 2190 Humid dune slacks          | 0.751 | 4                |
| *21A0 Machairs                  | 8.582 | 8                |

### 2110 Embryonic shifting dunes

#### Area

The habitat has increased from 0.61 ha to 0.71 ha since SDM. This increase is due to natural processes of deposition. This is consistent with an Area assessment of Favourable and the trend is stable.

#### Structure and Functions

No criteria failed the Structure and Functions assessment: the Structure and Functions were therefore assessed as Favourable. Since **2110 Embryonic shifting dunes** was assessed as Favourable during SDM, the trend is therefore stable.

#### Future Prospects

Walking was recorded as a low-intensity neutral impact, affecting 10% of the habitat. Future Prospects were therefore assessed as Favourable, and the trend was assessed as stable.

#### Conservation assessment

The conservation status assessments of the three parameters are as follows:

- Area: Favourable (stable)
- Structure and Functions: Favourable (stable)
- Future Prospects: Favourable (stable)

Since all three parameters were assessed as Favourable, the overall conservation assessment for **2110 Embryonic shifting dunes** at 26.01 Lough Nagreaney was Favourable and the trend is stable.

**Overall Conservation Status:** Favourable (stable)

#### Condition of the habitat by area

100% of the habitat was considered to be in good condition.

## 2120 Marram dunes (white dunes)

### Area

The area of **2120 Marram dunes (white dunes)** decreased from 1.05 ha to 0.70 ha since SDM. This was mainly due to natural succession and there was no sign of anthropogenic causes. This is consistent with an Area assessment of Favourable and the trend is stable.

### Structure and Functions

No criteria failed in the Structure and Functions assessment: the Structure and Functions were therefore assessed as Favourable. Since **2120 Marram dunes (white dunes)** was assessed as Favourable during SDM, the trend is therefore stable.

### Future Prospects

Walking was recorded as a low-intensity neutral impact, affecting 4% of the habitat. Future Prospects were therefore assessed as Favourable, and the trend was assessed as stable.

### Conservation assessment

The conservation status assessments of the three parameters are as follows:

- Area: Favourable (stable)
- Structure and Functions: Favourable (stable)
- Future Prospects: Favourable (stable)

Since all three parameters were assessed as Favourable, the overall conservation assessment for **2120 Marram dunes (white dunes)** at 26.01 Lough Nagreaney was Favourable and the trend is stable.

**Overall Conservation Status:** Favourable (stable)

### Condition of the habitat by area

100% of the habitat was considered to be in good condition.

## \*2130 Fixed dunes (grey dunes)

### Area

The area of **\*2130 Fixed dunes (grey dunes)** increased from 8.72 ha to 9.13 ha between SDM and CHNW21. This increase was the result of a natural succession between **2120 Marram dunes (white dunes)** and **\*2130 Fixed dunes (grey dunes)**. This is consistent with an Area assessment of Favourable. Given that during SDM this assessment was Favourable, the trend of the area is therefore stable.

### Structure and Functions

Only the criterion related to the height of vegetation failed in the Structure and Functions assessment. In fact, an average height between 2 and 10 cm was recorded in 0% of stops, while the threshold is 30-70%. As this criterion failed, the Structure and Functions were Unfavourable - Inadequate. The Structure and Functions was assessed Unfavourable - Inadequate during SDM, the trend is therefore stable.

### Future Prospects

High-intensity negative impacts recorded at Lough Nagreaney included overgrazing and off-road driving that affected about 20% of the habitat area, while lack of grazing, recorded over 50% of the habitat, was a neutral impact and non-intensive grazing was recorded over 30% with a positive influence. Due to the above-mentioned negative impacts, Future Prospects were therefore assessed as Unfavourable - Inadequate, and the trend was assessed as stable.

### Conservation assessment

The conservation status assessments of the three parameters are as follows:

- Area: Favourable (stable)
- Structure and Functions: Unfavourable - Inadequate (stable)

- Future Prospects: Unfavourable - Inadequate (stable)

Although Area was assessed as Favourable, Structure and Functions and Future Prospects were assessed as Unfavourable - Inadequate, so the overall conservation assessment for **\*2130 Fixed dunes (grey dunes)** at 26.01 Lough Nagreaney was Unfavourable - Inadequate. Since the overall assessment was Unfavourable - Inadequate (deteriorating) during SDM, the trend is therefore stable.

**Overall Conservation Status:** Unfavourable - Inadequate (stable)

#### Condition of the habitat by area

Given that about 20% of the habitat area was affected by overgrazing that lead to fail Structure and Functions, this area was considered to be in poor condition. The remaining 80% of the habitat was considered to be in good condition.

### 2170 Dunes with creeping willow

#### Area

The area of **2170 Dunes with creeping willow** increased from 1.83 ha to 1.96 ha between SDM and CHNW21. There was no indication of change due to human activities. This increase was the result of a different and better mapping technique. This is consistent with an Area assessment of Favourable and the trend is stable.

#### Structure and Functions

One criterion failed in the Structure and Functions assessment: trees and scrub were present at 75% of stops, while the threshold is less than 40% of stops. As this criterion failed, the Structure and Functions were Unfavourable - Inadequate. The Structure and Functions were assessed as Favourable during SDM, the trend is therefore decreasing.

#### Future Prospects

Medium-intensity negative impacts recorded at Lough Nagreaney included overgrazing and off-road driving that affected about 2% of the habitat area, while non-intensive grazing was recorded over 50% of the habitat with a positive influence. Due to the above-mentioned negative impacts, Future Prospects were therefore assessed as Unfavourable - Inadequate, and the trend was assessed as decreasing.

#### Conservation assessment

The conservation status assessments of the three parameters are as follows:

- Area: Favourable (stable)
- Structure and Functions: Unfavourable - Inadequate (decreasing)
- Future Prospects: Unfavourable - Inadequate (decreasing)

Since two of the three parameters were assessed as Unfavourable - Inadequate, the overall conservation assessment for **2170 Dunes with creeping willow** at 26.01 Lough Nagreaney was Unfavourable - Inadequate. Since the overall assessment was Favourable during SDM, the trend is therefore deteriorating.

**Overall Conservation Status:** Unfavourable - Inadequate (deteriorating)

#### Condition of the habitat by area

The failure of one criterion concerning Structure and Functions assessment was observed in 25% of the habitat area, so this area was considered to be in poor condition. The remaining 75% of the habitat was considered to be in good condition.

## 2190 Humid dune slacks

### Area

The area of **2190 Humid dune slacks** increased from 0.72 ha to 0.75 ha between SDM and CHNW21. This increase was the result of a different and better mapping technique. This is consistent with an Area assessment of Favourable and the trend is stable.

### Structure and Functions

One criterion failed during the Structure and Functions assessment: scrub was present in all stops, while it should be present in no more than 40% of stops. The Structure and Functions were therefore assessed as Unfavourable - Inadequate and the trend is stable.

### Future Prospects

Medium-intensity negative impacts recorded at Lough Nagreaney included off-road driving that affected only 0.5% of the habitat area. On the other hand non-intensive grazing was recorded over 100% of the habitat with a low-intensity positive influence. Due to this, Future Prospects were therefore assessed as Favourable, and the trend was assessed as stable because the previous assessment was also Favourable.

### Conservation assessment

The conservation status assessments of the three parameters are as follows:

- Area: Favourable (stable)
- Structure and Functions: Unfavourable - Inadequate (stable)
- Future Prospects: Favourable (stable)

Since one of the three parameters were assessed as Unfavourable - Inadequate, the overall conservation assessment for **2190 Humid dune slacks** at 26.01 Lough Nagreaney was Unfavourable - Inadequate. Given that the overall assessment was also Unfavourable - Inadequate during SDM, the trend is therefore stable.

**Overall Conservation Status:** Unfavourable - Inadequate (stable)

### Condition of the habitat by area

The failure of one criterion concerning the Structure and Functions assessment was observed in 25% of the habitat area, so this area was considered to be in poor condition. The remaining 75% of the habitat was considered to be in good condition.

## \*21A0 Machairs

### Area

The area of **\*21A0 Machairs** increased from 8.54 ha to 8.58 ha between SDM and CHNW21. This increase was the result of a different and better mapping technique. This is consistent with an Area assessment of Favourable and the trend is stable.

### Structure and Functions

Two criteria failed in the Structure and Functions assessment. There were signs that the vegetation composition has been negatively affected by agriculture, moreover *Senecio jacobaea* was occasional and *Lolium perenne* was recorded in every stop with a frequency of 87.5%. Lowest cover of bryophytes recorded was 0% while the relevant threshold is at least 1% in every stop. The Structure and Functions were therefore assessed as Unfavourable - Inadequate and the trend is stable because the previous assessment was also Unfavourable - Inadequate.

### Future Prospects

Overgrazing and offroad driving each had a high-intensity negative impact on the **\*21A0 Machairs** habitat, but in total affected no more than 2% of the habitat. On the other hand, reseedling is a widespread cultivation practice that affected 100% of the habitat and had a medium-intensity negative impact, being responsible for allowing the spread of negative indicator species. Sheep and cattle grazing were considered to be neutral impacts for this site as they contribute to maintaining the site as machair. Drainage was also considered to be a neutral impact as it is an alteration of the natural hydrological processes but it allows machair to stay here. If the drain were removed, the quality of the **\*21A0 Machairs** would deteriorate. Future Prospects were therefore assessed as Unfavourable - Inadequate, and the trend was assessed as stable.

### Conservation assessment

The conservation status assessments of the three parameters are as follows:

- Area: Favourable (stable)
- Structure and Functions: Unfavourable - Inadequate (stable)
- Future Prospects: Unfavourable - Inadequate (stable)

Since two of the three parameters were assessed as Unfavourable - Inadequate, the overall conservation assessment for **\*21A0 Machairs** at 26.01 Lough Nagreaney was Unfavourable - Inadequate. Since the overall assessment was Unfavourable - Inadequate (improving) during SDM, the trend is therefore stable.

**Overall Conservation Status:** Unfavourable - Inadequate (stable)

### Condition of the habitat by area

The spread of negative indicator species and the absence of bryophytes were affecting 25% of **\*21A0 Machairs**, so this area was considered to be in poor condition. The remaining 75% of the habitat was considered to be in good condition.

## Site 26 Subsite 1 Lough Nagreaney Appendices

### **Appendix 1 Area**

**Total habitat area recorded during reporting cycles to date.**

| <b>Habitat</b> | <b>2007</b> | <b>2013</b> | <b>2019</b> | <b>2025</b> |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 2110           | 0.770       | 0.610       | NS          | 0.707       |
| 2120           | 1.220       | 1.050       | NS          | 0.704       |
| 2130           | 8.240       | 8.720       | NS          | 9.127       |
| 2170           | 1.830       | 1.830       | NS          | 1.962       |
| 2190           | 0.720       | 0.720       | NS          | 0.751       |
| 21A0           | 8.540       | 8.540       | NS          | 8.582       |

**Favourable Reference Area and cumulative changes in area due to human activities (restoration and loss) recorded during reporting cycles to date. Natural fluctuations are not taken into account.**

| <b>Habitat</b> | <b>Favourable Reference area (ha)</b> | <b>2007 change (ha)</b> | <b>2013 change (ha)</b> | <b>2019 change (ha)</b> | <b>2025 change (ha)</b> |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 2110           | 0.770                                 | <1% per year            | 0                       | NS                      | 0                       |
| 2120           | 1.220                                 | <1% per year            | 0                       | NS                      | 0                       |
| *2130          | 8.240                                 | <1% per year            | 0                       | NS                      | 0                       |
| 2170           | 1.830                                 | 0                       | 0                       | NS                      | 0                       |
| 2190           | 0.720                                 | 0                       | 0                       | NS                      | 0                       |
| *21A0          | 8.540                                 | <1% per year            | 0                       | NS                      | 0                       |

## Appendix 2. Structure and functions

### Negative indicator species and non-native invasive species

| Habitat | Species name            | Cover (%) |
|---------|-------------------------|-----------|
| 2120    | <i>Senecio jacobaea</i> | 1.0       |
| *2130   | <i>Lolium perenne</i>   | 1.0       |
| *2130   | <i>Senecio jacobaea</i> | 1.0       |
| 2170    | <i>Senecio jacobaea</i> | 0.8       |
| *21A0   | <i>Cirsium arvense</i>  | 5.0       |
| *21A0   | <i>Cirsium vulgare</i>  | 1.0       |
| *21A0   | <i>Lolium perenne</i>   | 7.0       |
| *21A0   | <i>Senecio jacobaea</i> | 2.0       |

### Positive indicator species and notable species

| Habitat | Species name                     | Cover (%) (if recorded) |
|---------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 2110    | <i>Elytrigia juncea</i>          |                         |
| 2110    | <i>Leymus arenarius</i>          |                         |
| 2120    | <i>Ammophila arenaria</i>        |                         |
| 2120    | <i>Elytrigia juncea</i>          |                         |
| 2120    | <i>Heracleum sphondylium</i>     |                         |
| 2120    | <i>Leymus arenarius</i>          |                         |
| *2130   | <i>Anthyllis vulneraria</i>      |                         |
| *2130   | <i>Carex arenaria</i>            |                         |
| *2130   | <i>Daucus carota</i>             |                         |
| *2130   | <i>Euphrasia officinalis ag.</i> |                         |
| *2130   | <i>Festuca rubra</i>             |                         |
| *2130   | <i>Galium verum</i>              |                         |
| *2130   | <i>Homalothecium lutescens</i>   |                         |
| *2130   | <i>Hypochaeris radicata</i>      |                         |
| *2130   | <i>Lotus corniculatus</i>        |                         |
| *2130   | <i>Luzula campestris</i>         |                         |
| *2130   | <i>Plantago lanceolata</i>       |                         |
| *2130   | <i>Poa pratensis</i>             |                         |
| *2130   | <i>Polygala serpyllifolia</i>    |                         |
| *2130   | <i>Rhinanthus minor</i>          |                         |
| *2130   | <i>Rhytidadelphus squarrosus</i> |                         |
| *2130   | <i>Rhytidadelphus triquetrus</i> |                         |
| *2130   | <i>Scleropodium purum</i>        |                         |
| *2130   | <i>Syntrichia ruralis</i>        |                         |
| *2130   | <i>Trifolium repens</i>          |                         |
| *2130   | <i>Veronica chamaedrys</i>       |                         |
| 2170    | <i>Carex arenaria</i>            |                         |
| 2170    | <i>Carex flacca</i>              |                         |
| 2170    | <i>Euphrasia officinalis ag.</i> |                         |
| 2170    | <i>Festuca rubra</i>             |                         |
| 2170    | <i>Holcus lanatus</i>            |                         |
| 2170    | <i>Lotus corniculatus</i>        |                         |
| 2170    | <i>Pilosella officinarum</i>     |                         |
| 2170    | <i>Rhytidadelphus squarrosus</i> |                         |
| 2170    | <i>Salix repens v. argentea</i>  |                         |

|       |                                        |  |
|-------|----------------------------------------|--|
| 2170  | <i>Scleropodium purum</i>              |  |
| 2190  | <i>Agrostis stolonifera</i>            |  |
| 2190  | <i>Calliergon cuspidatum</i>           |  |
| 2190  | <i>Carex arenaria</i>                  |  |
| 2190  | <i>Carex flacca</i>                    |  |
| 2190  | <i>Carex nigra</i>                     |  |
| 2190  | <i>Galium palustre</i>                 |  |
| 2190  | <i>Juncus articulatus</i>              |  |
| 2190  | <i>Lotus corniculatus</i>              |  |
| 2190  | <i>Mentha aquatica</i>                 |  |
| 2190  | <i>Potentilla anserina</i>             |  |
| 2190  | <i>Salix repens</i> v. <i>argentea</i> |  |
| *21A0 | <i>Agrostis stolonifera</i>            |  |
| *21A0 | <i>Bellis perennis</i>                 |  |
| *21A0 | <i>Carex flacca</i>                    |  |
| *21A0 | <i>Carex nigra</i>                     |  |
| *21A0 | <i>Cerastium fontanum</i>              |  |
| *21A0 | <i>Festuca rubra</i>                   |  |
| *21A0 | <i>Galium verum</i>                    |  |
| *21A0 | <i>Hydrocotyle vulgaris</i>            |  |
| *21A0 | <i>Lolium perenne</i>                  |  |
| *21A0 | <i>Lotus corniculatus</i>              |  |
| *21A0 | <i>Plantago lanceolata</i>             |  |
| *21A0 | <i>Potentilla anserina</i>             |  |
| *21A0 | <i>Prunella vulgaris</i>               |  |
| *21A0 | <i>Thymus polytrichus</i>              |  |
| *21A0 | <i>Trifolium repens</i>                |  |

### Structure and Functions Assessment Criteria

| Habitat | Indicator                                                     | Pass/Fail |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 2110    | Positive indicator species                                    | Pass      |
| 2110    | Negative indicator species                                    | Pass      |
| 2110    | Non-native species                                            | Pass      |
| 2110    | Flowering or fruiting of positive indicator species           | Pass      |
| 2110    | Notable/rare species                                          | Pass      |
| 2110    | Interference with the sediment dynamics                       | Pass      |
| 2110    | Damage due to disturbance                                     | Pass      |
| 2120    | Positive indicator species                                    | Pass      |
| 2120    | Negative indicator species                                    | Pass      |
| 2120    | Non-native species                                            | Pass      |
| 2120    | Flowering or fruiting of positive indicator species           | Pass      |
| 2120    | Notable/rare species                                          | Pass      |
| 2120    | Interference with the sediment dynamics                       | Pass      |
| 2120    | Damage due to disturbance                                     | Pass      |
| *2130   | Positive indicator species                                    | Pass      |
| *2130   | Negative indicator species                                    | Pass      |
| *2130   | Non-native species                                            | Pass      |
| *2130   | Cover of trees and scrub other than <i>Juniperus communis</i> | Pass      |
| *2130   | Trees or saplings from adjacent plantations                   | Pass      |
| *2130   | Height of vegetation                                          | Fail      |

|       |                                                      |      |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------|------|
| *2130 | Flowering or fruiting of positive indicator species  | Pass |
| *2130 | Bare sand                                            | Pass |
| *2130 | Notable/rare species                                 | Pass |
| *2130 | Interference with the sediment dynamics              | Pass |
| *2130 | Damage due to disturbance                            | Pass |
| 2170  | Positive indicator species                           | Pass |
| 2170  | Negative indicator species                           | Pass |
| 2170  | Non-native species                                   | Pass |
| 2170  | Rank grasses                                         | Pass |
| 2170  | Cover of trees and scrub other than <i>S. repens</i> | Fail |
| 2170  | Height of <i>Salix repens</i>                        | Pass |
| 2170  | Bare sand                                            | Pass |
| 2170  | Notable/rare species                                 | Pass |
| 2170  | Interference with the sediment dynamics              | Pass |
| 2170  | Damage due to disturbance                            | Pass |
| 2190  | Positive indicator species                           | Pass |
| 2190  | Bryophytes                                           | Pass |
| 2190  | Cover of <i>Salix repens</i>                         | Pass |
| 2190  | Negative indicator species                           | Pass |
| 2190  | Non-native species                                   | Pass |
| 2190  | Cover of scrub                                       | Fail |
| 2190  | Forb:grass ratio (mean)                              | Pass |
| 2190  | Bare ground                                          | Pass |
| 2190  | Notable/rare species                                 | Pass |
| 2190  | Interference with the sediment dynamics              | Pass |
| 2190  | Damage due to disturbance                            | Pass |
| *21A0 | Positive indicator species                           | Pass |
| *21A0 | Bryophytes                                           | Fail |
| *21A0 | Negative indicator species                           | Fail |
| *21A0 | Non-native species                                   | Pass |
| *21A0 | Flowering or fruiting of positive indicator species  | Pass |
| *21A0 | Sward height                                         | Pass |
| *21A0 | Bare ground                                          | Pass |
| *21A0 | Notable/rare species                                 | Pass |
| *21A0 | Interference with the sediment dynamics              | Pass |
| *21A0 | Damage due to disturbance                            | Pass |

### Appendix 3. Impacts and Activities

#### Impacts recorded

| Habitat code | Impact code | Impact description                               | Relative importance | Influence | Source  | Timing  | Trend      | Area  |
|--------------|-------------|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|---------|---------|------------|-------|
| 2110         | PC06        | Dumping                                          | Low                 | Neutral   | Outside | Ongoing | Stable     | 1.0   |
| 2110         | PF05        | Walking                                          | Low                 | Neutral   | Inside  | Ongoing | Decreasing | 10.0  |
| 2120         | PF05        | Walking                                          | Low                 | Neutral   | Inside  | Ongoing | Decreasing | 4.0   |
| *2130        | PA05        | Lack of grazing                                  | Medium              | Neutral   | Inside  | Ongoing | Decreasing | 50.0  |
| *2130        | PA07        | Overgrazing and trampling (sheep)                | High                | Negative  | Inside  | Ongoing | Decreasing | 20.0  |
| *2130        | PA08        | Non intensive grazing (sheep)                    | Medium              | Positive  | Inside  | Ongoing | Increasing | 30.0  |
| *2130        | PA25        | Offroad driving                                  | High                | Negative  | Inside  | Ongoing | Stable     | 1.0   |
| *2130        | PM07        | Natural erosion and encroachment (Salix cinerea) | Medium              | Neutral   | Inside  | Ongoing | Decreasing | 1.0   |
| 2170         | PA07        | Overgrazing and trampling (sheep)                | High                | Negative  | Inside  | Ongoing | Decreasing | 1.0   |
| 2170         | PA08        | Non intensive grazing (sheep)                    | Low                 | Positive  | Inside  | Ongoing | Decreasing | 50.0  |
| 2170         | PA25        | Offroad driving                                  | Medium              | Negative  | Inside  | Ongoing | Decreasing | 1.0   |
| 2170         | PM07        | Encroachment (Salix cinerea)                     | Medium              | Neutral   | Inside  | Ongoing | Decreasing | 5.0   |
| 2190         | PA08        | Non intensive grazing (sheep)                    | Low                 | Positive  | Inside  | Ongoing | Stable     | 100.0 |
| 2190         | PA25        | Offroad driving                                  | Medium              | Negative  | Inside  | Ongoing | Decreasing | 0.5   |
| 2190         | PM07        | Encroachment (Salix cinerea)                     | Low                 | Neutral   | Inside  | Ongoing | Stable     | 1.0   |
| *21A0        | PA01        | Reseeding                                        | Medium              | Negative  | Inside  | Ongoing | Stable     | 100.0 |
| *21A0        | PA07        | Overgrazing and trampling                        | High                | Negative  | Inside  | Ongoing | Decreasing | 1.0   |
| *21A0        | PA08        | Non intensive grazing (cattle)                   | Low                 | Neutral   | Inside  | Ongoing | Stable     | 100.0 |
| *21A0        | PA22        | Drainage                                         | Medium              | Neutral   | Inside  | Ongoing | Stable     | 25.0  |
| *21A0        | PA25        | Vehicle track                                    | High                | Negative  | Inside  | Ongoing | Stable     | 1.0   |

#### Conservation Measures required

| Habitat code | Measure code | Measure description                                          | Area (ha) | Status (in place/partial/ Absent/unidentified) | Response timeframe  | Purpose                                                                    | Location (inside and or Outside SAC) |
|--------------|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| *2130        | CA05         | Measure required to regulate grazing                         | 9.1274    | Absent                                         | Medium-term results | Restore the structure & functions, including the status of typical species | Inside                               |
| *2130        | CA16         | Measure required to regulate offroad driving for agriculture | 0.0913    | Absent                                         | Medium-term results | Restore the structure & functions, including the status of typical species | Inside                               |
| 2170         | CA05         | Measure required to regulate grazing                         | 1.9616    | Absent                                         | Medium-term results | Restore the structure & functions, including the status of typical species | Inside                               |
| 2170         | CA16         | Measure required to regulate offroad driving for agriculture | 0.0196    | Absent                                         | Medium-term results | Restore the structure & functions, including the status of typical species | Inside                               |
| 2190         | CA05         | Measure required                                             | 0.7513    | Absent                                         | Medium-             | Restore the struc-                                                         | Inside                               |

|       |      |                                                              |        |        |                     |                                                                            |        |
|-------|------|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|---------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
|       |      | to regulate grazing                                          |        |        | term results        | ture & functions, including the status of typical species                  |        |
| 2190  | CA16 | Measure required to regulate offroad driving for agriculture | 0.0038 | Absent | Medium-term results | Restore the structure & functions, including the status of typical species | Inside |
| *21A0 | CA01 | Measure required to regulate reseeded                        | 8.5820 | Absent | Medium-term results | Restore the structure & functions, including the status of typical species | Inside |
| *21A0 | CA05 | Measure required to regulate grazing                         | 8.5820 | Absent | Medium-term results | Restore the structure & functions, including the status of typical species | Inside |
| *21A0 | CA16 | Measure required to regulate offroad driving for agriculture | 0.0858 | Absent | Medium-term results | Restore the structure & functions, including the status of typical species | Inside |

#### **Appendix 4. Condition of the habitat by area**

##### **Summary of habitat condition**

| <b>Habitat code</b> | <b>% remaining habitat in poor condition</b> | <b>% remaining habitat in good condition</b> |
|---------------------|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| 2110                | 0                                            | 100                                          |
| 2120                | 0                                            | 100                                          |
| *2130               | 20                                           | 80                                           |
| 2170                | 25                                           | 75                                           |
| 2190                | 25                                           | 75                                           |
| *21A0               | 25                                           | 75                                           |