GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

Name: Nakskov Fjord (H158)

Total site surface area (ha): 8195
Project site surface area (ha): 72

NUTS region code: DK006

Community protection status: SPA[1] ⊕ **NATURA 2000 Code**: DK006X88
pSCI ⊕ **NATURA 2000 Code**: DK006X242

Other protection status:
The site is included in Special Protected Area according to the Birds Directive, Site DK006X88, Nakskov Fjord og Inderfjord (F88).

Scientific description of site :
The site is consist of a shallow bay with the surrounding beaches, dunes, salt meadows and lagunes, in the bay is a archipelago with many smaller and three large islands with various degrees of influence from use for agricultural purposes. The project area is on one of the larger islands Enehøje. Parts of the island has been cultivated but small areas of dry grasslands habitat type 6230* remains together with larger areas of salt meadows habitats and two coastal lagoons. The commercial agricultural activities stopped in 1985. In 1999 the island was bought by the Danish Forest and Nature Agency for the purpose of Nature conservation and restoration and to give the public access to the island.

Importance of the site for the conservation of the species/habitat types targeted at regional, national and EU level (give quantifiable information wherever possible):
The larger Island of Lolland where the bay Nakskov Fjord is situated is and has for a long time been very intensely used for agriculture and there are little dry grasslands left in this region of Denmark.
As the Island Enehøje is isolated from influence from nearby adverse impacts from agriculture and still holds areas of the habitat type 6230* it is of national importance to restore the dry grasslands of Enehøje Island.

[1] SPA= special protected area pSCI= potential sites for community interest

MAP OF THE SITE OR SITES

The map or, where relevant, maps, at a scale of 1:100.000 (or more precise if necessary).

They must show the following information :

- for Member States - the boundaries of the area proposed by the Member State under the Habitats Directive or classified under the Birds Directive. Always verify with the competent national authorities, that the boundaries you have are the official one for the sites targeted
- for 2004 accession countries and candidate countries – the boundaries of the protected area
- the boundaries of the project area
- the location of the principal actions listed in section C of the form

☞ *This map can be presented on a format larger than A4, if necessary.*

Map no:

7.1: Project area and pSCI.
7.2: Current distribution of targeted habitats.
7.3: Ownership.
7.4: Location of management and restoration.
7.5: Areas grazed; currently and foreseen at end of project.

THESE MAPS ARE CONSIDERED AS BEING AN ESSENTIAL PART OF THE APPLICATION.

THEY MUST BE OF GOOD QUALITY, SHOWING THE SCALE, AND CONTAIN ALL THE REQUISITE INFORMATION LISTED ABOVE.

HABITATS DIRECTIVE ANNEX I {AND BERN CONVENTION RESOLUTION N° 4 (1996)} HABITAT TYPES PRESENT IN THE SITE AND DIRECTLY TARGETED BY THE PROJECT

Priority *? : Tick if the habitat type is a priority one according to Annex I of the Habitats Directive.*

Code *: Use only the NATURA 2000 codes (for habitats only listed in the Bern Convention resolution use the corresponding code)*

Name *: Name of the habitat type according to the Habitats Directive (or the Bern Convention resolution).*

% *: % cover of the habitat type over the whole project site.*

Priority	Code	Name	%	Comments (conservation status,etc.)
DIRECTLY TARGETED HABITATS DIRECTIVE ANNEX I HABITAT TYPES				
X	6230	* Species-rich Nardus grasslands, on silicious substrates in mountain areas (and submountain areas in Continental Europe)	< 1*	Cover:1 ha Representativity: C, Relative surface: C, Conservation status: C, Global assessment: C ***Inside project area <1 ha***.
CANDIDATE COUNTRIES: DIRECTLY TARGETED HABITAT TYPESACCORDING TO THE BERN CONVENTION RESOLUTION N° 4 (1996)				

* The percentages given is relative to the ***total*** area of the pSCI. Information of the FFH representation inside the project area is listed in the “comments” column.

HABITATS DIRECTIVE ANNEX II {AND BERN CONVENTION RESOLUTION N° 6 (1998)} SPECIES PRESENT IN THE SITE AND DIRECTLY TARGETED BY THE PROJECT

G : ***GROUP: M=Mammals, A=Amphibians, R=Reptiles, F= Fish, I=Invertebrates, P=Plants***

Priority ? : ***Tick if the species is a priority one according to Annex II of the Habitats Directive***

DIRECTLY TARGETED HABITATS DIRECTIVE ANNEX II SPECIES						
G	Priority	SCIENTIFIC NAME (IN LATIN)	POPULATION SIZE FOR THE SITE (quantitative estimates)			
			RESIDENT	MIGRATORY		
				BREEDING	WINTERING	STAGING
CANDIDATE COUNTRIES: DIRECTLY TARGETED SPECIESACCORDING TO						

Comments (conservation status if known, other listed species that will benefit ,etc) :

BIRDS DIRECTIVE ANNEX I {OR BERN CONVENTION RESOLUTION N° 6 (1998)} SPECIES PRESENT IN THE SITE AND DIRECTLY TARGETED BY THE PROJECT

Priority : ***Tick if the species is a "priority for funding under LIFE" according to the ORNIS Committee (see list in Annex 2 of this brochure).***

Priority	SCIENTIFIC NAME (IN LATIN)	POPULATION SIZE FOR THE SITE (quantitative estimates)			
		RESIDENT	MIGRATORY		
			BREEDING	WINTERING	STAGING
DIRECTLY TARGETED ANNEX I SPECIES OF THE BIRDS DIRECTIVE					
CANDIATE COUNTRIES: DIRECTLY TARGETED SPECIESACCORDING TO THE BERN CONVENTION RESOLUTION N° 6 (1998)					
OTHER MIGRATORY SPECIES DIRECTLY TARGETED BY THE PROJECT					

Comments (conservation status if known, other listed species that will benefit etc) :

MAIN THREATS TO THE HABITATS/SPECIES TARGETED WITHIN THE SITES INVOLVED IN THE PROJECT

Threat 1:
Name of the threat:
Lack of grazing or inappropriate grazing regimes.

Description:
Traditional husbandry grazing has almost ceased in dry grasslands in Denmark. Most semi-natural grassland fragments are less attractive for grazing as they represent small distant places with relatively high cost of fencing and water supply for the livestock. On dry grasslands with lack of grazing or insufficient grazing pressure an overgrowth will take place, initially with tall grasses and herbal species invading from nearby areas including non-native species but also an initial overgrowth with scrubs and trees such as *Rosa sp., Prunus spinosa* and *Abies alba*.
The microclimate will change resulting in unfavourable changes to the composition of the plant community and especially to the abundance of key plant species as well as insect species associated with the vegetation of open dry grassland. Summer grazing at a very high grazing pressure may be detrimental too. Although it may help controlling for potentially dominant herbs and grasses, this will often be at the expense of sensitive plant species and invertebrate species depending on flowering vegetation.

Location: (if relevant)

Impact on habitat/species (quantify if possible).
Grazing are needed for 2 ha of dry grassland at this site. After ending the project, the area under a grazing regime will be extended with 47 ha.

Threat 4:
Name of the threat:
Fragmentation of dry grasslands

Description:
In Denmark remnant patches with natural and semi-natural dry grasslands habitats are mostly located as long narrow strips on the slopes of river valleys, along the coast or on hill ridges. This characteristic has made dry grasslands especially vulnerable to fragmentation caused by conversion of segments hereof into arable land, use for plantations, unintended loss of fertilizer or pesticides from adjacent rotational fields or intensification of the use for grazing by application of fertilizers and/or pesticides.
Fragmentation causes one ore more of the following effects:
Populations of characteristic species (key species) becomes smaller and are in risk or local extinction
Re-colonisation of locally extinct species is prevented by increased distance to the closest remnant population.
The unfavourable borderline/area ratio gives rise to greater impact from adjacent areas of arable land where pesticides and fertilisers are applied.
The dispersal of seeds by grazing animals becomes restricted as the movement of these animals becomes more and more restricted.

Location: (if relevant)
The location of areas to be restored into dry grassland are shown on the site map

Impact on habitat/species (quantify if possible):
Former dry grassland located adjacent to dry grass habitat areas
47 ha. of presently arable land

Threat 5:
Name of the threat:
Low or no support for the conservation of dry grassland among landowners and the public

Description:
There is among landowners and their professional organisations as well as among the public in general a low level of understanding of the crucial importance of the unique qualities of dry grasslands. That goes both for their characteristics as habitat types as well as for their contribution to the conservation of biodiversity in Denmark and Europe. Dry grasslands does not have such spectacular appearances as other habitat types, and there is thus a need for promotion of the assets of dry grasslands among landowners and in the local communities in order to gain support for their conservation.

Location: (if relevant)
Not relevant

Impact on habitat/species (quantify if possible):
The future protection of dry grassland habitats in Denmark will depend to a large degree on the cooperation between nature managers, experts and local landowners. The valuable grassland area is divided on a very large number of small remnant grassland fragments, and conservation efforts can thus not be focused in a few large reserves. The limited knowledge basis of local landowners is considered a serious constraint to a successful future conservation of grassland habitats.

Threat 6:
Name of the threat:
Insufficient management capacity

Description:
There are shortcomings in the capacity of staff of the counties nature conservation departments responsible for managing privately owned land and of the state forest districts of the Danish Forest and Nature Agency responsible for government owned land concerning management of dry grasslands. There is a need for training in the range of adequate management techniques and up-to-date knowledge on the latest research results as well as an exchange of experience between managers.

Location: (if relevant)
National level

Impact on habitat/species (quantify if possible):
Insufficient capacity concerning management methods will lead to delays in implementation of adequate conservation measures and possibly introduction of inappropriate management measures.

Threat 7:
Name of the threat:
Adverse impacts from visitors (tourists)

Description:
At sites known to be visited by large number of people, either local or tourists, due to their natural beauty or proximity to mayor tourist attractions, deterioration is a threat to the favourable conservation status. Potential conflicts with visitors and grazing cattle, sheep or horses and the wear and tear from visitors might de-motivate farmers from providing livestock for an appropriate grazing of the grasslands or from entering into management agreements at all.

Location: (if relevant)

Impact on habitat/species (quantify if possible):
Large number of tourists will damage the sensitive vegetation by the tear imposed by their movements on the ground. Key plant species may be subject of illegal picking. Litter will be thrown. Grazing will not be optimal.

Threat 10:
Name of the threat:
Dominance of non-native subspecies of *Festuca rubra*

Description:
At the site Nakskov Fjord in the Project area Enehøje Island dry grasslands has for some time been used for primarily commercial agricultural purposes. This has included the sowing of the artificially developed subspecies *Festuca rubra ssp. longata.* This subspecies has a competitive advantage to the naturally occurring *Festuca rubra ssp. rubra*. Furthermore the subspecies *longata* is disadvantageous to the natural herbal vegetation as it creates to much shadow (unfavourable microclimate).

Location: (if relevant)
Subsite Enehøje Island at pSCI Nakskov Fjord.

Impact on habitat/species (quantify if possible):
40 ha of former dry grassland dominated by *Festuca rubra ssp. longata*. Jeopardizing the reestablishment of dry grassland habitats and a favourable conservation status.

PREVIOUS CONSERVATION EFFORTS ON THE SITES IN QUESTION

After the Danish Forest and Nature Agency bought the island in 1999 a management plan has been drafted and partially implemented as far as grazing has been provided for by cattle. Nature monitoring takes place on the island to follow the development after abandonment of commercial agriculture
The management plan proscribes:

- Support for the development of dry grassland habitat on former arable land.
- Establishment of natural hydrological conditions.
- Improvement of the habitats for birds and amphibians.

THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT OF THE PROJECT

The project area is owned by the government and managed by the Danish Forest and Nature Agency.
The local Falster forest district has regular consultations with local municipalities, NGO's and landowner's organisations in an Advisory Board concerning the management of all areas under its responsibility. The Advisory Board will be consulted during implementation of the project.

As the experience on restoration of dry grassland on former arable land is rather restricted the actions will be subdivided into three different treatments of the area in order to gain valuable experience and the suitable management methods for re-establishing a dry grassland vegetation.

The release of fallow deer on the Island is suggested by the management plan, but a dispensation from the Act on Wildlife Management is required.

RELATION BETWEEN THE PROPOSAL AND OTHER EU FUNDS

The Enehøje Island is government owned and solely government managed also in the future, no use of other EU funds is anticipated in the future.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE SPECIES TARGETED

Name of the species:

Ecology of the species:

General distribution of the species at European and national level and population trends:

Size of the population target by the project (e.g. n° of individuals, % of European and/or national population):

Main threats to the population targeted:

Threat 1:

Name of the threat:

Description:

Impact on species:

Threat 2

Etc.

Conservation measures already taken or proposed for the species at Community or national level :

PROJECT AREA AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT

Brief description of the project area:

Socio-economic context:

Relation between the proposal and other EU funds