Fancy Lake

 KBA, Nova Scotia

|  |
| --- |
| Golden-crest (*Lophiola aurea*) |

**Instructions for Reviewers**

1. Read through the “Summary of Proposed KBA” section.
2. Read the questions after the summary and provide answers in the specified spaces.
3. Once you are done, make sure to save your work under a new file name (your answers will be lost if saving back to the original file name).
4. For additional information, see:
* [What are KBAs and how are they assessed?](http://www.kbacanada.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/What-are-KBAs-and-how-are-they-assessed.pdf)
* [Instructions for reviewers](http://www.kbacanada.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Instructions-for-reviewers.pdf)

# Summary of Proposed KBA

*Please note that this summary has been generated automatically, and as a result there may be species scientific names that are not italicized.*

1. **KBA Name:** Fancy Lake
2. **Location (province or territory, mid-point lat/long):** Nova Scotia

, 44.323

/-64.544

1. **KBA Scope:** National
2. **Trigger Biodiversity Element(s):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | ● Species: Golden-crest (*Lophiola aurea*) |

1. **Status Summary:**

Fancy Lake

qualifies as a candidate National

 KBA for the following KBA criteria:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | ● A1b [criterion met by 1 species] - Site regularly holds ≥1% of the national population size AND ≥10 reproductive units of a Vulnerable species. |
|  | ● B1 [criterion met by 1 species] - Site regularly holds ≥10% of the national population size AND ≥10 reproductive units of a geographically-restricted species. |

1. **Site Description:**

Fancy Lake is a medium size lake within the Petite Rivière watershed in Lunenburg County, southwestern Nova Scotia. Goldencrest occurs in a sheltered bay bog at the western end of the lake on quaking margins, floating peat mats and seasonally exposed rocky islands with a thin peat layer. The lands surrounding Fancy Lake are mostly privately owned (including the parcels where Goldencrest occurs) except for small sections such as Fancy Lake Provincial Park on the eastern shore of the lake and a section of the Petite Rivière outflow in the south. Two major highways run along the northwestern length of the lake within 1km of the lakeshore and residential development is dense in along sections of the lakeshore. The wetland where Goldencrest occurs is bordered by a major highway, a former rail line and two unpaved roads. Fancy Lake situated in the Western ecoregion of Nova Scotia in the Lahave Drumlins ecodistrict. The Western ecoregion is characterised as having a mild climate with early springs, warm summers and a longer growing season than the rest of Nova Scotia (Neily et. al., 2017). The forest surrounding the three lakes is primarily composed of tolerant mixedwood and spruce/pine stands (Service Nova Scotia Provincial Landscape Viewer [accessed June 2020]). For references see: FancyLakeKBAProposal\_supplement.docx

1. **Assessment Details - KBA Trigger Species:**

| **Species** | **Status** | **Criteria Met** | **# of Reproductive Units** | **Assessment Parameter** |  | **Site Estimate** |  | **National Estimate** | **% of National Pop. at Site** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Min | Best | Max | Year | Min | Best | Max |
| *Lophiola aurea* | N2 (NatureServe) | A1b; B1 | 101 | Number of mature individuals |  |  | 1000002 |  | 2012 |  | 300000 | 3000003 | 300000 | 33.3 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1The site exceeds the minimum number of RUs required to meet the criteria, see: COSEWIC. 2012. COSEWIC assessment and status report on the Goldencrest Lophiola aurea in Canada. Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada. . |
| 2The population estimate for the site is at minimum 100,000 mature individuals. See: COSEWIC, 2012. COSEWIC assessment and status report on the Goldencrest Lophiola aurea in Canada. Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada. Ottawa. xi + 37 pp. . |
| 3The total Canadian population includes hundreds of thousands of rosettes, although the number of genetic individuals is certainly much lower. The total number of mature individuals is estimated as greater than 300,000 see: COSEWIC, 2012. COSEWIC assessment and status report on the Goldencrest Lophiola aurea in Canada. Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada. Ottawa. xi + 37 pp. . |

1. **Assessment Details – KBA Trigger Ecosystems:** None
2. **Delineation Rationale:**

Boundary is derived from a 1m vertical buffer of the peatland polygons containing trigger elements, using an Enhanced Digital Elevation Model (DP ME 55, Version 2, 2006) for the province of Nova Scotia. The vertical buffer was trimmed at a 300m horizontal distance of the lakeshore.

1. **Additional Site Information:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rationale for site nomination** | Fancy Lake supports a large dense population of Goldencrest (approximately one third of the national population), in a sheltered bay at the west end of the lake. Goldencrest is an herbaceous perennial of open lakeshores and graminoid-dominated peatlands with a Canadian distribution limited to only seven sub-populations in southern Nova Scotia (COSEWIC, 2012). Its main global range concentrated in the Gulf of Mexico Coastal Plain and scattered on the Atlantic Coastal Plain of United States, no closer to Nova Scotia than southern New Jersey and is considered rare in half of the jurisdictions in which it occurs (COSEWIC, 2012). The disjunct populations of Goldencrest in southwestern Nova Scotia are part a group of unrelated plants referred to as Atlantic Coastal Plain Flora, that are rare or unknown elsewhere in Canada. Due to the large distance between the Nova Scotia populations and the closest population in the US, there is a limited likelihood for immigration if the Canadian population is lost. These disjunct species may also be of importance to the species’ range-wide genetic diversity: morphological and genetic differences have been documented between Nova Scotia Goldencrest populations and the nearest populations in New Jersey (COSEWIC, 2012).Although the population of Goldencrest on Fancy Lake is relatively unthreatened and has probably been stable in the past 15 years, its habitat could be affected by shoreline development or eutrophication and has likely been historically impacted by damming (COSEWIC, 2012). For references see: FancyLakeKBAProposal\_supplement.docx |
| **Biodiversity elements that were assessed but did not meet KBA criteria** | *-* |
| **Other significant biodiversity elements** | none known |
| **Percent of site covered by protected areas** | 0% - completely unprotected |
| **Customary jurisdiction at site** | - |
| **Ongoing conservation actions** | Legislation |
| **Ongoing threats** | Pollution; Residential & commercial development |
| **Additional conservation actions needed** | Site/area protection |

**Questions for Reviewers**

If you run out of space for any of your answers to questions 5-11, please expand the text box by clicking it and then pulling the bottom border downwards.

*Required information for review completion:*

1. Name 

2. Email address 

3. Phone number (optional) 

4. I understand and agree that my name and contact information may be provided to additional reviewers indicating that I provided a technical review of this KBA





5. Are the global values (or national, for national-scale KBAs) used in the threshold calculation accurate and adequately documented?





*Additional comments*

6. Are the site-level estimates for each assessment parameter accurate and adequately documented?







7. Is it reasonable to assume that the KBA trigger element (species or ecosystem) is present at the site and has been correctly identified?







8. Is the proposed KBA boundary appropriate and at a useful scale to focus conservation efforts?







9. If they have been provided, are the mapped distributions of the biodiversity elements realistic?







*Additional information for review:*

10. If you are familiar with the site, please comment on the site description and provide any other information that may help its documentation and conservation, including about:

* ongoing conservation actions being applied to the site
* conservation actions needed at the site
* additional biodiversity elements at the site
* relevant information about customary jurisdiction(s) of the site (i.e. traditional territories, landowners, etc.)
* threats to the persistence of biodiversity at the site (pertaining to the trigger species or in general)



11. Any other comments?

