**Decision Support Tool – Screening Criteria**

All criteria in Tables 1 and 2 of the Decision Support Tool are intended to help practitioners determine whether an area meets the Pan-Canadian standards and is therefore eligible to be reported as a Protected Area or an “Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measure" (OECM) under the pan-Canadian standards. Criteria in Table 1 apply similarly to both Protected Areas and OECMs. Criteria in Table 2 help to both define and distinguish between Protected Areas and OECMs. All criteria in Table 2 must be met at the PA level for an area to be reported as protected, or at the OECM level or combination of OECM and PA levels for an area to be reported as an OECM. **This template is intended to be used in conjunction with the decision support tool and detailed interpretation guide.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BASIC INFORMATION** | |
| **Name of Site** | Porcupine Provincial Forest |
| **Designation** | Provincial Forest |
| **Province/Territory** | Manitoba |
| **Year of Establishment / Securement** | 1906 |
| **Area (ha)** | 193,481.5 ha |
| **Management Authority** | Forestry and Peatlands Management Branch, Department of Sustainable Development, Government of Manitoba |
| **Explanation of Management Authority** *(optional)* |  |
| **Governance Type *(CPCAD type*)** | Government - subnational |
| **Legal Basis / mechanism(s)** | The Forest Act (C.C.S.M. c. F150) |
| **Explanation of legal basis / mechanism(s)** *(optional)* |  |
| **Summary of Essential / Relevant natural, social and cultural values** | This large forested area is located primarily in the Mid-Boreal Uplands Ecoregion on the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border. The area is characterized by mixed forest interspersed with fens, bogs, and numerous river canyons. Three protected areas – Bell and Steeprock Canyons Protected Area, Armit Meadows Ecological Reserve, and Birch River Ecological Reserve – are contained within Porcupine Provincial Forest. These areas have distinct objectives and management regimes from the rest of the provincial forest, and therefore are excluded from this analysis. |

| **TABLE 1: STANDARDS COMMON TO PROTECTED AREAS AND OECMS** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CRITERIA:** | **INTENDED EFFECT OF THE CRITERION** | **SCREENING CHOICE** | **EVIDENCE-BASED RATIONALE  Rationale/evaluation of how area meets or does not meet the intended effect of the criterion** | **MEETS INTENDED EFFECT?** |
| **GEOGRAPHICAL SPACE** | Demarcates the area to facilitate the in-situ conservation of biodiversity. | A. The geographical space has clearly defined and agreed-upon borders. | Legal boundaries are shown on a plan filed in the office of the Director of Surveys at Winnipeg as No. 19596. | Yes |
| **EFFECTIVE MEANS – 1** | Activities incompatible with the in-situ conservation of biodiversity do not occur and compatible activities are effectively managed. | C. The mechanism(s) does/do not provide sufficient ability to prevent and/or manage activities within the area that are likely to have impacts on biodiversity. | The Forest Act management provision that states provincial forests are intended to “provide for a reasonable use of all the resources that the forest lands contain” which encourages resource extraction and the construction of the respective infrastructure. The Act states that provincial forests are “in order to reserve certain areas in the province for a perpetual growth of timber, and to preserve the forest cover”. While this ensures forest regeneration, it does so in the context of timber harvesting and therefore does not mention preservation of biodiversity, only timber value. It contains structures for obtaining resource rights but offers no mention of in-situ biodiversity conservation in the applications. Within provincial forests persons are able to obtain the right to use lands for pipeline and power transmission, mining and quarrying, construction of schools, churches or cemeteries, government structures, airstrips, winter roads, and recreational structures such as summer homes.  Subsurface rights continue to be legally available, and subsurface rights may or may not have been granted prior to designation or establishment. The exercise of pre-existing rights is not substantially hindered by law, policy, ministerial discretion, or other effective means, regardless of impacts on the conservation values of the area. | No |
| **EFFECTIVE MEANS – 2** | C. The mechanism(s) does/do not compel the authority(ies) to prohibit activities incompatible with the in-situ conservation of biodiversity and/or incompatible activities are being allowed or are likely to occur. | The Forest Act does not provide specific goals, methods or guidelines that would encourage the governing authorities to deny the use of forest land on the basis of in-situ biodiversity conservation. In Porcupine Provincial Forest activities such as cottage developments, quarrying (several quarry leases and dispositions are active in the area), logging, ATV use, and recreational development. All of these are incompatible with in-situ conservation as they cause increased access for hunters and fragmentation of the landscape as well as habitat destruction and noise pollution. | No |
| **LONG TERM** | The area is permanently protected or conserved and not easily reversed. | A. The mechanism(s) is/are intended to be in effect for the long term and not easily reversed. | The Forest Act states that provincial forests are intended to provide for “a perpetual growth of timber”, and in establishing a provincial forest withdraws all Crown lands within the forest from “disposition, sale, settlement or occupancy”. These provisions imply perpetuity, and Porcupine Provincial Forest has been designated for over 100 years.  The designation of Porcupine Provincial Forest was accomplished via regulation to the Forest Act. The removal of a provincial forest designation would have to be done through Order and Council, as this is how they are created. Substantial evidence that showed the economic benefits of the change would be required, in a resource management context. Provincial forests are “exempt from disposition, sale, settlement or occupancy except under authority of [the] Act” meaning that removal of land from the provincial forest must be done under the authority of the act, whose explicit purpose is preserving forest cover and perpetual timber growth. Providing justified reason for a reversal of the designation while remaining true to the management provisions of the Act would be difficult. Furthermore, under the Statutes and Regulations Act, public consultation for a duration of 45 days will be required for a change in designation of the land. As a result reversal of current resource protection mechanisms is unlikely. | Yes |
| **TIMING** | Biodiversity is protected or conserved year-round. | A. The mechanism(s) is/are in effect year-round | The designation is in place year round | Yes |

| **TABLE 2: STANDARDS THAT FURTHER DEFINE AND DISTINGUISH BETWEEN PROTECTED AREAS AND OECMS** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CRITERIA:** | **INTENDED EFFECT OF THE CRITERION** | **SCREENING CHOICE** | **EVIDENCE-BASED RATIONALE:**  **Rationale/evaluation of how area meets or does not meet the intended effect of the criterion** | **OUTCOME** |
| **SCOPE OF OBJECTIVES** | Objectives have sufficient scope to result in the in-situ conservation of biodiversity. | E. The objectives are neither for, nor consistent with, the in-situ conservation of biodiversity; or objectives do not exist. | The objectives are not for the conservation of any elements of biodiversity, and the outcome is not in-situ conservation of biodiversity.  The objectives of provincial forests, as defined in The Forest Act, are to “reserve certain areas in the province for a perpetual growth of timber, and to preserve the forest cover thereon, and to provide for a reasonable use of all the resources that the forest lands contain”. These objectives are resource-focused and contain no provisions for conservation of biodiversity. | No |
| **PRIMACY OF OBJECTIVES** | Objectives are such that they result in the in-situ conservation of biodiversity. | E. Based on evident intent the in-situ conservation of biodiversity is likely to be compromised by conflicting objectives, or objectives do not exist. | Conservation of biodiversity is not an objective in Porcupine Provincial Forest. The forest is dedicated specifically for harvest timber and other resources. Timber harvesting activities are well known to be contrary to biodiversity objectives as they lead to fragmentation and increased access. | No |
| **GOVERNING AUTHORITIES** | The in-situ conservation of biodiversity is not jeopardized by relevant governing authorities. | E. Not all relevant governing authorities acknowledge and abide by the conservation objectives of the area or by a management regime likely to result in the in-situ conservation of biodiversity. As a result, the area is not managed in a manner likely to de | Although the relevant governing authorities abide by the management regime, that regime does not result in the in-situ conservation of biodiversity. There are no biodiversity objectives and no conservation objectives included in the Forest Act. The management regime focuses only on resource extraction. | No |
| **BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION OUTCOMES** | Biodiversity is conserved in-situ. | E. The area is not being managed in a way that achieves the conservation objectives or is likely to deliver the in-situ conservation of biodiversity. | Because of the traits of the mechanism and the allowable activities that are incompatible, the area is not being managed to achieve the long-term, in-situ conservation of biodiversity. | No |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT** | |
| **OUTCOME / EVALUATION** | **Screening Outcome:** Neither  Is this an Interim Target 1 area: no  Is this a candidate Target 1 area: no  **Currently reported to CPCAD/CARTS?** No  **Total Area (ha) to be reported to CPCAD/CARTS: n/a** |
| Identify deficiencies that could be overcome in order to report as PA or OECM | Needs effective means |
| Lead evaluator / assessor | Originally evaluated for a CCEA case study. Transferred to this current format by Abby Menendez (ECCC) |
| Communications / Engagement | *Names of governing authorities and others consulted, including names and positions of contact people and dates* |
| Approvals | Jason Kelly, Ecological Reserve and Protected Areas Specialist, Parks and Natural Areas Branch, Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship, Government of Manitoba |