**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** | **Canadian Forces Base Shilo** |
| **Designation** | Canadian Forces Base |
| **Province/Territory** | Manitoba |
| **Year of Establishment / Securement** | In 1910 Dominion of Canada’s Militia Department acquired land within the former Spruce Woods timber reserve. The current area of the base was established as a regular army base in October 1946. |
| **Area (ha)** | 23,061 ha |
| **Management Authority** | *e.g. for FPT governments: provide government, department and division/branch*  Department of National Defense (DND) |
| **Explanation of Management Authority** *(optional)* | *Only provide description if management authority is very complex or not well understood. This is not necessary for most sites.* |
| **Governance Type *(CPCAD type*)** | Government - federal |
| **Legal Basis / mechanism(s)** | Acceptance of a Transfer of Administration and Control from Her Majesty in Right of a Province. Order in Council No. 429/2013 (Lease Agreement between Manitoba and Canada) |
| **Explanation of legal basis / mechanism(s)** *(optional)* | *Only provide description if legal basis or mechanism(s) is very complex or not well understood. This is not necessary for most sites*  The OIC stipulates that DND shall develop and maintain an environmental protection plan, known as the Canadian Forces Base Shilo Long Term Natural Resources Management Framework. |
| **Summary of Essential / Relevant natural, social and cultural values** | *Maximum 3-4 sentences intended to provide overall site context and connection to in-situ conservation of biodiversity*  CFB Shilo as a whole supports a wide-range of military training by both home and visiting units. Training consists of small arms, grenades, artillery, rocketry, air weapons, tank and anti-tank firing.  **Areas A and B and 1, 2 and 9** are areas that are intensely utilized for training and may contain significant infrastructure that make the sites incompatible with the conservation of biodiversity. These areas are not being considered in this case study or for reporting.  **Areas C through F and 3 through 8** of CFB Shilo that are the focus of this case study are natural habitats that are relatively undisturbed and support plant and wildlife communities in mostly pristine conditions. The site is located on the outwash plain of glacial Lake Agassiz, and contains four different plant communities: mixed-grass prairie, deciduous forest, mixed-forest, and tamarack-black spruce wetland.  The habitat distribution within the base area is close to what would be expected naturally. Other areas surrounding the base have been experiencing aspen encroachment and loss of open sand and prairie habitat die to lack of wildfire and natural disturbance, such as grazing by large bison herds. The management plans indicate awareness of this issue and an intent to take preventative measures to protect the natural habitat proportions.  CFB Shilo is adjacent to Douglas Marsh Provincial Forest and Spruce Woods Provincial Park, both of which have considerable portions of their land base protected.  Shilo Environmental Advisory Committee was established in 1974. It is a committee that connects researchers from Universities, Manitoba Sustainability, Environment and Climate Change Canada, Manitoba Environment, MB Parks, Nature Conservancy of Canada, Conservation Data Centre with military members from our G3 branch (Operations and Training) and Base Environment Officer and Base Biologist. |

| **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.  The boundaries of CFB Shilo are signed and fenced and the shapefile is publically available for free on the Manitoba Land Initiative website. The boundary for each Area is delineated as shapefiles, on maps, and on ground through fireguards and trails. | Yes |
| **EFFECTIVE MEANS – 1** | Activities incompatible with the in-situ conservation of biodiversity do not occur and compatible activities are effectively managed. | A. The mechanism(s) provide(s) the ability to prevent incompatible activities and manage all other activities within the area, such that the in-situ conservation of biodiversity can be achieved | The OIC gives the Department of National Defence sole jurisdiction over the base and therefore DND has the power to manage all activities in the area, including those that are likely to have impacts on biodiversity. Any access to the subsurface would be dependent on a negotiated mutually acceptable access agreement. | Yes |
| **EFFECTIVE MEANS – 2** | B. The mechanism(s) does/do not compel the authority(ies) to prohibit activities incompatible with the in-situ conservation of biodiversity but incompatible activities are not likely to occur. | The CFB Shilo Long Term Natural Resources Management Framework does place an emphasis on the maintenance of biodiversity.  While the OIC does define several ecologically important areas within the base that are out of bounds to vehicles, the mechanism does not compel DND to prohibit activities that may be incompatible with biodiversity in other parts of the area under consideration.  For security and safety reasons DND prohibits most activities that would have a negative impact on conservation of biodiversity. There are a number of unexploded ordnance devices located throughout the Base and consequently CFB Shilo will not authorize activities which will disturb the ground as the risk of an accident is too great. Additionally, allowing developments within the boundaries of the Base would affect training as they would be unable to conduct training activities in their vicinity. | Yes |
| **LONG TERM** | The area is permanently protected or conserved and not easily reversed. | B. The mechanism(s) is/are expected to be in effect for the long term and not easily reversed. | CFB Shilo has been in operation since 1946. The OIC establishing the base will be in place until December 31, 2033, with an option to renew again for a period of 20 years. Given the nature of the training it is anticipated that lease will be renewed and will continue to be in operation for the long term.  The designation can be removed by rescinding the OIC, which requires cabinet approval. Alternatively, the OIC could be permitted to expire without renewal in 2033, although this is not likely as indicated above. | Yes |
| **TIMING** | Biodiversity is protected or conserved year-round. | A. The mechanism(s) is/are in effect year-round | There are no seasonal components to the designation. | 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. | C. The area has objectives consistent with, whether intentionally or otherwise, the in-situ conservation of biodiversity. | The CFB Shilo Long Term Natural Resource Management Framework (NRM Framework) acknowledges that the base is “only a small portion of a larger ecosystem, the natural region, or habitat”, and defines the responsibilities of DND for environmental management. These include responsibilities for the Range and Training Area (RTA) as follows:   * Maintain clean and uncontaminated surface and ground water * Maintain abundant and diverse wildlife populations * Maintain and preserve mixed-grass prairie * Maintain ecotypes as defined in 2006 vegetation classification * Identify and protect all known archaeological sites in   The NRM Framework outlines the following objectives that are associated with biodiversity conservation:   * Identify relative abundance, frequency, and diversity of small and large mammals, birds, reptiles and amphibians. * Identify and maintain database of SARA species and update yearly. * Maintain sustainable populations of small and large mammals, birds, reptiles, and amphibians through habitat preservation. * Identify and determine relative abundance, frequency, richness and diversity of fish and invertebrates. * Review wildlife populations via surveys every five years on a rotational basis. * Maintain a yearly invasive weed control program. * Maintain and annual burn plan on a rotational basis. * Identify and develop a long term removal plan for areas of pine and aspen encroachment on prairie areas. * Maintain yearly veg monitoring on a rotational basis. | Yes - OECM |
| **PRIMACY OF OBJECTIVES** | Objectives are such that they result in the in-situ conservation of biodiversity. | D. Based on evident intent (e.g., management intent, stated or implied objectives, allowable and prohibited activities), primary and overriding objectives are not expected to result in adverse impacts on the in-situ conservation of biodiversity. | The primary mandate of the base is to provide a space for military training. This mandate takes priority in a case of conflict with conservation objectives, although all measures are taken to mitigate possible impacts on biodiversity. In addition, some activities carried out by DND on the site, including prescribed burns and artillery practice, enhance biodiversity by preventing aspen encroachment on areas of mixed-grass prairie.  Although not a stated objective, for security and safety reasons DND prohibits most activities that would have a negative impact on conservation of biodiversity. Any subsurface developments would pose a great risk to the developer due to unexploded ordnance being buried throughout CFB Shilo; consequently permits would not be issued due to public risk. Additionally, any developments would restrict the area available for training which would not be compatible with the Bases purpose.  Therefore, although not clearly defined in policy, allowable and prohibited activities support conservation of biodiversity overall in practice. | Yes - OECM |
| **GOVERNING AUTHORITIES** | The in-situ conservation of biodiversity is not jeopardized by relevant governing authorities. | C. All relevant governing authorities acknowledge and abide by a management regime that delivers the in-situ conservation of biodiversity. | In the context of the current lease agreement, Manitoba transferred the administration and control of Provincial Crown land to Canada. Consequently, DND is the sole governing authority of the site and abides by its self-imposed conservation objectives. As for the sub-surface rights, subject to prior negotiation, Manitoba (Minister/Agents) may have limited access to the Crown land to explore, assess, and extract mineral and petroleum resources.  Given the use of the land, permitting is unlikely. Any subsurface developments would pose a great risk to the developer due to unexploded ordnance being buried throughout CFB Shilo; consequently permits would not be issued due to public risk. Additionally, any developments would restrict the area available for training which would not be compatible with the Bases purpose. | Yes - OECM |
| **BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION OUTCOMES** | Biodiversity is conserved in-situ. | C. The area is being managed in a way that delivers the in-situ conservation of biodiversity. | CFB Shilo has documented 63 species of mammals, over 200 species of birds, 7 species of reptiles, 8 species of amphibians, and 450 species of flora. There are 17 resident species at risk located in CFB Shilo while an additional 11 species at risk have been seen or heard on the site but a breeding population was not confirmed.  CFB Shilo has a number of ongoing monitoring programs including using Landsat imagery to document habitat changes over time, breeding bird surveys every two years, and yearly nocturnal owl, common nighthawk, chimney swift, bat, and prairie skink surveys, vegetation transect monitoring (every year on a five year rotational basis and hairy prairie clover mapping and change detection.  Assessments of habitat distribution in CFB Shilo indicate little change in the proportion and distribution of habitat types throughout the base. Bird monitoring has indicated a slow decline over time for SAR however this is likely due to loss of habitat and other factors found along their migration corridors and wintering areas and is reflective of a larger global trend. Reptile and amphibian surveys have had consistent results over years. | Yes - OECM |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT** | |
| **OUTCOME / EVALUATION** | **Screening Outcome:** OECM (meets all criteria)  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:** 23,061 |
| Identify deficiencies that could be overcome in order to report as PA or OECM | *What, if any, actions could be undertaken to meet the Pan-Canadian criteria and standards for reporting?* |
| Lead evaluator / assessor | *Names and organizations of lead evaluator and contributors, date of contribution, relationship to site*  Screening originally conducted by the Canadian Council on Ecological Areas (CCEA) and the Department of National Defense in 2016 using the draft CCEA Screening Tool. The case study was then reviewed by Environment and Climate Change Canada. The case study has been updated to use the pan-Canadian guidance included in the Decision Support Tool. |
| Communications / Engagement | *Names of governing authorities and others consulted, including names and positions of contact people and dates*  Department of National Defense, Manitoba Sustainable Development, Manitoba Infrastructure. |
| Approvals | *Names of governing authorities (including landowners, right holders and the responsible jurisdiction) that have approved the content and results of this screening as being accurate and complete to the best of their knowledge and agree to reporting of data.*  Saleem Sattar, Director General, Department of National Defense |
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