



7

CONCLUSION

# 7

## CONCLUSION

The preparation of the present report has allowed for the creation of a factual and realistic description of the state of the biodiversity protection in protected areas by measuring the progress in the field between 2002 and 2009. The aim of the report was to determine the main deficiencies present in the network regarding nature conservation and to evaluate the quality of the network both in terms of the representativeness of natural environments and species and in terms of effectiveness in preserving biodiversity using available knowledge.

Apart from the level attained, which in itself constitutes a considerable achievement, the results obtained by the PASAP 2002-2009 are unprecedented in the history of biodiversity conservation in Québec. Many ecosystems which were not protected in 2002 presently are, as far as physical, aquatic and forest variables are concerned and regarding cover types and EMV.

Particular attention should be paid to the fact that between 2002 to 2009, an inversion of the protected area management categories. While in 2002, protected areas with strict management (categories I through III), represented 20% of the network, they now constitute 81%. Since a high level of protection provided through strict biodiversity management is a very important indicator of network quality, the objective achieved by Québec in this matter is remarkable. Strict management conditions are essential in maintaining an observation role of the dynamics of ecosystems and species changes.

In the spring of 2009, the Québec Government committed itself to reach the objective of including 12% of its territory in protected areas by 2015. Therefore, within the next five years, almost 65,000 km<sup>2</sup> must be added to the protected areas network in Québec. In order to ensure the representativeness of the network within the additional 4%, it will be necessary to focus on the main deficiencies highlighted by the present report. This constitutes the first element of conclusion. In the light of this report, a second element can be formulated. In fact, the representativeness deficiencies of the protected areas network concerning natural habitats and species should be remedied in priority via protected areas with management categories of I through III, to ensure the representativeness of the network, as was the case from 2002 to 2009.

Furthermore, in order to complete the protected areas network, it will be necessary to select new protected areas in a manner ensuring their representativeness and effectiveness by protecting, for example, old-growth forests, productive sites, endangered and vulnerable species and sites sensitive to climate changes.

The report also highlights a significant shortage of protected marine areas, which constitutes the third element of conclusion. In this light, particular attention should be paid to the creation of protected areas representative of the biodiversity of the St. Lawrence Estuary in order to identify innovative solutions which will enable significant progress in marine environment protection.

This overview also highlights several rare elements which make up the biodiversity of the Québec territory, and, by definition, do not extend over large areas. The present report demonstrates that the current network covers a considerable part of these elements, though some of these elements are not yet represented in the network. The fourth element of conclusion concerns the necessity to create a specific strategy in order to ensure full representation of rare elements in the protected areas network, on the bases of the present findings on representativeness variables, for example, by devoting 1% of the additional 4% to complete the representation of this diverse rarity within the protected areas network.

Another challenge that the present report points out is the concern of ensuring the effectiveness of “strict” protected areas within the network that can adequately fill its role as observer of the dynamics of ecosystems and species changes. The most important activities which should be put in place in order to ensure such effectiveness include consolidating the current conservation cores of protected areas, maintaining and developing connectivity between protected areas to allow them to assure biodiversity protection beyond 8% or 12%, and controlling human encroachment. Implementing these actions would allow for an easier and more efficient attainment of the objectives concerning land reserved for protected areas. Protected areas with less strict formulae (management

categories IV, V and VI) could be used to consolidate protected areas insure representativeness of the network. Future actions should be guided by this fifth element of conclusion.

In view of the issues related to the protection of wide-ranging species (including Woodland caribou), climate change, and the depletion of old growth forest stands, the contingency plan should include the possibility of creating several large protected areas (about 10,000 km<sup>2</sup> each) which would be functional from the ecological, social and economic point of view. Such “wildlife sanctuaries” could be created on the basis of some of the existing protected areas. This is the sixth element of conclusion, which concerns the development of a new planning and action strategy.

**In summary, the next Québec strategic plan for protected areas could be built around the following six principles:**

1. Improve the performance of the current protected areas network by substantially reducing the main representativeness gaps as outlined in the Overview of Québec’s Protected Areas Network – the 2002-2009 period.
2. Continue the actions by favouring the creation of new protected areas of management categories I through III to achieve the desired representativeness of biodiversity in protected areas.
3. Determine and implement innovative solutions which will enable significant progress as far as protected marine environments are concerned.
4. Focus on the protection of rare biodiversity elements in the protected areas network.
5. Innovate in biodiversity conservation in relation to the pro-development concept of protected areas, focusing on consolidating the current network by creating protected areas with less strict formulae (management categories IV, V and VI), in particular by defining new adapted legal statutes.
6. Create several large “wildlife sanctuaries” in order to meet the international challenges of wide-ranging species protection, climate change and its influence on biodiversity, and the worrisome rejuvenation of the Québec forest landscape with its specific biodiversity.





8

ANNEXES

## 8

## ANNEXES

**ANNEX 1 LIST LIST OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ROUND TABLE ON PROTECTED AREAS**

Fédération québécoise de la faune	Pierre Latraverse
Nature conservancy of Canada (NCC)	Nathalie Zinger
Fédération québécoise de la marche	Daniel Pouplot
Fédération québécoise du canot et du kayak	Pierre Trudel
Reassembly of public lands tenants of Québec Inc.	Alain Lalande
Regroupement national des conseils régionaux de l'environnement du Québec	Philippe Bourque
Réseau québécois des groupes écologistes	Maude Prud'Homme
Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society	Sophie Paradis
Centre for Forest Research	Mélanie Desrochers
Ducks Unlimited Canada	Bernard Fillion
Action boréale	Henri Jacob
Fédération québécoise pour le saumon atlantique	Amélie Dussault
Nature Québec	Edith Cadieux
Greenpeace	Nicolas Mainville
Québec Outfitters Federation Inc	Jonathan Leblond
Fédération québécoise des gestionnaires de zecs	Christian Langlois
The Canadian Boreal Initiative	Suzan Methot
Chair in Landscape and Environmental Design of the Université de Montréal	Sabine Courcy
<b>MDDEP</b>	
Assistant Deputy Minister, Sustainable Development Branch	Léopold Gaudreau
Acting Director, Direction du patrimoine écologique et des parcs	Patrick Beauchesne
Head, Service des aires protégées	Christiane Bernard
Scientific Coordinator	François Brassard
<b>MRNF</b>	
Assistant Deputy Minister for the Plan Nord et au territoire	Christian Dubois
Environnement et coordination	Claude Leblanc

**ANNEX 2      LANDSAT COVER TYPES**

23 CLASSES	12 CLASSES
No Data	Exclude from analysis
Cloud	Exclude from analysis
Shadow	Exclude from analysis
Snow and Ice	Exclude from analysis
Rock and rubble	Rock and rubble
Exposed land	Exposed land
Bryoids	Bryoids
Shrub – tall	Shrub
Shrub – low	Shrub
Wetland – treed	Wetland
Wetland – Shrub	Wetland
Wetland – Herbaceous	Wetland
Herbaceous	Herbaceous
Coniferous – dense	Coniferous
Coniferous – open	Coniferous
Coniferous – sparse	Coniferous sparse
Broadleaf – dense	Broadleaf
Broadleaf – open	Broadleaf
Broadleaf – sparse	Broadleaf
Mixed wood – dense	Mixed wood
Mixed wood – open	Mixed wood
Mixed wood – sparse	Mixed wood
Water	Water

### ANNEX 3 DEFINITION OF VARIABLES USED TO DESCRIBE WETLAND TYPES

This description was produced via data extraction and spatial analyses of the databases presented in the following table. Sources for the data used to characterise the physical structure of aquatic habitats.

NAME OF THE SOURCE	SCALE	CLASSES	TERRITORY
Québec Topographic database (BDTQ)	1/20,000	- Surfacic hydrography - Linear hydrography	South of the 52 <sup>nd</sup> parallel
National topographic database (NTDB)	1/50,000	- Surfacic hydrography - Linear hydrography	North of the 52 <sup>nd</sup> parallel
Ecological reference framework	1/1,000,000	Level 2	Québec

#### AQUATIC DOMAIN

Each element on the territory is assigned to an aquatic domain (lentic or lotic) according to the classification determined by the BDTQ. In the case of the NTDB, the information had to be interpreted on the screen, as it was not included in the initial database.

#### PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

By integrating this qualitative variable, we aim to represent in an integrated manner the elements which influence some of the aspects of the motor function and physical chemistry of water in aquatic habitats. The physical environments of aquatic habitats are located and described in accordance with the level 2 of the Ecological reference Framework (ERF). These areas are then segregated on the basis of the geomorphology of the territory which allows for an integrated approach to the geomorphological, geological and climatic aspects. An integrated account of these elements is particularly pertinent, as these elements often function in synergy on aquatic habitats.

The type of geological formation composing each physical environment (source rock and surface deposits) has a major influence on the natural physical chemistry of the water flowing through it. The natural composition of the water, in particular with regard to nutrients and pH, can be inferred from this information.

#### SIZE

The surfacic area influences aquatic habitats on the energetic and physical chemistry level by regulating the amount of light that enters the lake, surfacic evaporation, fetch, and gas exchanges between the surface of the water and the atmosphere (Wetzel, 2001). These influences are particularly associated with lentic environments, but they play a significant role on lotic habitats.

This variable is calculated differently for lentic and lotic habitats. Lentic habitats (lakes and calm water surfaces) have been mapped and are well circumscribed, and their surface area is easy to calculate. On the other hand, the size of lotic habitats, being more open by nature, has to be measured according to the relative width rather than their surface area. A cartographic representation (lines or polygons) is used to classify lotic environments into two classes, small or large. Lines represent smaller streams and rivers than those represented by polygons.

Classification of surface area values for lentic environments

CLASS	SURFACE AREA (HA)	DESCRIPTION
XS	< 5	Very small
S	5 – 25	Small
M	25 – 625	Medium
L	625 – 3,125	Large
XL	3,125 – 15,625	Very large
I	> 15,625	Immense

### SHAPE

This variable is applicable only to lentic environments. Calculations of the coastal development index (CDI) are based on the surface area and perimeter and express the relationship between the actual perimeter of a water surface and its hypothetical perimeter. This formula has been taken from the work by Wetzel (2001). In Limnology, this index is considered to be a good indicator of the habitat potential for wildlife.

$$SINUOSITY = \frac{PERIMETER}{\sqrt{2 * (\pi * AREA)}}$$

Classification of the sinuosity values for lakes

CODE	COASTAL DEVELOPMENT INDEX	DESCRIPTION
S	1 – 1.25	Simple
D	1.25 – 2.5	Developped
I	2.5 - +	Intricate

### CONNECTIVITY INDEX

The connectivity index was evaluated for lentic environments. This index represents the strength and diversity of connections between a body of water and the rest of the hydrographic network, which makes it possible to represent the motor functions of lakes and other bodies of still water. These functions are clearly related to some of the physical chemistry characteristics of lakes. This relationship was observed, among others, by Martin and Soranno (2006).

The connectivity index involves two variables: the number of connections and the size of the largest connection. The number of connections is based on a simple tally of lines and polygons representing streams and rivers related to each body of water. Size is simply based on the type of representation (lines or polygons), of related streams and rivers. A stream or river represented by a line is characterised in most cases by a lesser flow than one represented by a surface (polygon). Finer data including the Strahler stream order or the size of the catchment area of streams or rivers are only available for the part covered by the BDTQ, which explains why this data was not used.

The number of connections and the size of the largest connection are linked in a two dimensional matrix. These relations are translated into types, which are then reclassified so as to obtain the final index.

The connectivity index is obtained by multiplying the classes of the weighted criteria by the number of connections. The results are then reclassified so as to limit the number of possible classes while taking into account all of the criteria.

#### Connectivity Types

	NO CONNECTION V = 0	LESS THAN 3 CONNECTIONS V = 1	FROM 3 TO 5 CONNECTIONS V = 2	5 CONNECTIONS OR MORE V = 3
SMALL CONNECTION (LINEAR) V = 1	ISOLATED	Small – not very diversified (SN)	Small – moderately diversified (SM)	Small – very diversified (SV)
LARGE CONNECTION (SURFACIC) V = 3	ISOLATED	Large – not very diversified (LN)	Large – moderately diversified (LM)	Large – very diversified (LV)

#### Reclassification of connectivity indices

TYPE OF CONNECTIVITY	INDEX VALUE	CLASS
ISOLATED	0	I
SN	1	F
SM	2	F
SV	3	F
LN	3	E
LM	6	E
LV	9	E

#### ANNEX 4 QUALITY SCALE FOR MULTI-SPECIES HABITATS ELABORATED FOR CONNECTIVITY

A displacement cost matrix was elaborated based on the encroachment matrix. A cost was attributed to each encroachment type according to the effect on the quality of the habitat (see table below). A more encroached habitat is considered to be a lesser quality habitat. The cost gradient associated with the different anthropogenic disturbances was inspired from gradients elaborated to quantify the impact of different land use types on ecological processes (Faber-Langendoen et al, 2008 [NatureServe]; Brown and Vivas, 2005).

ANTHROPOGENIC DISTURBANCES	ASSOCIATED COST
No disturbance	1
Partial cutting in old-growth forests (> 20 years)	20
Total cutting in old growth forests (> 20 years), impracticable old forest path	30
Recent partial forest cutting (20 years)	40
Hydroelectric reservoir, transmission line	50
Recent partial forest cutting (20 years), land lease (cottages, outfitters, etc.)	60
Agriculture, railroad, snowmobile and all-terrain vehicle path	70
Unpaved road that is suitable for motor vehicles, secondary and inferior forest pathway, navigation channel, dredged waterway	80
Paved road, primary forest pathway, strongly anthropised environment (golf, airport, etc.)	90
Urban environment, mine	100

**ANNEX 5 AGE CLASS DEFINING OLD-GROWTH FORESTS ACCORDING TO FOREST SPECIES**

DOMINANT SPECIES	ESTABLISHMENT AGE OF OLD-GROWTH FOREST (MNRF, UNPUBLISHED)	AGE OF BREAKAGE (KNEESHAW AND GAUTHIER, 2003)	MATURITY AGE (BURNS AND HONKALA, 1990)	ESTABLISHMENT AGE OF THE OLD FOREST (UHLIG ET AL., 2001)	AGE CLASS CORRESPONDING TO OLD GROWTH FORESTS, ACCORDING TO SPECIES **
White Birch *	-	90-110 years	60-70 years	90-100 years	90 years and older and old uneven-aged forests
Yellow Birch	-	-	120-150 years	150-160 years	120 years and older and old uneven-aged forests
Red Oak or indistinct	-	-	-	110-120 years	120 years and older and old uneven-aged forests
White Spruce	-	110-130 years	100-250 years	90-120 years	90 years and older and old uneven-aged forests
Black and/or red spruce	70-114 years	110-160 years	95-132 years	80-150 years	90 years and older and old uneven-aged forests
Sugar Maple	-	-	140-150 years	120-140 years	120 years and older and old uneven-aged forests
Red Maple *	-	-	70-80 years	70-100 years	70 years and over and old uneven-aged forests
Indistinct Ash	-	-	-	100 years	120 years and older and old uneven-aged forests
Tamarack	-	-	-	90 years	90 years and older and old uneven-aged forests
Indistinct Poplar *	66-82 years	90-100 years		80-100 years	90 years and older and old uneven-aged forests
Eastern White Pine	-	-	-	120-150 years	120 years and older and old uneven-aged forests
Jack Pine *	70-86 years	90-110 years	60-80 years	80-140 years	90 years and older and old uneven-aged forests
Red Pine	-	-	-	130-140 years	120 years and older and old uneven-aged forests
Hemlocks	-	-	-	140 years	120 years and older and old uneven-aged forests
Balsam Fir	50-112 years	70-80 years	-	70 years	70 years and over and old uneven-aged forests
Eastern White Cedar	-	-	-	100-150 years	120 years and older and old uneven-aged forests
Humid hardwood			-		120 years and older and old uneven-aged forests
Tolerant hardwood			-		120 years and older and old uneven-aged forests
Intolerant hardwood *			-		120 years and older and old uneven-aged forests
Indistincts Softwood			-		90 years and older and old uneven-aged forests

\* Species denoting the beginning of succession

\*\* Correspondence of age classes: 10 = 0 to 20 years; 30 = 20-40 years; 50 = 40 to 60 years; 70 = 60 to 80 years; 90 = 80 to 100 years; 120 = 100 years and more

## ANNEX 6 PROCESS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PROTECTED AREAS

### 1 PROCESS FOR CREATING AQUATIC RESERVES AND BIODIVERSITY - MAIN STEPS

The process for creating aquatic and biodiversity reserves has evolved over the time period from 2000 to 2008. However, the following steps were generally carried out.

#### DETERMINATION OF TERRITORIES OF INTEREST

**PUBLIC INFORMATION SESSIONS AND MEETINGS WITH TARGETED STAKEHOLDERS** – Before setting aside territories and designing them as proposed reserves, the MDDEP, between 2002 and 2008, held over 115 public information sessions and meetings with over one hundred targeted stakeholders, in more than 45 locations throughout Québec. Moreover, the public sessions presented an opportunity for the MDDEP to invite citizens and local stakeholders to propose territories to protect. Meetings with specific stakeholders (ex.: CREs, RMCs, Native communities) led to discussions where sectors of interest were selected for analysis and protection.

**DETERMINATION OF TERRITORIES TO PROTECT AND BOUNDARIES** – Proposals for territories to protect made by citizens and local stakeholders were analysed and the MDDEP determined a series of territories of interest to be submitted for analysis to the MRNF. The MDDEP and MRNF met to finalise the determination of territories of interest and their boundaries. The latter is part of energetic and mining constraints whereas forestry-related constraints are integrated after meeting with those in charge of planning. A number of Native communities have participated in the determination of territories of interest and boundaries.

**CONSULTATION WITH REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVES** – Regional representatives such as the CREs, RMCs, as well as Native communities were officially consulted before setting aside territories of interest.

**GRANTING OF PROPOSED RESERVE STATUS** – This status is granted for a time period of four years, but can be extended for two more years.

**DRAFTING OF A CONSULTATION DOCUMENT OR IMPACT STUDY** – Studies carried out on the territory have led to the publication of a biophysical description of a proposed reserve and meetings with individuals involved (tallymen, quad and snow mobile drivers, hikers, and vacationers, etc.) were scheduled so as to compile a detailed description

of activities taking place on the reserve and estimate anthropogenic pressure factors on the natural environment. The MDDEP has also decided at times to meet with local or regional authority figures, such as Native communities, RMCs, cities or municipalities, in order to determine potential issues associated with the practice of these activities.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS** – As for southern Québec, the BAPE was appointed to hold public consultation sessions on aquatic and biodiversity reserve proposals. As for proposals on territories covered by the JBNQA, the COMEV and the COMEX are in charge of the consultation process.

**DETERMINATION OF FINAL BOUNDARIES AND DRAFTING OF A CONSERVATION PLAN** – Final boundaries of aquatic and biodiversity reserves following public consultation sessions are determined by the government (MDDEP and MRNF), and regional or local authorities may be consulted if necessary. Once the final boundaries have been agreed upon by the MDDEP, a conservation plan is drafted. This plan suggests conservation and enhancement objectives for a given aquatic or biodiversity domain. This document serves to adapt activities according to conservation issues and proposes a zoning status that allows for more appropriate

management of requests for authorisations for interventions (ex. path layout).

**GRANTING OF A PERMANENT STATUS TO AQUATIC OR BIODIVERSITY RESERVES.**

**ACTION AND MANAGEMENT PLAN** – Following the granting of a permanent status, the MDDEP must prepare an action plan, suggesting practical actions, a timeline, means for achievement, individuals involved, etc., to attain the aims of the conservation plan. The MDDEP has chosen a participatory approach to management. As such, the aim is for the main stakeholders involved to play a significant part., via a management committee, in the elaboration of an action plan and allow for them to participate, via the implementation of the action plan, in the management of these protected areas.

## 2 PROCESS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL PARKS AND PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

The establishment of a national park is a long and complex process that spans over years and is subdivided into several steps, some of which target public participation and consultation. The main steps leading to the establishment of a park are the selection of a territory of interest, the study of this territory, the nomination of a task group, the production of a document describing the current state of knowledge and a provisional master development plan, the holding of public hearing sessions and the adoption of an establishment order decreed by the government.

### SELECTION OF THE TERRITORIES OF INTEREST

The management of the network of national parks in Québec is the responsibility of the MDDEP. Over the years, several territories have been set aside in this manner in several regions of Québec, awaiting their consideration by the Minister, which then begins their elaboration. Moreover, proposals from local stakeholders (RMCs, ATR, socio-economic organisation groups, etc.) are regularly submitted to the care of the MDDEP. Analysis of the pertinence of these requests is thus based on the contribution of the project to the representativeness of the network or on the exceptional characteristics of the territory. If the response is positive, the proposal is set aside, until it is considered by the MDDEP.

### NOMINATION OF A TASK GROUP

Once the park is on its way to be considered and the *Service des parcs* of the MDDEP has initiated characterisation studies, a task group is set up. The main objective of this group is to serve as a relay between the *Service des parcs* and the regional environment. The task group includes members who represent the main local and regional interest groups. Native communities involved are invited to be a part of this process and they have at times composed the majority or the whole of the group. The members of the work group are invited to share their knowledge, the expectations of local stakeholders, and suggestions to enhance the project and obtain better support from the locals.

### HOLDING PUBLIC HEARINGS

Once the Minister has completed data collection, it is consigned in a report titled *État des connaissances* (actual state of knowledge). Then, having proceeded with summarising and analysing this information, boundaries are proposed, as well as a zoning plan and a management concept for the future park. This proposal is presented in the provisory master development plan. The public consultation process as per article 4 of the *Loi sur les parcs* is then engaged. The provisory master development plan is made public as hard or electronic copies. Moreover, information sessions are held in communities involved, in the days after the hearings begin. They serve to answer ques-

tions raised by the project and to explain how to participate in the hearings.

Hearings always take place in the communities involved in the project. They are chaired by the minister or someone appointed by the minister. When the hearings involve Native communities, cultural differences are taken into account to facilitate the participation of the communities involved.

Following the hearing, a detailed analysis of the interventions is carried out and a report is submitted to the minister responsible for parks. The conclusions show if a consensus has been reached on the proposal and allow for adjustments, if necessary, to the boundaries, the zoning plan, and the management concept and orientation. In the light of the information received, the minister makes decisions and submits a memorandum to the *Conseil des ministres* addressing the establishment of the park.

In the case of parks proposed on territories covered by northern agreements, additional steps are necessary before the memorandum is to be submitted to the *Conseil des ministres*. These park proposals must go through an evaluation process to examine the impact on the natural and social environment, as set in chapter II of the *Loi sur la qualité de l'environnement*. Some of the hearings related to the evaluation process are additional to

those related to the *Loi sur les parcs*. The Minister will decide in the end if the park proposal is accepted, and if certain conditions apply.

The government is in charge of the establishment of a park by ordering a decree. After this step is completed, the final master development plan can be written up. When necessary, agreements defining the participation of Native communities in the exploitation of the park are signed.

### NOMINATION OF A HARMONISATION ROUND-TABLE

The connection established with the population by the task group is followed-up once the park is created. From then on, the park director is in charge of these discussions. A harmonisation round-table is nominated in the case of parks in southern Québec where the *Société des établissements de plein-air du Québec* (SÉPAQ) is in charge and a committee is nominated for parks such as those in Nunavik where the Kativik Regional Government takes over.

### 3 CONSULTATION PROCESS ON EXCEPTIONAL FOREST ECOSYSTEMS (EFE) PROJECTS

The classification and consultation process on EFE projects can be summed up as follows:

- Project executives at the MRNF write up a preliminary list of potential projects based on the inventory already completed and proposals received from local stakeholders.
- A document describing the project is produced (mapping and descriptive characteristics).
- The MRNF implements provisory protection measures with regard to forestry-related activities.
- Project executives at the MRNF hold consultations inside the MRNF and then consult with the MDDEP to validate proposals, determine rights and adjust, when necessary, the land areas involved.
- The MRNF holds external consultations in accordance with the *Loi sur les forêts*, with municipalities, RMCs, Native communities, and holders of forest, mining, or energy-related rights.
- The MRNF proceeds with the final selection of projects and makes required modifications.
- The MRNF prepares the legal documents as required and submits them to the minister.
- The minister reaches a decision and makes an announcement of the classification of the EFES.

Here is an example of consultations carried out, relating to the sixth classification undertaking, now under way, with 27 park establishment projects proposed as well as 5 expansion projects for existing EFES and the consultation of 72 rights holders, 18 RMCs, 16 municipalities, 15 Native communities and 16 other groups of stakeholders, such as ZECs managers and outfitters. With regard to the five classification undertakings which have led to 145 existing EFES, an average of 150 intervention groups were consulted for each.

### 4 PROCESS FOR APPOINTING AND CONSULTING ON BIOLOGICAL SHELTER PROJECTS

In accordance with the article 54 of the *Loi sur les forêts*, beneficiaries of forest contracts are to invite RMCs, Native communities, wildlife managers and maple producers to participate in the preparation of the *Plan Général d'Aménagement Forestier (PGAF)* (general forest management plan). Any other organisation or individual may also be included in this process. The PGAF presented to the minister of *Ressources naturelles et de la Faune*, which shows biological refuge proposals, must be accompanied by a report indicating the names of individuals who participated in preparing the plan, as well as the results of this participation, such as areas of disagreement between individual proposals and the final plan.

Once this is established, the plan is to be made available to the public (article 58.1) as well as to the individuals and groups from whom the proposals originated (article 58.2) Rules for consultation are detailed in a document titled *Procédure d'information et de consultation du public sur les plans généraux d'aménagement forestier en vigueur pour la période 2008-2013*. As for consulting with Native communities, the procedure presented in the document titled *Consultation des communautés autochtones sur la gestion forestière et l'aménagement forestier* must be implemented.





9

WORKS CITED

# 9

## WORKS CITED

---

ACBF (ALBERTA CENTER FOR BOREAL STUDIES), 2000. Protected areas in boreal Alberta: Considerations for design and Implementation. Fact Sheet by the Alberta Center for Boreal Studies, August.

ANDERSON, J.E., 1991. A Conceptual Framework for Evaluation and Quantifying Naturalness, Conservation Biology, volume 5, no 3, September.

BARRETTE, M. and J-P. GUAY, 2008. Mesure de la naturalité des écosystèmes forestiers – proposition d’une méthode d’évaluation. Rapport rédigé pour la direction du Patrimoine écologique et des Parcs du ministère du Développement durable, de l’Environnement et des Parcs. Université Laval, Québec. 53 p.

BROWN, T.B. and M.B. VIVAS, 2005. Landscape development index. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment. Vol. 101, p. 289-309.

BURNS, R.M. and B.H. HONKALA, 1990. Silvics of North America. Vol. 1 and 2. U.S. Dep. Agric. Agric. Handb. 654 p.

CDPNQ (CENTRE DE DONNÉES SUR LE PATRIMOINE NATUREL DU QUÉBEC), 2008. Les plantes vasculaires menacées ou vulnérables du Québec, 3<sup>e</sup> édition. Gouvernement du Québec, ministère du Développement durable, de l’Environnement et des Parcs, Direction du patrimoine écologique et des parcs, Québec. 180 p.

CHABOT, M., P. BLANCHET P., DRAPEAU, J. FORTIN, S. GAUTHIER, L. IMBEAU, G. LACASSE, G. LEMAIRE, A. NAPPI, R. QUENNEBILLE and É. THIFFAULT, 2009. « Le feu en milieu forestier » dans Ordre des ingénieurs forestiers du Québec, Manuel de foresterie, 2<sup>e</sup> édition. Collective work, Édition multimondes, Québec, p. 1093-1146.

CHAPE, S., M.D., SPALDING, M.D. and JENKINS, 2008. The World’s Protected Areas, UNDP World conservation Monitoring Centre, University of California Press, USA, 359 p.

COLE, D.N, L., YUNG, E.S. ZAVALETA, G.H., APLET, F.S., CHAPIN III, D.M., GRABER, E.S., HIGGS, R.J., HOBBS, P.B., LANDRES, C.I., MILLAR, D.J., PARSONS, J.M., RANDALL, N.L., STEPHENSON, K.A., TONNESSEN, P.S., WHITE, and S. WOODLEY, 2008a. Naturalness and beyond: protected area management in an era of regional and global environmental change. The George Wright Forum 25(1):36-56.

COLE, D.N., 2008b. Wilderness, Protected Areas and Climate Change. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Climate Change Resource Center. <http://www.fs.fed.us/ccrc/topics/wilderness.shtml>

COMITÉ DE RÉTABLISSEMENT DU CARIBOU DE LA GASPÉSIE, 2004. Plan de rétablissement du caribou de la Gaspésie (2002-2012) (*Rangifer tarandus caribou*). Société de la faune et des parcs du Québec, Direction du développement de la faune. 51 p.

COMITÉ SCIENTIFIQUE SUR LES ENJEUX DE BIODIVERSITÉ, 2007. Enjeux de biodiversité de l’aménagement écosystémique dans la réserve faunique des Laurentides. Rapport préliminaire du comité scientifique, ministère des Ressources naturelles et de la Faune. Québec (Québec). 118 p.

- COURTOIS, R., J.-P. OUELLET, S. ST-ONGE, A. GINGRAS and C. DUSSAULT, 2003. Préférences d'habitat chez le caribou forestier dans des paysages fragmentés. Chapitre 7 dans : La conservation du caribou forestier dans un contexte de perte d'habitat et de fragmentation du milieu. Ph.D. thesis, Université du Québec à Rimouski, Rimouski, Québec. 350 p.
- CROOKS, K.R., and M.A. SANJAYAN, 2006. Connectivity Conservation. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. 736 p.
- DESPONTS, M., BRUNET, G., BÉLANGER, L. and M. BOUCHARD, 2004. The eastern boreal old-growth balsam fir forest: a distinct ecosystem. *Can. J. Bot.* 82: 830–849.
- DUDLEY, N., 2008. Lignes directrices pour l'application des catégories de gestion aux aires protégées. Gland, Suisse : UICN. 96 p.
- DUFOUR, R. and P. OUELLET, 2007. Rapport d'aperçu et d'évaluation de l'écosystème marin de l'estuaire et du golfe du Saint-Laurent. Rapport technique canadien des sciences halieutiques et aquatiques. 2744F. Pêches et Océans Canada. 123 p.
- DUNLOP, M. and P.R. BROWN, 2008. Implications of Climate Change for Australia's National Reserve System: A preliminary assessment. Report to the Department of Climate Change, February 2008. Department of Climate Change, Canberra, Australie.
- ENVIRONMENTAL LAW INSTITUTE, 2003. Conservation Thresholds for Land Use Planners. Washington D.C. 55 p.
- ÉQUIPE DE RÉTABLISSEMENT DU CARIBOU FORESTIER DU QUÉBEC, 2008. Plan de rétablissement du caribou forestier (*Rangifer tarandus*) au Québec – 2005-2012, ministère des Ressources naturelles et de la Faune, Faune Québec, Direction de l'expertise sur la faune et des habitats. 78 p.
- ERVIN, J. and N. DUDELY, 2008. Protected area standards assessment: tools and resources. *Parks* vol. 17 no 1.
- FABER-LANGENDOEN, D., G. KUDRAY, C. NORDMAN, L. SNEDDON, L. VANCE, E. BYERS, J. ROCCHIO, S. GAWLER, G. KITTEL, S. MENARD, P. COMER, E. MULDAVIN, M. SCHAFALE, T. FOTI, C. JOSSE, AND J. CHRISTY, 2008. Ecological Performance Standards for Wetland Mitigation: An Approach Based on Ecological Integrity Assessments. NatureServe, Arlington, VA. + Appendices.
- FOURNIER, N., and R. FAUBERT, 2001. Évaluation du troupeau de caribous de la Gaspésie. Société de la faune et des parcs du Québec, Direction de l'aménagement de la faune de la région de la Gaspésie–Îles-de-la-Madeleine.
- GAUTHIER, S., M.-A. VAILLANCOURT, A. LEDUC, L. DE GRANDPRÉ, D. KNEESHAW, H. MORIN, P. DRAPEAU and Y. BERGERON, 2008. Aménagement écosystémique en forêt boréale. Presses de l'Université du Québec. 568 p.
- GERARDIN, V., J.-P. DUCRUC and P. BEAUCHESNE, 2002. « Planification du réseau d'aires protégées du Québec – Principes et méthodes de l'analyse écologique du territoire. *VertigO* », vol. 3, no 1.
- GILG, O., 2004. Forêt à caractère naturel. Caractéristiques, conservation et suivi. Gestion des milieux et des espèces. Cahiers techniques no 74.
- GREENFACTS, 2002. Consensus scientifique sur le changement climatique. Évaluation 2001. <http://www.greenfacts.org/fr/dossiers/changement-climatique/sources.htm>
- GIEC (GROUPE D'EXPERTS INTERGOUVERNEMENTAL SUR L'ÉVOLUTION DU CLIMAT), 2002. Les changements climatiques et la biodiversité, WMO, UNEP, Document technique V, 75 p.
- GIEC, 2008. Bilan 2007 des changements climatiques. Rapport synthèse. 114 p.
- GRONDIN, P., J.-P. BERGER, Y. LANDRY and P. LÉBOEUF, 2007. Guide de reconnaissance des types écologiques des régions écologiques 5j – Île d'Anticosti et îles de Mingan de même que 5k–Gaspésie–Îles-de-la-Madeleine, Québec, ministère des Ressources naturelles et de la Faune, Forêt Québec, Direction des inventaires forestiers, Division de l'analyse et de la diffusion des informations forestières et écologiques.

- HANNAH, L., G.F. MIDGLEY and D. MILLAR, 2002. Climate change-integrated conservation strategies. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 11, 485-495.
- HANNAH, L., 2008. Protected Areas and Climate Change. *Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci.* 1134 : 201-212.
- JAEGER, J., 2000. Landscape division, splitting index, and effective mesh size: new measures of landscape fragmentation, *Landscape Ecology* 15: 115-130.
- KNEESHAW, D. and S. GAUTHIER, 2003. Old growth in the boreal forest: A dynamic perspective at the stand and landscape level. *Environmental reviews*. Volume 11: pp. 99-114.
- LAMARRE, J.-F., 2005. Design écologique des parcs nationaux : proposition d'un cadre opérationnel pour le Québec. M.A. thesis. Université Laval, Département des sciences du bois et de la forêt, Faculté de foresterie et de géomatique.
- LAVOIE, G. and B. TARDIF, 2009. Le CDPNQ, vingt ans au service de la documentation du vivant. *Naturaliste canadien* 133 : 24-25.
- LEE, P., 1996. The natural heritage network – Integrating Canada's provincial conservation data centers with international biodiversity conservation. *The World Conservation Congress*. 13-23 October 1996. Montreal, Canada.
- LEMIEUX, C.J. and D.J. SCOTT 2005. Climate change, biodiversity conservation, and protected areas planning in Canada. *The Canadian Geographer*, 49(4): 384-399.
- MARGULES, C.R. and R.L. PRESSEY, 2000. Systematic conservation planning, *Nature*. (405) 243-253.
- MARTIN, S. L. and P.A. SORANNO, 2006. Lake landscape position: Relationships to hydrologic connectivity and landscape features. *Limnology and oceanography*, vol. 51, no 2, p. 801-814.
- MARTIKAINEN, P., SIITONEN, J., PUNTTILA, P., KAILA, L. and J. RAUH, 2000. Species richness of Coleoptera in mature managed and old-growth boreal forests in southern Finland. *Biol. Conserv.* 94: 199-209.
- MRNF (MINISTÈRE DES RESSOURCES NATURELLES ET DE LA FAUNE DU QUÉBEC), 2006. Proposition d'une grille d'analyse des enjeux de l'aménagement écosystémique. Document de travail. MRNF, Direction de l'environnement forestier. 12 p.
- MRNF, 2008. Zones de végétation et domaines bioclimatiques du Québec. Web site: <http://www.mrnf.gouv.qc.ca/forets/connaissances/connaissances-inventaire-zones-carte.jsp>
- NOSS, R., 1995. Maintaining ecological integrity in representative reserve networks. Discussion paper. World Wildlife Fund – Canada / World Wildlife Fund – United States.
- NOSS F. REED, E. DINSESTEIN, B. GILBERT, M. GILPIN, BRIAN J, MILLER, J. TERBORGN and S. TROMBULAK, 1999. Core Areas: Where Nature Reigns. In: *Continental conservation: scientific foundations of regional reserve networks* by Michael E. Soulé, John Terborgh, Wildlands Project Edition: illustrated. Island Press, 227 p.
- PYKE C. and D, FISCHER, 2005. Selection of bioclimatically representative biological reserve systems under climate change. *Biological conservation* 121: 429-441.
- QUÉBEC, 2002. Plan d'action stratégique. Premiers résultats. Stratégie québécoise sur les aires protégées. 43 p.
- SAUCIER, J.-P., J.-F. BERGERON, P. GRONDIN and A. ROBITAILLE, 1998. Les régions écologiques du Québec méridional (3<sup>e</sup> version) : un des éléments du système hiérarchique de classification écologique du territoire mis au point par le ministère des Ressources naturelles du Québec. Supplément de l'Aubelle no 124, 12 pp. (map revised in 2001).
- SARAKINOS, H., A.O. NICHOLLS, A. TUBERT, A. AGGARWAL, C.R. MARGULES and S. SARKAR 2001. Area prioritization for biodiversity conservation in Québec on the basis of species distributions: A preliminary analysis. *Biodiversity and conservation* 10: 1419-1472.
- SAUNDERS, S. EASLEY, T. LOGAN, J.A. and T. SPENCER, 2007. Losing ground: Western national parks endangered by climate disruption. *The George Wright Forum*. 24(1): 41-81.

- SCBD (SECRÉTARIAT DE LA CONVENTION SUR LA DIVERSITÉ BIOLOGIQUE), 2006. Perspectives mondiales de la diversité biologique, deuxième édition. Montréal, 83 p.
- SCOTT, D., J. MALCOLM and C.J. LEMIEUX, 2002. Climate change and modeled biome representation in Canada's national parks system: Implications for planning and park mandates. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* (11): 475-484.
- SCOTT, D.J. and C.J. LEMIEUX, 2005. Climate change and protected areas planning in Canada. *The Forestry Chronicle* 81(5): 696-703.
- SCOTT, D.J. and C.J. LEMIEUX, 2007. Climate change and the management of protected areas in the boreal forest. *The Forestry Chronicle*, 83(3): 347-357.
- SIITONEN, J. and L. SAARISTO, 2000. Habitat requirements and conservation of *Pytho kolwensis*, a beetle species of old-growth boreal forest. *Biol. Conserv.* 94 : 211-220.
- TARDIF, B., G. LAVOIE and Y. LACHANCE, 2005. Atlas de la biodiversité du Québec. Les espèces menacées ou vulnérables. Gouvernement du Québec, ministère du Développement durable, de l'Environnement et des Parcs, Direction du patrimoine écologique et des parcs, Québec. 60 p.
- TAYLOR, P.D., L. FAHRIG and K.A. WITH, 2006. Connectivity Conservation. In: Crooks KR, Sanjayan MA, eds, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. 736 p.
- UHLIG, P., A. HARRIS, G. CRAIG, C. BOWLING, B. CHAMBERS, B. NAYLOR and G. BEEMER, 2001. Old growth forest definitions for Ontario. Ont. Min. Nat. Res., Queen's Printer for Ontario, Toronto, ON. 53 p.
- USOTA (U.S. OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT), 1993. Preparing for an uncertain climate. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- VARADY-SZABO, H., M. CÔTÉ, Y. BOUCHER, G. BRUNET and J.-P. JETTÉ, 2008. Guide pour la description des principaux enjeux écologiques dans les plans régionaux de développement intégré des ressources et du territoire – Document d'aide à la mise en œuvre de l'aménagement écosystémique, Gaspé, Consortium en foresterie de la Gaspésie–Les-Îles et ministère des Ressources naturelles et de la Faune, 61 p.
- WETZEL, R.G., 2001. Limnology. Lake and River Ecosystems. Third Ed. Academic Press, San Diego. xvi, 1006 p.
- WIERSMA Y.F. and T. NUDDS, 2003. On the fraction of land needed for protected areas. Making ecosystem based management work, 5<sup>th</sup> International SAMPAA Conference. May 11-16 2003. University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia Columbia, Canada.



For information, contact the Centre d'information  
du ministère du Développement durable,  
de l'Environnement et des Parcs :

Telephone: 418 521-3830  
1 800 561-1616 (toll free)

Fax: 418 646-5974

E-mail: [info@mddep.gouv.qc.ca](mailto:info@mddep.gouv.qc.ca)  
Internet: [www.mddep.gouv.qc.ca](http://www.mddep.gouv.qc.ca)

Legal deposit  
Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec, 2010  
ISBN : 978-2-550-58652-4 (print version)  
ISBN : 978-2-550-58597-8 (PDF)

Cette publication est également disponible en français.

**Développement durable,  
Environnement  
et Parcs**

**Québec** 

#### Book cover and tabs



#### Interior pages

