

Reconciliation through long-range municipal plans: Lessons for Winnipeg

by

Sonikile Tembo

A Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in  
partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF CITY PLANNING

Department of City Planning

University of Manitoba

Winnipeg

Copyright © 2018 by Sonikile Tembo

## **Abstract**

Many Canadian big cities have made commitments to create positive pathways towards reconciliation. However, at present, limited resources exist to guide the development of urban policies that support reconciliation. This research explores how the long-range strategic planning documents of Canada's 22 'Big Cities' (as defined by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities), align with or respond to the Principles of Reconciliation developed by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC). As well, the research examines what lessons the City of Winnipeg can learn for the review of their 25-year Official Development Plan. Interpretive policy analysis is used to analyze the 22 strategic planning documents according to an analytical framework developed through a synthesis of the academic literature and the TRC's Principles of Reconciliation. This research generates insights specifically for the review of *OurWinnipeg* as well as more general insights, for municipal governments and organizations dealing with how to address Indigenous reconciliation. I hope that the research informs future municipal planning documents and creates abundant opportunities for reconciliation and the positive coexistence of Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.

## **Acknowledgments**

Umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu (a person is a person because of their people). Thank you to my mother and father, Robbie and Joyce Tembo for always inspiring me, believing in me, pushing me to do more and mostly for loving me unconditionally. Thank you to my dear husband Allen for being patient and supporting me all the way. Thank you to friends from Lighthouse of Hope for being supportive during this challenging phase. Thank you to friends from my cohort, Lissie, Mike, and Michael, for proofreading drafts and talking things through.

Thank you to the Department of City Planning and Faculty of Graduate Studies, as well as Faculty of Architecture library and CadLab staff that made life easier by providing vital resources always on time. I am grateful to all the City Planning faculty members that took the time to chat about my research topic and provide insight and resources. I am thankful to have worked on an issue as fundamental as this under the expertise of Dr. Janice Barry. I appreciate the knowledge, wisdom, and insight I gained from her during my studies. I am honored to have worked with her on this research. I am also grateful to my internal and external committee members, James Platt and Michelle Richard, for their input and commitment.

I am grateful for the G. Clarence Elliot, MPPI, and Shirley Bradshaw Scholarships awarded to me to support my research. I would also like to acknowledge that my degree work has been carried out through the University of Manitoba, whose campuses are located on original lands of Anishinaabeg, Cree, Oji-Cree, Dakota, and Dene peoples, and on the homeland of the Métis Nation. I respect the treaties on these territories.

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Abstract.....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Acknowledgments.....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>List of Tables .....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>List of Acronyms .....</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>1.0 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.2 Research Purpose .....	6
1.3 Research Questions.....	6
1.4 Chapter Outline.....	6
<b>2.0 Canada’s Reconciliation Journey and a History of Long-Range Planning.....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 A Brief Truth and Reconciliation Journey .....	8
2.2 Long-Range Strategic Planning in Canada .....	12
2.2.1 Long-Range Planning in Winnipeg.....	14
2.3 Summary.....	16
<b>3.0 Literature Review.....</b>	<b>18</b>
3.1 Reconciliation and Recognition Definitions .....	18
3.1.1. Defining Reconciliation .....	19
3.1.2. Defining Recognition .....	21
3.2 Reconciliation and the Urban Environment.....	25
3.3 Reconciliation and Urban Planning.....	29
3.3.1 Indigenous Peoples and Planning.....	29
3.3.2. Reconciliation and Urban Planning Policy .....	33

3.4 Summary.....	34
<b>4.0 Research Methods and Strategy .....</b>	<b>36</b>
4.1 Research Strategy: Why Interpretive Policy Analysis? .....	37
4.2 Methods of Data Collection: IPA Steps 1 and 2 .....	38
4.3 Methods of Data Analysis: IPA Steps 3 and 4.....	40
4.4 Biases and Limitations.....	44
<b>5.0 Analysis of Significant Carriers of Meaning.....</b>	<b>46</b>
5.1 Relationships .....	46
5.2 Culture .....	51
5.3 History .....	56
5.4 Public Service Provision .....	59
5.5 Site Preservation .....	62
5.6 Treaty Negotiations .....	64
5.7 Geographic Location.....	66
5.8 Distinct Needs and Talents.....	69
5.9 Summary of Findings .....	71
<b>6.0 Analysis of Documents in Possible Conflict with Carriers of Meaning.....</b>	<b>73</b>
6.1 History of Indigenous Peoples .....	75
6.2 Improved Relationships with Indigenous Peoples.....	76
6.3 Treaties and Agreements .....	78
6.4 Site Preservation .....	79
6.5 Culture .....	80
6.6 Overall Recognition of Indigenous Peoples' Rights .....	81
6.7 Summary of Findings .....	83

<b>7.0 Discussion .....</b>	<b>85</b>
7.1 Key Findings.....	85
7.2 Lessons and Recommendations for <i>OurWinnipeg</i> .....	88
<b>8.0 Conclusion and Suggestions for Future Research .....</b>	<b>92</b>
8.1 Suggestions for Future Research .....	97
<b>References .....</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Appendices .....</b>	<b>104</b>
<i>Appendix A: Initial OCP Analysis .....</i>	<i>104</i>
<i>Appendix B: Table summary of findings- List of Nodes and Cities .....</i>	<i>106</i>

## **List of Tables**

Table 1: Summary of Steps in Interpretive Policy Analysis .....	38
Table 2: Secondary Data for Analysis .....	40

## **List of Acronyms**

AFN – Assembly of First Nations

FCM – Federation of Canadian Municipalities

OCP – Official Community Plan

ODP – Official Development Plan

RCAP – Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples

TRC – Truth and Reconciliation Commission

UNDRIP – United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

## 1.0 Introduction

---

First through the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP) and then through the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) of Canada, Canadians have been urged to commit to an ongoing process of reconciliation (TRC, 2015). RCAP was a response to a number of fractures in Canadian-Indigenous relations, including the Oka Crisis: a well-known historical event in the history of Indigenous activism and advocacy. It was a 78-day standoff between Indigenous protesters, police, and army personell over the expansion of a golf course and development of condominiums on disputed land that included Indigenous burial grounds (Marshall, 2013). Following this event, RCAP was established in 1991 and produced a report in 1996 that was a product of extensive research regarding relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in Canada (Marshall, 2013). This report had a 20-year agenda that made several recommendations, many of which were not fully implemented. Formation of the TRC was one of the recommendations of RCAP, though it was not established until over ten years later in 2008. In 2015 the TRC released a final report that included Principles of Reconciliation, Calls to Action and Survivors Speak. Through the Calls to Action and Principles of Reconciliation, the TRC advise all Canadians, and particularly governing bodies, to commit to positive reconciliation and provide principles on which to base reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Canada (TRC, 2015). The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) is one of many bodies to respond to the TRC reports. Its Big City Mayors' Caucus released *Pathways to Reconciliation* (FCM, 2016) to honor the efforts of the Commission towards Indigenous reconciliation and illustrate the role cities can play in reconciliation by providing existing examples.

Winnipeg is one of many Canadian cities that are grappling with how to address reconciliation. Since a historical example of this type of reconciliation does not exist, municipalities are faced with a challenge that, it seems, has to be addressed through trial and error, or by implementing the strategies that other municipalities have attempted. For example, in 2010, Edmonton developed the *Edmonton Urban Aboriginal Accord*, which was the first Urban Indigenous Accord developed in Canada (City of Edmonton, 2010, 27). In 2016, after being labeled the most racist city in the country, Winnipeg committed to developing an Urban Indigenous Accord to “recognize the role Indigenous people have played in Canadian history and further strengthen relationships with Indigenous governments, peoples, and communities” (City of Winnipeg, 2017,1). Winnipeg’s Urban Indigenous Accord was developed and modeled after Edmonton’s Urban Aboriginal Accord which sought to strengthen relationships between the municipality and Indigenous people by ensuring that the rights and aspirations of Indigenous peoples are acknowledged in policies and practices (City of Edmonton, 2015; FCM, 2016). This research explores the ways that cities have begun to address reconciliation specifically through urban planning policy.

Given that one of the fundamental issues in the field of planning is land, and that reconciliation is as a result of failed recognition of Indigenous peoples’ title over land, it follows that planning should have a role in the journey of reconciliation. Indigenous title includes not only title to land but also perspectives about land and way of life on the land, including having the right to have a say over how land is used (Anderson et al., 2008). The Canadian Institute of Planners (CIP), the national voice of Canada’s planning community, defines planning as “the scientific, aesthetic, and orderly disposition of land, resources, facilities and services with a view to securing the physical, economic and social efficiency, health and well-being of urban and rural

communities" (CIP, 2018, 2). CIP also explains that the work of planners "ultimately always touches on public policy" and planners need to "know about land, air and water resources, employment trends, cultural diversity and associated issues" (CIP, 2018, 2). The need to address issues facing Indigenous peoples in the urban environment has become more apparent with census data continuing to show that urban Indigenous people experience various forms of socio-economic marginalization (Land et al., 2011). At the same time, recent efforts to address unfulfilled treaty land entitlements have created new economic opportunities through establishment of urban reserves (Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, 2017). Planning has a role to play in addressing Indigenous reconciliation from a policy perspective, in recommending policies that take into account the rights and needs of Indigenous peoples as well as through appropriate community consultation that includes the voice of Indigenous peoples in the planning of cities.

Yet, recent literature reveals that planning has a "split personality" in that it is both an agent of colonialism as well as a tool for reconciliation and positive change (Hibbard et al, 2008). This means that while planning has traditionally played a role in the marginalization of Indigenous peoples, it also has the potential to play a counter role in improving the quality of life of Indigenous peoples. Scholars assert that unless the colonial effects of planning are recognized and addressed, Indigenous peoples will continue to experience its repressive and dominating impact (Yiftachel, 1998; Porter, 2006). Since reconciliation is founded on Indigenous rights, and Indigenous rights are primarily political and spatial (Porter and Barry, 2016), then it follows that the recognition of such rights would directly affect the field of planning especially concerning urban Indigenous communities. Moreover, with the increase in urban Indigenous peoples across Canada, including the development of urban reserves, the need to actively address reconciliation

in the urban environment is more evident and urgent. Planning can no longer rely on discussing only the regional aspects of coexistence, in which municipalities work with First Nations because they share boundaries, but must also consider the positive coexistence of Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples within the same urban environment (Porter and Barry, 2016). Coexistence is a rather neutral term and as such can be negative or positive. Just because two parties exist in the same space does not necessary infer that they have a positive relationship, it simply means they coexist. For the purpose of this research, positive coexistence is referring to a mutually beneficial relationship between parties. Since urban planning is concerned with the development and use of land, and the field is bound by text in the form of policy, it follows that planning policy has a role to play in the development and use of land. And furthermore, planning has a role in ensuring positive coexistence of urbanites, and in aiding or inhibiting reconciliation (Porter and Barry, 2016). The purpose of planning as a tool for reconciliation and positive change has been explored more proactively by cities like Edmonton that have included intentions towards Indigenous reconciliation in their long-term planning initiatives.

One of the hindrances to positive reconciliation is the lack of understanding of the different ways of living and governance between Indigenous and non-Indigenous contexts. The government-to-government relationship between First Nations and municipalities is a complex one since First Nations are technically at the same tier level as the federal government (Walker, 2008), but they nevertheless interact directly with municipalities over jurisdictional issues and services. As well, it is one thing to be adjacent governments and another to coexist within the same space. Coexistence of Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples has become more prevalent in urban settings because of more Indigenous peoples moving into cities as well as the development of urban reserves. The journey of reconciliation involves positive coexistence of

governments and peoples living in the same space. The famous sculpture of the *Spirit of Haida Gwaii* depicts a full canoe of diverse passengers who, though seated in disarray, somehow managing to paddle in unison and “appear to be heading in the same direction” (Tully, 1996, 28). This sculpture is seen by many as a symbol of coexistence between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, where the “recognition of difference does not mean the end of political unity” (Barry & Porter, 2012, 175). Canadian municipalities have shown interest in figuring out how to interact with Indigenous peoples and governments in positive ways (Walker, 2008).

Another hindrance to positive reconciliation is different understandings and sometimes contradictions of terminology such as reconciliation and inclusion. Reconciliation and inclusion are often coupled as in the FCM's opening message in the *Pathways to Reconciliation* report that states "reconciliation is about understanding, respect, acceptance, and inclusion" (FCM, 2016, 1) or City of Saskatoon's holistic action plan for "reconciliation and increased inclusion" (FCM, 2016, 6). Inclusion, like recognition, has been critiqued by scholars for producing the very opposite of reconciliation (Lister, 2007). Without an understanding of reconciliation and the terminology around it, any attempt to address positive reconciliation risks either doing the very opposite or not changing the status quo.

This research attempts to bring such differences to light through literature review and document analysis, and provide resources for the challenge of how to take commitments to Indigenous reconciliation, and effectively translate them into strategic planning policy documents. Specifically, this research seeks to inform the review of *OurWinnipeg*, which began in the summer of 2017.

## **1.2 Research Purpose**

This practicum will use the tools of interpretive analysis to explore how the long-range strategic plans of Canada's 22 Big Cities are aligned (or not) with the TRC's Principles of Reconciliation. It seeks to identify emerging strategies and practices as well as bring to light some gaps in policy development, with the aim of providing considerations for the ongoing review of *OurWinnipeg*, the City of Winnipeg's long-term plan.

## **1.3 Research Questions**

1. What are the principles of reconciliation? How can they be applied to urban policy?
2. How is Indigenous reconciliation being addressed in the official municipal planning documents of Canada's 22 Big Cities?
  - a. What is privileged and what is omitted?
  - b. What strategies are being used to address Indigenous reconciliation?
  - c. How are the documents reflective of principles of reconciliation?
3. What lessons can be learned for the review of *OurWinnipeg*?

## **1.4 Chapter Outline**

This document is structured in eight chapters, the first being this introduction. Chapter 2 provides background and context information on Canada's truth and reconciliation journey, long-range planning and *OurWinnipeg*. This context is necessary to situate and justify the research focus. Chapter 3 is the literature review, which examines three main areas of literature: definitions of reconciliation and recognition; reconciliation and the urban environment; and reconciliation and urban planning. Chapter 4 details the research methods and strategy, and provides a justification of my use of interpretive policy analysis, methods of data collection and methods of data analysis. Chapter 5 presents some themed results from the document analysis

process of the long-range plans. Chapter 6 shows similarly themed results from the analysis of the TRC Principles of Reconciliation document and the United Nations Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples document. Chapter 7 is a discussion of findings from Chapters 5 and 6 to answer the research question of how long-range plans are reflective of principles of reconciliation. Chapter 8 concludes the research by providing a summary of findings and suggests areas for future research.

## **2.0 Canada's Reconciliation Journey and a History of Long-Range Planning**

This research explores two central themes, Indigenous reconciliation, and long-range planning, both in the Canadian context. It is essential to provide the history and context of these two themes to understand further how they apply to the research. An understanding of Canada's journey towards reconciliation will give some context to the existence and recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. A knowledge of long-range strategic planning in Canada will provide the necessary background on how and why cities develop long-term goals and what they are intended to do. The chapter also provides a brief history of *OurWinnipeg*, the City of Winnipeg's Official Development Plan. The chapter provides the basis for how reconciliation can be reflected within the long-term commitments presented in long-range plans.

### **2.1 A Brief Truth and Reconciliation Journey**

In 1999, the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples proposed a 20-year strategy to redefine their relationship with Indigenous peoples and the rest of Canada (Parliament of Canada, 1999). This strategy was "founded on the recognition of Aboriginal peoples as self-governing nations, and major recommendations included legislation that committed to a new relationship, recognition of an Aboriginal order of government and initiatives to address social, educational, health and housing needs including necessary professional training" (Parliament of Canada, 1999). Following the RCAP report strategy, a Statement of Reconciliation acknowledging the Government of Canada's role in Indian residential schools was released. In 2001, a federal Office of Indian Residential Schools Resolution Canada was created to manage the claims of former students against the federal government. It also worked with the Assembly of First Nations to negotiate the Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement (IRSSA),

which was implemented in 2007. The agreement included some measures to address the legacy of Indian Residential School system, one of which was the formation of a Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Canada's Truth and Reconciliation journey is about responding to the needs of Indigenous peoples, upholding responsibilities within treaty agreements, and renewing trust relationships (Aboriginal Healing Foundation, 2009). Indigenous people have a history of unresolved trauma caused by colonial initiatives like the residential school system, an experience that has been passed down from one generation to the next (Maxwell, 2014). In 2008, the Prime Minister of Canada made a Statement of Apology to former students of Indian Residential Schools (IRS) on behalf of the Government of Canada. The same year, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) of Canada was established to contribute to truth, healing, and reconciliation and to build upon the 1998 "Statement of Reconciliation" (Residential School Settlement, 1998).

In 2015, the TRC released Calls to Action that included Principles of Reconciliation to expand on the RCAP strategy by advocating a new set of commitments. The TRC released these Calls to Action to advance the process of Reconciliation and address ongoing issues faced by urban and rural Indigenous communities (TRC, 2015). The Calls to Action address issues of child welfare, language, culture, education, health, and justice. The Principles of Reconciliation address issues of rights, governance, and coexistence, among other concerns (TRC, 2015). These principles of reconciliation state the various rights of Indigenous peoples using the United Nations Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) as the framework for reconciliation that States are to abide by.

Efforts to develop a specific instrument for the protection of Indigenous peoples worldwide date back to the 1980s (United Nations, 2007). UNDRIP was adopted by the United

Nations (UN) General Assembly in 2007. In 1995, the UN established a working group as a result of a study on the problem of discrimination faced by Indigenous peoples throughout the world. This working group worked on various drafts of UNDRIP until it was finally adopted in 2007 by a majority of 144 states in favour, 11 abstentions, and 4 votes against by Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States (United Nations, 2007). Since the adoption of the Declaration, Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States have all reversed their positions and expressed support for the Declaration (United Nations, 2007). UNDRIP establishes the "universal framework for minimum standards for the survival, dignity, and well-being of Indigenous peoples around the world" (United Nations, 2007, 2).

While a significant portion of the TRC's Calls to Action are centered on recovering from and building awareness of the residential school system, reconciliation has to do with more than the residential school system. Since the signing of treaties, generations of Indigenous people have experienced various attempts at assimilation through traumatic initiatives; the residential school system is one of them, as well as natural resource restrictions and forced community relocation. These experiences are the very opposite of what was agreed upon in the Treaty agreements with the Queen (de Silva, 2010, 66). Reconciliation, then, is mainly about fulfilling treaty promises through a renewal of trust relationships between Treaty people, which include both Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. In the absence of treaty agreements, there is still a necessity for relationship agreements based on reconciliation because Indigenous peoples were and are affected by settler colonialism whether or not treaties were signed.

The impact of the TRC is evident in reports such as the 2015 Impact Report released by Reconciliation Canada, which showed an increase in Community Outreach through public awareness and interactive community initiatives, community events throughout the country,

partnerships with governmental and non-governmental organizations, and economic reconciliation initiatives. For example, in 2015, Reconciliation Canada and the Shqwi qwal (speaker) for Indigenous Dialogue at Vancouver Island University announced a partnership to support delivery of economic reconciliation dialogues” (Reconciliation Canada, 2015, 25). As discussed in Chapter 1, the final TRC report has also inspired the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM), to begin “a new era of partnership between local governments and First Nation communities” (FCM, 2015, 1).

Municipalities have started to address reconciliation in the urban environment, using means such as accords or strategies to acknowledge the colonial effects that have led to the marginalization of urban Indigenous peoples. The issue of reconciliation is essential to many if not all, municipal departments as expressed by the TRC Calls to Action which identifies various departments that need to address reconciliation including justice, environment and child welfare (TRC, 2015). Municipalities need to be engaged in the journey of reconciliation because they play a significant role in all of the issues outlined in the TRC's Calls to Action. In 2016, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) released a *Pathways to Reconciliation* document as a response to the TRC’s Calls to Action. In Winnipeg, this was followed by the 2016 Pathways to Reconciliation Conference which was designed to examine the work done and to take steps towards reconciliation (pathwaysconference, 2016). An Indigenous Advisory Circle was also formed by the City of Winnipeg in 2015 to work with the Mayor on policies the City can implement to continue building awareness and understanding between the Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples of Winnipeg. The Mayor also committed to developing a Winnipeg Urban Aboriginal Accord, similar to the Edmonton Urban Aboriginal Accord, that would work with the Mayor’s Indigenous Advisory Circle to strengthen relationships with First Nation

governments (City of Winnipeg, 2017). Edmonton went a step further and developed an Urban Aboriginal Strategy as part of their Official Community Plan, to “work with local community partners to help improve social and economic opportunities for Aboriginal people living in urban centers” (UAS, 2015, 4). Since in Canada, long-range plans are generally seen as the community vision and guide the community’s public policy, the plans can dictate how reconciliation in the urban environment, which is mostly dependent on urban planning policy, will happen. To fully appreciate the sign of this shift to the recognition of reconciliation in planning documents, it is necessary to explore the nature of long-range plans.

## **2.2 Long-Range Strategic Planning in Canada**

As outlined in Chapter 1, the Canadian Institute of Planners defines planning as "the scientific, aesthetic, and orderly disposition of land, resources, facilities, and services with a view to securing the physical, economic and social efficiency, health and well-being of urban, and rural communities" (CIP, 2018, 3). The work of planners whether in private or public sectors, ultimately touches on public policy. Public policy can take many forms one of which is long-range strategic plans. Long-range strategic planning is a recent (20<sup>th</sup> century) comprehensive planning concept that aims to provide a long-range community development plan that guides private and public development (Hodge, 2003). This type of plan helps “organize and direct social, economic, and political forces in the community in a rational and productive manner” and provides a graphical and verbal guide to “development elements and the desired relationships between them” (Hodge, 2003, 139). Various terminology is used to refer to Canadian long-range planning documents; in British Columbia and Ontario for example, they are called Official Plans, in Alberta, they are called General Municipal Plans, and in Manitoba, they are named

Development Plans (Hodge, 2003). *Table 2*, found in the Research Methods Chapter 4, shows the terminology used for Canada's 22 big cities.

This type of strategic planning has some challenges and opportunities. Long-range planning is a challenge because of unpredictable external forces and conditions. The field of planning has instead been challenged to be more flexible and adaptive and to be efficient and inclusive in ever-changing cities (Friedmann, 1971). The positive side of long-range planning is that it helps direct discussion and debate to agree on policies that affect the functioning of communities and the content of their plans (Hodge, 2003). This type of planning, however, has been critiqued for its reliance on central authority and attention to only specific public interests (Hodge, 2003). Moreover, some studies done on long-range strategic planning showed that the goal of these plans to shape the development of cities with a preconceived design was not being accomplished (Friedmann, 1971).

Participatory planning is often used in the process of developing a long-range municipal plan but is often challenged to ensure that all sections of a community participate. It is generally understood that since spatial planning influences spaces that people inhabit and are usually required to operate in the public interest, community residents must play a role in delivering effective and inclusive planning (Kingston, 2010). Participatory planning emphasizes the importance of involving communities in urban planning processes. Arnstein's ladder is a description of citizen participation as different levels of citizen power from manipulation to citizen control (Arnstein, 1969). By using tools such as Arnstein's ladder of participation, planners can understand the power dynamics in communities and determine effective ways to engage communities in ongoing projects. Such is the process that was used in *SpeakUpWinnipeg*, the civic engagement effort towards the development of *OurWinnipeg*, the City of Winnipeg's

Official Community Plan. One significant advantage of participatory planning, if done effectively, is it creates the opportunity to hear from commonly underrepresented groups. With the increase in urban Indigenous peoples throughout Canada but particularly in Winnipeg, Indigenous communities are often categorized under this umbrella of underrepresented groups. Despite having participatory approaches to planning, there remain gaps in the process of advancing respectful coexistence with Indigenous peoples as is further revealed in the document analysis section. Scholars have critiqued participatory planning for its lack of sophisticated understanding concerning issues of equity, efficiency, and empowerment within communities (Kingston, 2010; Sandercock, 1998). As more methods of engaging different publics continue to be developed, participatory planning remains one of the tools used in long-range planning to ensure a more equitable planning process than conventional planning methods.

### ***2.2.1 Long-Range Planning in Winnipeg***

Since this research is reviewing the planning documents of Canadian cities to provide recommendations for Winnipeg, this section provides some statistical information about Indigenous peoples in Winnipeg to emphasize the urgency of the issue of Indigenous reconciliation specifically for Winnipeg. The City of Winnipeg not only has the highest Indigenous population in the country, but it is also the city with the highest per capita proportion of Indigenous residents in Canada (Census, 2016; Indian Country Today, 2017). As well, the province of Manitoba has the largest number of Treaty First Nations in Canada (INAC, 2014). By highlighting these statistics and comparing them with other Canadian cities, this research proposes that Winnipeg can learn from other city initiatives and play a significant role in leading

Canada's journey towards positive Indigenous reconciliation in urban centers, through urban planning policy.

The urban policy guiding the growth and development of Winnipeg is *OurWinnipeg*. *OurWinnipeg* is the Official Development Plan guiding growth and change for the City of Winnipeg. It is a requirement by the City of Winnipeg Charter for the City to adopt, by by-law, a development plan that sets out long-range plans and policies for the development of the city (City of Winnipeg, 2011). SpeakUpWinnipeg was a public engagement process that ran from January 2010 to April 2010 involving more than 34,000 people to inform the plan (Speak Up Winnipeg, 2017). *OurWinnipeg* is a strategy to accommodate urban change such as general population increase, increase in diversity (specifically increase in urban Indigenous populations), and the impact of such change on municipal government (City of Winnipeg, 2011,13). In 2010, the number of Indigenous peoples in Winnipeg was growing at a faster rate than that of the non-Indigenous population (City of Winnipeg, 2011,13), influencing the need for more work towards positive coexistence of Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples (City of Winnipeg, 2011). The overall plan explores themes of public service, sustainability and quality of life (City of Winnipeg, 2011, 1) and references four thematic documents; Complete Communities, Sustainable Transportation and Sustainable Water and Waste (City of Winnipeg, 2011, 2). Fortunately, long-range plans usually somewhat accommodate urban change in their requirement for revision of the plan every certain number of years to review its relevance and edit it as necessary.

*OurWinnipeg* took effect in 2011 and is reviewed every five years, its first review since its adoption, begun in the summer of 2017. The City proposed three phases of public engagement for this review; understanding what is essential and imagining the future; confirming the vision

and exploring possibilities, and finalizing the plan including updating *OurWinnipeg* based on feedback received. A Community Advisory Committee was formed to provide input into community-based issues including exploring gaps or opportunities in policies and building relationships with specific sectors typically underrepresented (Speak Up Winnipeg, 2017). There is an opportunity in this review process to recognize the role of planning policy in the journey of Indigenous reconciliation and work towards a better textual representation of the principles of reconciliation. Unfortunately, resources that provide toolkits or templates on how to positively coexist with Indigenous peoples are hard to come by, as is guidance on what ‘reconciliation friendly’ policy looks like (Koch, 2016). This research will provide examples of how reconciliation has been addressed in other big cities and produce findings that can be used to develop a toolkit on how ‘reconciliation friendly’ policy could look. This toolkit can inform the review of long-range planning documents such as *OurWinnipeg*.

### **2.3 Summary**

Indigenous peoples and municipalities have recognized reconciliation as an ongoing process, a journey without a destination per se (Coulthard, 2014). This research explores the use of long-range planning documents to direct strategic development that upholds the interests of Indigenous peoples and addresses issues affecting the Indigenous reconciliation journey. The findings and recommendations resulting from his research will hopefully contribute to the review process of *OurWinnipeg*, the City of Winnipeg’s long-range development plan.

This chapter has provided a brief history of Canada’s reconciliation journey, highlighting the issues that resulted in the formation of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, and the purpose of the Commission. The chapter has provided some examples of how

municipalities have begun to respond to the recommendations put out by the TRC including changes to policy. Long-range strategic plans are potentially one of the types of policy documents that ought to change to address issues of reconciliation. To appreciate the recognition of reconciliation in planning documents, the chapter also explored the nature and history of long-range strategic planning. Since the research aims to provide recommendations for the review of *OurWinnipeg*, the chapter concluded by presenting some statistical information concerning Indigenous peoples in Winnipeg as well as a description of *OurWinnipeg*, the City's Official Community Plan. The next chapter explores a more detailed description through scholarly literature, of how reconciliation and planning policy do or should overlap and what the role of the municipality is or should be in this overlap.

### **3.0 Literature Review**

---

This literature review is divided into three sections that demonstrate how the two central themes of this research, reconciliation and urban planning policy, intersect. The first defines Indigenous reconciliation and recognition and highlights the TRC's Principles of Reconciliation. The second section situates reconciliation in the urban environment and examines the complicated government-to-government relationship between urban municipalities and Indigenous peoples. It also examines the conflicting understandings between Indigenous and non-Indigenous principles and ways of life, and how this plays a role in the reconciliation journey of urban planning. The last section explores what reconciliation has to do with urban planning policy by understanding Indigenous peoples' experience of the planning field and analyzing opportunities for formal textual recognition of Indigenous peoples in urban planning policy.

#### **3.1 Reconciliation and Recognition Definitions**

The definitions of reconciliation and recognition are the focus of this section because these are the two terms that have been commonly used to frame Indigenous related policy (for example, Coulthard, 2014; Lane & Hibbard; 2014; Walker, 2008; FCM, 2016). Evidence of this is found in the reconciliation and recognition discourse of court decisions, government apologies and truth and reconciliation commissions that have influenced the framing of Indigenous policy (Lane & Hibbard, 2005; Ugarte, 2014; Coulthard, 2014; TRC, 2015). Planners cannot overlook the significance of defining these vital terms since the interpretation and implementation of a policy depends on the understood meanings of the words used. Definitions establish the meanings of key terms in policy. This section discusses the 'politics' of these two terms, the

implications of those politics and what scholars are saying about Indigenous reconciliation and recognition in a colonial context (Coulthard, 2014).

### ***3.1.1. Defining Reconciliation***

General definitions of reconciliation are often contradictory to scholarly definitions specifically of Indigenous reconciliation. Three examples of scholarly definitions of Indigenous reconciliation are: legal and political recognition of Indigenous peoples' rights and a restoration of state control of their territories (Hibbard; et al, 2008); a process of decolonizing relationships and encouraging Indigenous self-government and protection of culture (Perry 1996); and, a peacemaking paradigm that focuses on restoring and rebuilding relationships (Short, 2003). The general Oxford definitions of reconciliation include: "restoration of friendly relations," "the action of making one view compatible with another" and "the action of making financial accounts consistent; harmonization" ("Reconciliation," 2010). The TRC critiques definitions of reconciliation that are focused on re-establishment of a "conciliatory state" or of "friendly relations," since this is a state that many Indigenous peoples assert has never existed between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples (TRC, 2015, 113). As well, making one view compatible with another is more in-line with assimilation than Indigenous reconciliation; and, the act of making "accounts" consistent also falls in line with assimilation. A precise definition of Indigenous reconciliation will assist and clarifying what Indigenous reconciliation is not, thereby aiding its positive progress.

To the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) of Canada, the national body that guides and inspires Canada's reconciliation journey, reconciliation is about establishing and maintaining a mutually respectful relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples

in Canada based on 10 Principles of Reconciliation. The 10 Principles of Reconciliation as summarized by the TRC are listed below.

1. The *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* is the framework for reconciliation at all levels and across all sectors of Canadian society.
2. First Nations, Inuit, and Métis peoples, as the original peoples of this country and as self-determining peoples, have Treaty, constitutional, and human rights that must be recognized and respected.
3. Reconciliation is a process of healing relationships that requires public truth sharing, apology, and commemoration that acknowledge and redress past harms.
4. Reconciliation requires constructive action on addressing the ongoing legacies of colonialism that have had destructive impacts on Aboriginal peoples' education, cultures and languages, health, child welfare, administration of justice, and economic opportunities and prosperity.
5. Reconciliation must create a more equitable and inclusive society by closing the gaps in social, health, and economic outcomes that exist between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Canadians.
6. All Canadians, as Treaty peoples, share responsibility for establishing and maintaining mutually respectful relationships.
7. The perspectives and understandings of Aboriginal Elders and Traditional Knowledge Keepers of the ethics, concepts, and practices of reconciliation are vital to long-term reconciliation.
8. Supporting Aboriginal peoples' cultural revitalization and integrating Indigenous knowledge systems, oral histories, laws, protocols, and connections to the land into the reconciliation process are essential.
9. Reconciliation requires political will, joint leadership, trust building, accountability, and transparency, as well as a substantial investment of resources.
10. Reconciliation requires sustained public education and dialogue, including youth engagement, about the history and legacy of residential schools, Treaties, and Aboriginal rights, as well as the historical and contemporary contributions of Aboriginal peoples to Canadian society. (TRC, 2015, 3).

As is evident in the contradiction between definitions, reconciliation is an understandably controversial term, and scholars have critiqued it regarding what form it takes and whether it moves towards an improved relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, or merely masks assimilation (Coulthard, 2014; Short, 2003). A similar critique is found in scholarly literature about recognition of Indigenous peoples as a route of Indigenous reconciliation.

### ***3.1.2. Defining Recognition***

The documents surrounding Canada's reconciliation journey show that the self-determination efforts of Indigenous peoples have increasingly included the language of "recognition." This self-determination includes the freedom to determine their political status and run their economic, social and cultural development. Recognition is a term critiqued in this research, in its various meanings and contexts. For this research, recognition is referring to acknowledgment of Indigeneity in all its forms: culture, rights, sovereignty, self-government, title and all other forms of recognition highlighted by the TRC and UNDRIP. As well, recognition referred to in this research is more than just the general recognition used in day-to-day language, such as to identify someone or something from a previous encounter. Rather, recognition referred to in this research is within the settler-state context that includes power dynamics that have resulted from colonization and domination by the state of Indigenous peoples (Coulthard, 2014).

This emphasis on recognition as a way towards reconciliation is evident in documents like the TRC's Principles of Reconciliation, which states that Indigenous Treaty, constitutional and human rights "must be recognized and respected" (TRC, 2010, 3). A second example is the

Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples Report that proposes "four principles as the basis for a renewed relationship: recognition, respect, sharing and responsibility" (Library and Archives Canada, 2016). A third example is the expansion of this statement expressed by the Assembly of First Nations in a vision of the relationship between First Nations and Canada "which would lead to strengthening recognition and implementation of First Nations' governments" (AFN, 2005). The TRC has identified the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) document, as the framework for reconciliation. This framework upholds Indigenous peoples' self-determination and self-governance and specifically upholds the need to "recognize, respect and promote the rights of Indigenous peoples which derive from Indigenous political, economic and social structures and their cultures, spiritual traditions, histories and philosophies" (UN General Assembly, 2008, 2). The medium of recognition used to describe how the journey to reconciliation is to take place comes from a history of the lack of recognition of Indigenous peoples' human, economic, social and cultural rights.

According to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP) report, the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in Canada has changed in some ways and remained the same in others. The initial relationship between settlers and Indigenous peoples was one of dependence since settlers were in unfamiliar territory. As trade intensified and settlement increased, this relationship changed into one of displacement and domination of Indigenous peoples leading to the Royal Proclamation of 1763; the first document to define jurisdiction between First Nations and the Crown (Miller, 2009; Craft, 2013). This document, however, as well as others that followed it like treaty negotiations and the Indian Act, have been labeled as oppressive means aimed at assimilating Indigenous peoples to western ways (Hyslop and Bone, 2015, as cited in Koch, 2016). The relationship desired by the TRC is unlike what has

been experienced between Indigenous peoples and settlers in the past based on inconsistency, deceit, and betrayal. Instead the principles of reconciliation call for relationships of mutual recognition and mutual respect that recognize the effects of colonialism on Indigenous peoples and work towards decolonizing coexistence of Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples (Tully, 2004).

A move towards recognition seems like the obvious solution to a problem of lack of recognition of Indigenous peoples. However, scholars critique the effectiveness of this focus on recognition in colonial contexts. Recognition as a general term is defined as the "identification of someone or something or person from previous encounters of knowledge" or "acknowledgment of the existence, validity, or legality of something" ("Recognition," 2010). When these definitions are put in the context of Indigenous peoples with a colonial history, the act of recognizing still assumes that one has to "recognize" the other's "existence, validity, or legality." This indicates a power imbalance or the evidence of "master/slave" relations between the recognizer and recognized (Coulthard, 2014, 27). In the early days of settler colonialism, the settlers gave Indigenous peoples hunting, and fishing rights. However, such "rights" after Indigenous peoples' ways of life started to change because of unfulfilled promises of coexistence with settlers. Today, the Canadian government "recognizes" similar rights of Indigenous peoples by providing necessary hunting, fishing and resource exceptions to allow Indigenous peoples continue their traditional way of life. The similarity in the circumstances of several years ago and those of today is that there remains a dominant authority that sought for recognition of Indigenous rights. Coulthard along with other scholars have argued that;

In contexts of colonialism, not only are the terms of recognition usually determined by and in the interests of the colonizing state and society, but also over time the colonized tend to develop attachments to these master sanctioned forms of recognition. This attachment is essential in maintaining

the economic and political structure of colonizer/colonized relations.  
(Coulthard, 2014, 26)

Scholars have critiqued the focus on recognition in colonial contexts, for producing the very outcomes that Indigenous reconciliation is working against, and some have described this as the “politics of recognition” (Coulthard, 2009; Jones, 2010; Taylor, 2013). The politics of recognition “describes a politics that has risen in recent years in which groups demand recognition for their identities” (Jones, 2010,2). Coulthard highlights the politics of this avenue of recognition stating that “whereas prior to 1969, federal Indian policy was unapologetically assimilationist, now it is couched in the vernacular of mutual recognition” (Coulthard, 2009, 3). He defines “politics of recognition” as the “now expansive range of recognition-based models that seek to reconcile Indigenous assertions of nationhood with Crown sovereignty by the accommodation of Indigenous identity claims in some form of renewed legal and political relationship with the Canadian state” (Coulthard, 2009, 4). This recognition approach, however, has been critiqued for having the same effects on Indigenous peoples as colonialism.

Instead of ushering in an era of peaceful coexistence grounded on the idea of mutual recognition, the politics of recognition in its contemporary liberal form promises to reproduce the very configurations of colonialist racist, patriarchal state power that Indigenous peoples' demands for recognition have historically sought to transcend (Coulthard, 2014, 3).

The "contemporary form" of recognition that relies on one to recognize the rights of the other and in a sense validate the existence of the other, still leaves Indigenous peoples in the position of an "other." That is, reliant on the powers of non-Indigenous governments to usher in the era of mutual recognition and positive reconciliation. No matter what renewed legal or political relationship is sought to advance reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, colonialism continues if the foundation lies in power imbalance and dominant governance. Colonialism, after all, is the practice of taking full or partial control of another nation. Without

the development of intentional skills and tools of unlearning general colonial cultures of governance, the result of contemporary avenues of recognition risks reproducing the very attitudes that reconciliation seeks to extinguish and maintaining the same colonial control over Indigenous peoples that currently exists across Canada.

With few toolkits or precedents available to study and implement, the issue of Indigenous reconciliation is a complicated one leaving lawmakers to navigate the journey towards reconciliation with little know-how. Using buzzwords, such as recognition, may not be achieving the desired progress towards reconciliation, but it certainly creates the opportunity for critique, discourse, and argument, such as that of Coulthard, that hopefully leads to more answers to the question of what Indigenous reconciliation should look like. The purpose of examining these differences in meanings is to understand and be aware of such tensions and their possible implications on the urban environment and progress of reconciliation (Barry and Porter, 2011).

### **3.2 Reconciliation and the Urban Environment**

Canada's urban Indigenous population has been overall growing steadily and, in some cities, more rapidly. In Winnipeg, for example, the population of Indigenous peoples in 2016 was more than four times higher than it was 25 years earlier (Census, 2016). In the 2011 census, off-reserve Indigenous peoples constituted the fastest growing segment of Canadian society, with Winnipeg having the largest Indigenous population (Census, 2011). Realizing that cities were ill-equipped to cater to Indigenous-specific needs and ways of life, in 1997, the federal government developed an Urban Aboriginal Strategy to "increase the economic participation of Aboriginal peoples living in cities across Canada" (Urban Aboriginal Strategy, 2016). Cities must be capable of adaptation to suit changes in population demographics and changing social and

economic needs (Ryks, 2014), the way urban municipalities work within the context of Indigenous aspirations affects the "quality of future urban development" (Walker, 2008, 21). Fortunately, municipalities are showing interest in figuring out how best to “interface with their aboriginal citizens in appropriate and beneficial ways” (Walker, 2008), addressing themes such as relationship building, capacity building and joint management of resources (Mountjoy, 1999; Alcantara et al., 2016).

The increase in urban Indigenous peoples across Canada and how this increase affects the urban environment is the subject of this section. As more Indigenous peoples move into urban centers or acquire land for urban reserves, the issue of how to coexist together in adjacent spaces becomes evident primarily because of the self-governance right of First Nations.

Urban municipalities are built on land that originally belonged to First Nations. Before the Indian Act, Indigenous peoples dwelled on the land as they saw fit depending on their seasons of hunting, fishing and other ways of life. What was supposed to be a mutually beneficial relationship between First Nations and settlers turned into one of land domination and unfulfilled promises by the settlers, causing displacement and relocation of Indigenous peoples and inhibiting them from living their way of life (Marshall, 2013). Displacement and forced relocation of First Nations is, in many cases, what has resulted in the development of cities as we see them today (Matunga, 2013; Porter & Barry, 2015). Indigenous peoples were confined to live on reserves; land set aside under the Indian Act and treaty agreements for their exclusive use.

Even after setting aside reserves, there are records of municipalities attempting to eliminate ‘Indian Reserves’ because of city growth and the challenges that reserves presented to urban development (Stanger-Ross, 2008, 541). In 1933 Vancouver, this issue was evident in the complaints of a newspaper publication. The publication stated, "the city is suffering from a

useless, undeveloped, untaxable piece of wasteland impinging on the populous area" and furthermore that the city is no place "for primitive wards of the government" (Stanger-Ross, 2008, 542). Stanger-Ross (2008) argues that compared to general colonialism in Canada, the effects of municipal colonialism – settler territorial claims predicated on the supposed requirements of urban vitality and development – have not been fully explored.

Addressing colonialism within cities involves integration into the broader history of colonial land politics and keen attention to the details of city history. A further provocative argument is that even the notion of "urban Indigenous peoples" or as they were initially called 'city Indians' "flattens the history of First Nations people" (Peters, 2005, 328). This happens by applying a settler division of space and population to people who understand themselves and their surroundings in alternative terms" (Stanger-Ross 2008, 579; Peters, 2005). First Nations urbanization has generally caused friction within government agencies because of a colonial history that relegated First Nations people and cultures to spaces separate from modern and, particularly, urban society" (Peters, 2005, 77).

This system of reserves and municipalities existing separately makes intergovernmental interfaces between First Nations and municipal governments easier to understand and maintain. However, as the relationship between municipal and reserve governments gets complicated as reserves and municipalities grow, the need for shared resources and services becomes more evident. Furthermore, many First Nations have claimed or begun to claim lands within municipalities for economic development or urban reserves, creating more opportunities for First Nations and municipalities to work together and bringing to light the issue of what this government-to-government relationship should look like.

First Nations and municipalities have a complicated government-to-government relationship. First Nation Treaty agreements largely govern Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations, and these treaties were signed between First Nations and the federal government, the federal government therefore has a "direct" relationship with First Nations. In contrast, provincial statutes govern municipalities, making the government-to-government relationship between municipalities and First Nations an "indirect" one (Walker, 2008, 21). Because of their government-to-government relationship with the federal government, First Nations can be seen as a higher order within the government spectrum, than municipal governments (Walker, 2008). Local governments are often left without guidance on how to navigate these relationships, as there is no formalized relationship between these two governments, (Mountjoy, 1999). The lack of an organized First Nation-Local government relationship has led to a "patchwork of short-term, overlapping and inefficient urban Aboriginal programs and policies" (Andersen and Strachan, 2011, 128). Social exclusion of Indigenous peoples in urban areas is another issue needing municipal attention specifically municipal officials that deal with community services, urban design and economic development (Walker, 2008, 21). Despite this complication, municipalities not being signatories to the treaties should not wholly deter them from collaborating with First Nations because they are often working as adjacent or overlapping governing authorities, and hence still play a role in hurting or promoting treaty relationships.

Indigenous peoples have aspirations within the urban environment that are different from non-Indigenous peoples, such as "culturally appropriate municipal services, governance arrangements with municipal councils and placemaking endeavors like urban design and heritage articulation." All of these aspirations contribute to their quality of life and the lack of which has contributed to their marginalization (Walker, 2008, 28). Urban Indigenous peoples constitute a

significant part of the marginalized urban population leading municipalities to seek guidance on how to address issues facing urban Indigenous peoples and work towards awareness and relationship building (Mountjoy, 1999). Instead of working towards accommodation of the "other," however, reconciliation is about positive coexistence in which no party is treated as an "other," that is as unequal or inferior (Coulthard 2009).

### **3.3 Reconciliation and Urban Planning**

This section broadly discusses how planners and designers of the urban environment might facilitate or hinder the creation of reconciliation friendly cities with positive coexistence (Walker and Barcham, 2010). Planning systems, such as land use zoning, development approval, and plan making, have primarily disciplined the social formations of pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial coexistence of peoples (Howitt and Lunkapis, 2010). The issue of reconciliation is commonly not seen as an urban planning issue. In many modern societies, Indigenous peoples' customary laws and informal economies and cultures "have persistent footprints" (Howitt and Lunkapis, 2010, 110) in urban environments that challenge these assumptions about the "incompatibility of indigeneity and urban places" (Howitt and Lunkapis, 2010, 110). This section gives a brief history of Indigenous peoples and planning, explores some different understandings between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples regarding the urban environment, and discusses what reconciliation has to do with urban planning policy.

#### ***3.3.1 Indigenous Peoples and Planning***

The practice of planning is not something that colonization introduced to Indigenous peoples. It has always existed, in a less formalized way, among Indigenous peoples through their

culturally rooted methods (Matunga, 2013). However, early and modern settlers affected this practice of Indigenous planning, as can be seen more vividly in environmental fields where natural habitat was, and still is, disturbed by settlers, leading Indigenous peoples to adapt to situations and new environments foreign to them. This failure to accommodate Indigenous planning traditions is one of the injustices that have led to the marginalization of Indigenous peoples and an inability of Indigenous peoples to continue their way of life, as they knew it before colonization (Matunga, 2013). Jojola (2013) explains the “seven generations model” as a tool used by Indigenous peoples for meaningful community development (457). This model is based on knowledge being passed from generation to generation to inform the present and build a vision towards the future. Maintaining the “community’s worldview” by passing it down to future generations, is “at the heart of sustainability” for Indigenous peoples (459). Unfortunately, through efforts such as residential schools, settlers have devalued Indigenous knowledge and tried to destroy it in the name of civilization thereby undermining the seven generations model (Jojola, 2013). Unlike the seven generations model, conventional planning that includes “the imposition of land-use planning, zoning control, and the engagement of rational planning approaches has replaced traditional ways of managing land” and diminished Indigenous peoples’ role of collective governance over land (Jojola, 2013, 463).

The field of planning is concerned with land and resource use and has been described as “an ethical commitment to the future, and a commitment to make a difference in the world” (Friedmann, 2002, 151). However, given this ethical commitment, planning has been slow to respond to Indigenous peoples’ interests. Hibbard, Lane, and Rasmussen (2008) provide three reasons for why even new approaches to planning for Indigenous groups have served Indigenous peoples poorly. Firstly, new technologies of planning that emphasize community empowerment,

participation and collaboration are relatively new. Secondly, these new technologies depend on the participatory and communicative competence of communities. And thirdly, planners have given insufficient regard to the question of difference, particularly in circumstances of disadvantage or historically based antagonisms (Hibbard et al.,2008, 147). With the recent recognition of injustices experienced by Indigenous peoples' and a push toward reconciliation, the field has an opportunity to engage in better-planned environments that do not contribute to the marginalization of Indigenous peoples but make a positive ethical difference in the urban environment. Scholars have attested that what the field needs is a deconstruction of the "official story" (Sandercock, 1998, 97) of conventional planning, to reveal what assumptions are embedded in it that continue the work of colonialism (Wallace, 2000). Such a deconstruction will shed light on the reality of the negative assimilationist impacts of planning and restructure the field to "plan Indigenous peoples out of oppression" (Matunga, 2013, 20).

Planning in partnership with Indigenous communities, as opposed to planning for Indigenous communities, is an attempt to undo the damage caused by the assimilationist tendencies of conventional approaches (Matunga, 2013). A step up from planning in partnership is a reclamation of Indigenous planning based on Indigenous self-determination and an understanding that the planning efforts by Indigenous peoples are not a product of the colonial processes that are embedded in conventional planning practice and policy (Matunga, 2013; Porter, 2006). This reclamation refuses ongoing exploitation and oppression. Part of the role and challenge of Indigenous planning is to "advocate, mediate and negotiate across the planning divide" with conventional planning (Matunga, 2013, 14).

One of the ways planning addresses issues of marginalization is through specific planning initiatives such as participatory planning policies and processes that intentionally engage diverse

communities and attempt to reach commonly underrepresented groups (Forester, 1999). The participatory side of urban planning encourages the use of various inclusive practices, like collaboration and consultation, to reach out to commonly underrepresented groups. Inclusion is a term often used in municipal policy to address Indigenous reconciliation and the importance of recognition of Indigenous peoples (FCM, 2016). This idea of including Indigenous peoples along with other marginalized “stakeholders” has been critiqued for causing the very opposite effect of reconciliation, thereby serving Indigenous peoples poorly by ignoring their distinct rights and encouraging assimilation, discrimination, and exclusion (Hibbard, et al, 2008). Firstly, categorizing Indigenous groups as yet another stakeholder seeking inclusion fails to acknowledge Indigenous peoples as owners and original inhabitants of the land (Walker, 2008). Secondly, inclusion inherently implies a dominant primary party that includes an “other” party. Inclusion has been critiqued as by definition entailing exclusion (Lister 2007) and as being part of governing bodies’ agenda of social control (Simon-Kumar and Kingfisher, 2011).

Definitions of inclusion and reconciliation present some potentially problematic contradictions. The Oxford Dictionary definition of inclusion is "the action of including or of being included within a group or structure" (“Inclusion,” 2003). To include implies not only that the structure could continue without the inclusion, but also that there is a dominant structure that is present in this transaction and an “other” to be included. Power imbalance is appropriate between the general government and the governed; however, Indigenous reconciliation works in a colonial context and on the premise of self-governance and self-determination, so to be included in a dominant structure does away with indigeneity and contributes to the marginalization of Indigenous peoples. This argument is similar to Coulthard's (2014) critique of recognition used in colonial contexts with obvious power domination. Positive coexistence is

part of the journey of reconciliation, but it is important to be careful in encouraging this coexistence of urban residents to not “reduce the struggle for coexistence to a struggle for inclusion” (Porter and Barry, 2016, 21). It is also important to be aware of the contradiction presented by buzzwords like inclusion, and “thoughtfully structure” (Lombe and Sherraden, 2008, 210) them in policy, considering whether they bring about active reconciliation or encourage assimilation.

### ***3.3.2. Reconciliation and Urban Planning Policy***

The increase in urban Indigenous peoples has created challenges for public policy (Peters, 2012), and critical textual analysis of meanings that conflict between Indigenous and non-Indigenous settings is necessary to further the work of active Indigenous reconciliation through policy. To meet the needs of urban Indigenous residents, it is essential to consider Indigeneity, or Indigenous identity, in public processes of planning and policy-making (Walker & Belanger, 2013). Porter (2013) questions the kinds of relationships currently present between government and Indigenous peoples and further emphasizes the need for Indigeneity to be seen as legitimate in policy development and implementation. Apart from an occasional statement to recognize how Indigenous people have contributed to modern society, gratitude for the land on which we are, and the symbolic inclusion of cultural diversity (Walker 2008), how can reconciliation permeate our entire documents and effectively translate into implementation? Can reconciliation have more to do with what appears in the nuts and bolts of policy which rather than the typical reference to Indigenous people in policies concerning protection of Indigenous cultural heritage sites (Porter, 2013)? This section focuses on the emancipatory role of planning policy, and it's "potential to transform the structural dimensions" of oppression (Hibbard, 2008).

Planning practice is established and mediated through text. A primary local example of this is that the City of Winnipeg by-laws dictate where specific land-uses should go and so dictates how people coexist in urban space. Urban planning policymakers and analysts are actively engaged in the process of Indigenous reconciliation, furthering or hindering it, based on the textual content of planning policy (Barry and Porter 2012; McLeod et al., 2017). Walker (2013) gives Edmonton as an example of a city that has developed intentional policy approaches with Indigenous communities, such as the Edmonton Urban Aboriginal Accord that creates relationship building and collaboration opportunities to improve urban Indigenous residents' quality of life. Municipal governments have the responsibility of encouraging residents through social and political structures, to "live together differently without drifting apart" (Maaka and Fleras 2005, 300) and such is the work of a strategy like an accord.

The state-directed policy has been accused of continuing colonization and contributing to the marginalization of Indigenous peoples (Hibbard et al, 2008). As scholars study various efforts of reconciliation through programs, projects and policies, they "more often despair at the new ways in which colonial assumptions can reproduce themselves in policy and practice" (Maddison et al 2016, 2) and therefore ask the question "how will we know when we are reconciled?" (Maddison et al 2016, 2).

### **3.4 Summary**

This chapter has demonstrated how despite the growing attention towards reconciliation and Canada's commitments to walk the path towards reconciliation, the field of urban planning has lagged behind in addressing reconciliation in the urban environment because it is generally not seen as a planning issue. The chapter begins with the conflicting definitions of reconciliation

and recognition, showing how the general definitions of these terms conflict with the purpose of Indigenous reconciliation. The chapter goes on to explore the need for reconciliation in the urban environment, given not only the increase in Indigenous peoples but also the increased development of urban reserves, and how ill-equipped municipalities are to deal with these changes. Scholars have critiqued municipalities for not stepping up to the plate to address reconciliation in the urban environment since “municipal colonialism” (Stanger-Ross, 2008, 541) has contributed to the state of urban Indigenous peoples. The chapter concludes by situating reconciliation in the field of urban planning by explaining the role planning has played in marginalizing Indigenous peoples and proposing that since planning is mediated through policy, reconciliation can be address through urban planning policy.

This literature review has unpacked some of the characteristic findings regarding coexistence, reconciliation, and indigeneity in the urban environment; however, “methodological tools” (Barry and Porter, 2012, 182) on what reconciliation friendly policy looks like are hard to come by. What type of language should urban planners be considering the development of policies that affect the urban environment? Since the urban environment is majorly affected by public policy, the gap that justifies this research is found in the lack of information available to inform what reconciliation in urban policy should look like. The research methods and strategy seek to answer the research questions and to highlight the language, tools, and frameworks used by urban cities across Canada, to address reconciliation through urban planning policy.

## **4.0 Research Methods and Strategy**

---

To justify the methods used to undertake this research, I will reiterate the purpose of the study and the overall strategy used to address the research questions. The goal of the study is to explore how Canada's' Big City Official Development Plans address the principles of reconciliation put out by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. The anticipated outcome is some examples of how cities across Canada has tackled reconciliation through their development plans that can inform recommendations for the review of *OurWinnipeg*, the City of Winnipeg's Official Development Plan. The context section has provided a history of Canada's reconciliation journey, and the literature review has provided some information on the definition of relevant terms, how reconciliation is an urban environment issue and furthermore how it is precisely an urban planning issue. The literature review ended by proposing that to address reconciliation in urban planning means to discuss it in policy and that is an area lacking in the literature, leaving cities to "fend for themselves" regarding figuring out what it means to address reconciliation in urban planning policy. The first research question that asks what the principles of reconciliation are and how they can be applied to policy is answered in the document analysis Chapters 5 and 6 and discussion in Chapter 7. The other two questions ask how the big cities address reconciliation in their plans, and what lessons can be learned for the review of *OurWinnipeg*. To answer these questions, it was essential to select a policy-based research method.

To evaluate how reconciliation is addressed, or not, in urban planning policy, I will conduct an Interpretive Policy Analysis (IPA) on the municipal development plans of the 22 big cities identified in Chapter 4 *Table 2*. The municipal development plans were retrieved through secondary data available online and my focus was the textual content of this secondary data.

Language has contributed to creating inequality, injustice, and oppression; it can also be used to

bring about equality, inclusion, and reconciliation (Innes, 1987). For this change to happen, it is essential to reveal and challenge, through policy analysis, the implicit assumptions found in our current policies.

#### **4.1 Research Strategy: Why Interpretive Policy Analysis?**

Interpretive Policy Analysis (IPA) has been used for this research because it provides some conceptual tools and approaches to guide the research. Policy analysis can generally be defined as seeking to inform an audience about the costs and benefits of a particular policy (Yanow, 2000). This cost-benefit analysis could include the impact of the policy on a target population, a review of whether it will achieve desired outcomes, and determination of whether it is the right policy to address a particular problem (Yanow, 2000). Policy analysis is essential for obvious reasons like determining value and usefulness of a policy, but perhaps also for less obvious reasons like determining the need for change in policy concerning a specific urban change in a city. Policy analysis can help in ensuring policies are inclusive of values and beliefs different from the norm.

Unfortunately, the primary cost-benefit approach to policy analysis does not consider factors like values and beliefs of particular communities which Yanow calls interpretive communities (Yanow, 2000). Yanow defines interpretive communities as communities that “arise around a shared point of view relative to a policy issue” (2000, 37). The interpretive policy analysis approach “focuses on the meanings of policies, on the values, feelings, or beliefs they express, and the processes by which these meanings are communicated” (Yanow, 2000, 14). Yanow (2000) argues that these meanings that reflect values and beliefs are embedded in policy language. The steps in this type of analysis include: identifying the documents that are

“significant carriers of meaning” for the given issue; identifying the “interpretive communities” involved; identifying the community “discourses” (how the parties involved talk about the issue at hand); and identifying the meanings that are in conflict between or among the parties involved (Yanow, 2000, 22). Below is a *Summary of Steps* table that describes how the steps outlined by Yanow are applied in this research.

*Table 1: Summary of Steps in Interpretive Policy Analysis (Yanow, 2000)*

<b>Step</b>	<b>Details of step</b>	<b>Application to research</b>
1	Identify the artifacts that are significant carriers of meaning for a given policy issue	Artifacts: Long-range Strategic Plans or Official Development Plans Policy issue: Reconciliation in urban planning
2	Identify communities of meaning relevant to the policy issue	All departments engaged in the development of the Plans including professional planners
3	Identify the discourses being communicated through specific artifacts	Codes: How the plans “talk and act” with respect to the policy issue of reconciliation in urban planning
<b>Interventions/Actions</b>		
4.a	Show implications of different meanings/interpretations	Identifying the meanings found in the plans that are in conflict with the TRC and UNDRIP
4.b	Show that differences reflect different ways of seeing	Differences between codes and meanings in TRC show different ways of seeing
4.c	Negotiate/Mediate/Intervene in some other form to bridge differences (e.g., suggest reformulation or reframing)	These suggestions will come in the findings, discussion, and conclusion

## **4.2 Methods of Data Collection: IPA Steps 1 and 2**

### *Step 1 and 2 – Identify artifacts and communities of meaning*

During these steps, I identified the "artifacts that are significant carriers of meaning for the interpretive communities relative to a given policy issue," and identified “the communities of meaning or interpretive communities, relevant to the policy issue that interprets these artifacts and meanings" (Yanow, 2000, 20). To fulfill the purpose of this research and operate within an urban planning policy lens, the artifacts are identified as official development plans, the policy

issue is Indigenous reconciliation, and the interpretive community is that of professional planners and other municipal departments that wrote the plans. Another way to understand this is that the plans or artifacts are the ‘window’ into how the professional planning community understands its relationship to Indigenous peoples and the discourses within these artifacts will be identified in the next section as the codes derived from the plans in the document analysis. These artifacts, specifically called Official Community Plans, were collected as secondary data for further analysis relative to the policy issue of reconciliation with Indigenous peoples.

I used selective sampling to identify secondary data relevant to the research interest because the documents were all available online and could be selected on the basis of whether or not they were classified as official development plans. The secondary data comprised of the 18 big-city official development plans (excluding the four that are only available in French). The necessary data was all found online and downloaded after verification of data source and validity to ensure the information was being downloaded from a trusted website and the document was signed by the city as the official plan. Since the documents for this research were not general plans but specifically municipal development plans, all websites visited had to be read through to ensure the documents being downloaded were the official plans made available by the municipality. The four municipal offices that did not have documents available in English were contacted by email and phone to request English versions be made available but these were not provided. They were therefore excluded from the study. An initial table, *Table 2*, was then generated to track general information on all documents collected including the names of the documents and the dates they took effect, as well as a column to show whether they took effect before or after the TRC Calls to Action. For the plans that took effect before the TRC Calls to Action, I looked at what they might do to take action on the Calls to Action. For the plans that

took effect after the Calls to Action, I looked at the extent of actions they have taken and focused on identifying remaining gaps. Once all plans were downloaded, they were saved into one folder for further sorting and analysis, which happened in phases explained in the next section.

*Table 2: Secondary data for analysis*

City	Plan Name	Year took effect	Before or After TRC
Brampton	Official Plan	2006 - 2031	Before
Calgary	Municipal Development Plan	2009 - 2018	Before
Edmonton	The Way We Grow	2009 - 2040	Before
Halifax	Centre Plan	2017 - 2018	After
Hamilton	Urban Official Plan	2013 - 2025	Before
Kitchener	Official Plan	2014 - 2018	Before
London	Official Plan	2006 - 2019	Before
Mississauga	Official Plan	2017	After
Montreal	Municipal Development Plan	2013	Before
Ottawa	Official Plan	2003 - 2031	Before
Regina	Design Regina - OCP	2007 - 2032	Before
Saskatoon	Strategic Plan	2013 - 2023	Before
St. John's	Municipal Plan	2015 - 2025	After
Surrey	PlanSurrey 2013	2014 - 2041	Before
Toronto	Official Plan	2015	After
Vancouver	<i>Several Official Development Plans*</i>		After
Windsor	Official Plan	2013 - 2033	Before
Winnipeg	OurWinnipeg	2011 - 2036	Before

*\*Official Development Plans include Arbutus Corridor, Coal Harbour, Central Waterfront, Downtown, Downtown Eastside/Oppenheimer, East Fraser Lands, False Creek, False Creek North, Heritage Conservation Area, Southeast False Creek, Southeast Granville Slopes.*

### **4.3 Methods of Data Analysis: IPA Steps 3 and 4**

*Step 3 and 4 – Identify community discourses and show implications of different meanings/interpretations*

Step 3 identifies the communities' discourses, meaning, "how they talk and act with respect to the policy issue" (Yanow, 2000, 20). The goal of this step is to be able to show the

values, beliefs, and feelings that are important to the "interpretive community" by identifying the artifacts in which these values, beliefs, and feelings are embedded. This step shows how planners talk and act with respect to Indigenous reconciliation through analysis of long-range plans. Since these plans are developed by professional planners to express the vision and growth plan of cities, these documents were analyzed to determine the discourses being communicated through the plans. These documents reveal the values, beliefs, and feelings of professional planners as it relates to urban development, including coexistence between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in the city. Once the discourses that have to do with reconciliation are pulled out of the artifacts (the plans), Step 4 will show the implications of different meanings and interpretations by comparing these findings with the standard of Indigenous reconciliation in Canada which is the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The purpose of Step 4 is three-fold: to highlight different meanings and interpretations; show that the differences reflect different ways of seeing; and negotiate, mediate or intervene in some form to bridge the gaps by suggesting reformulation or reframing. The document analysis section highlights the differences found in the plans of Canada's big cities and provides recommendations for changes to *OurWinnipeg*.

The document analysis of the long-range plans was done in two parts explained in detail below. The research began with the intention to analyze the documents using a deductive approach based on a framework developed from the literature review. This quickly changed because a framework developed from the literature may not be explicitly applied to the plans and might have missed the opportunity of finding patterns arising within the plans. Instead, an inductive approach was used, in which the framework/themes emerged from the plan data analyzed.

### *Initial Document Review*

A detailed review of the long-range plans began with a text search of terms that are commonly used to refer to Indigenous peoples including Indigenous, Aboriginal, First Nations and Native. If even one of these was found in a document, it was saved in a new folder for further analysis. If none were found, the text was read word-for-word to ensure the plan did not use another synonym for Indigenous peoples that was not anticipated by the research terms. If even after reading the document no reference to Indigenous peoples was found, the document was left in the original folder and not analyzed any further. *Appendix A* was created to track this detailed analysis. A comments field in this table was used for further comments about the initial review of the plans, including information on details like whether the plan referenced a different document that did include reference to Indigenous people. Once this step was complete, all the plans requiring further analysis were uploaded into NVivo (a qualitative research software package) for coding.

### *Further Analysis*

Codes (or 'Nodes' as referred to in Nvivo) were used during this phase to sort and help analyze the data. To identify the text in the documents that refer to Indigenous peoples, a query was done to highlight all sections of all the documents that had references to Indigenous peoples, First Nations, and Aboriginal peoples. This general query was saved to a broadly named node called "recognition." The coded text was read through and further organized into general child nodes that showed different types of recognition like culture, history and urban design, and these were also read through and coded further to generate more child nodes. These codes were, to some degree, informed by the literature review since they were created to help assess whether the

mode of recognition was just one of inclusion as critiqued by scholars such as Coulthard, or one that promotes coexistence. After using this open coding method of thoroughly going through the documents and assigning nodes, twenty-two nodes were selected and sorted through further to develop the final seven nodes: distinct group, collaboration, culture, history, geographic location, public service, site preservation and treaty negotiation. Five of these nodes comprised child nodes. A full list of nodes is shown in *Appendix 1*. The purpose of this coding process was to extract themes, identify relationships, identify similarities and highlight differences, and it allowed for codes to be flexible and relevant to the research. The analysis did not consider any references to Indigenous peoples that were not explicit. For example, if Indigenous peoples were expected to be captured in a general term like "community organizations," or "cultural groups" that would not be included in this analysis.

To fulfill IPA steps 3 and 4, this research examined the identified secondary data in *Table 2* for attention to reconciliation with specific elements or “grounded categories” emerging from the analyzed documents (Berg, 2007, 326). Each category was guided by questions and indicators relevant to the category to reveal alignment or conflict with the themes of reconciliation and act as the systematic criteria for sorting data (Berg, 2007).

There were two possible ways considered for presenting the findings of the plan analysis. The first way was to show findings organized by city. Since the occurrence of Indigenous recognition varied from one city to the next, this option would produce a long result that would be difficult to use for comparison. The second option, which was used in this analysis, was to organize findings by node/category. This option provides a summary of how different cities recognized Indigenous peoples through commitments to, for example, public service or culture.

#### **4.4 Biases and Limitations**

Some of my background that may be conceived as a bias is that I am of African descent and my parents' generation experienced a different kind of colonialism. My grandparents and parents have bitter memories of what life looked like for them, and those attitudes have undoubtedly passed on to me. I am an immigrant to Canada from Zambia and initially did not know much about the history of Indigenous peoples but quickly developed personal opinions after taking courses such as Grassy Narrows course offered by the University of Manitoba. This course is a two-week program located in Northwestern Ontario to engage in the environmental and cultural politics of Grassy Narrows First Nation. I have since continued to build my knowledge on issues facing Indigenous peoples through formal and informal classes and training sessions. I approached this research with a spirit of humility and sincerity recognizing the sensitivity of topics such as this.

Given (2008), a scholar that has written on policy and qualitative research methods encourages researchers to recognize that text is open to subjective interpretation, reflects multiple meanings and is context dependent. As well, qualitative research, though very dependent on a categorization system, runs the risk of oversimplifying the data collected (Richards, 1999, 55). Research based on manifest and latent content analysis, which is an analysis of the actual subject matter and the underlying meanings, is limited by the availability of material and is somewhat based on the opinion of the researcher. This, however, is true of all interpretive research methods. To minimize potential bias, I was careful to use clear research procedures and double-check the research for consistency and accuracy. As well, the context of the documents and the implementation of the text cannot be captured through content analysis. Four of the plans were only available in French, and I am unable to read French. Also, since this

is textual analysis, a software translated version of the documents might not have the same content as with the original text of the documents, so they were not included in the analysis. Since the majority of the municipal plans were developed before the TRC Calls to Action, the review of the documents focuses more on recommendations for revisions to better address the TRC Calls to Action and Principles of Reconciliation, rather than critiquing based on alignment.

## **5.0 Analysis of Significant Carriers of Meaning**

---

This chapter critically evaluates the 18 long-range plans to determine how Indigenous peoples are recognized in them. The chapter is divided into categories, which broadly capture the nature of the recognition, such as culture or history, to identify similar carriers of meaning in the different plans. Sections are organized from most common to least commonly found in the plans. Since our understanding of reconciliation and Indigenous peoples is not natural or pre-given but a product of actions, interactions, history, society and culture (Rapley, 2007), doing a side-by-side analysis and comparison within each context allows us to bring to light some patterns of Indigenous recognition, as well as some variations. The analysis chapter sets out to understand in what contexts Indigenous peoples are mentioned, and the details of the recognition and the next chapter provides a discussion of what that means for Canada's reconciliation journey. Some of the examples provided in the sections may seem like they belong to other sections but the examples were selected according to the context of the text.

### **5.1 Relationships**

This category had the most references of all the categories. It includes all references to some relationship with Indigenous peoples, which can take the form of protocols, strategies, collaboration, negotiation, engagement, consultation, notification, and a government-to-government relationship. The nature of recognition here is the acknowledgment of the need to strengthen relationships with Indigenous communities and leaders. Within this code, there are variations in the type of relationship. Some cities refer to a relationship with First Nations communities within their regional territories, others refer to First Nations peoples within the city. Another form of variation is in the form of relationship. In some cities this is seen in their

commitment to notify Indigenous peoples, other cities commit to a deeper relationship through partnerships. The last variation can be observed in whether the relationship is based on the inclusion of Indigenous peoples in municipal structures or something that is more akin to coexistence of distinct forms of government.

Edmonton is the only city with an Urban Aboriginal Strategy and was the first to have an Urban Aboriginal Accord. Edmonton's implementation plan has a goal to be a "caring, inclusive, affordable community," and within this goal, the city commits to "take several innovative actions to ensure Edmonton is an inclusive city" (City of Edmonton, 2010, 54). Such an action is the Edmonton Urban Aboriginal Accord between the municipality and urban Indigenous peoples as a principle-based relationship agreement, to help "build relationships and guide how the city will work with, and serve, Aboriginal peoples living in the city" (City of Edmonton, 2010, 54). As one of its "planned initiatives" to achieve this goal, the city will "implement the Edmonton Urban Aboriginal Strategy in collaboration with urban Aboriginals. This will be done to increase the capacity of urban Aboriginals in identifying their priorities and taking action for improving and enhancing their quality of life in the city" (City of Edmonton, 2010, 59). The plan states that this initiative is "\$80, 000 funded" and the City has a lead role in building relationships with the urban Aboriginal community (City of Edmonton, 2010, 59). This commitment to working with urban Indigenous peoples to "improve quality of life" was unique to Edmonton. However, the framing regarding how the city plans on working with Indigenous peoples through the lens of inclusion was not unique. For example, the City of Halifax had a subsection in its culture chapter titled "Indigenous inclusion" that describes the working relationship between First Nations and the city (City of Halifax, 2017, 46). Other plans had a specific type of relations such as

engagement, consultation, negotiation and collaboration on specific projects or in particular contexts such as in cultural heritage.

Most plans mentioned engagement of or with Indigenous peoples regarding specific projects. In the "Review of Development Applications" chapter of Ottawa's plan, under a subheading "First Nations Peoples Design Interests," (sic) the city commits to "engage and work with the Algonquins where proposals on public lands provide opportunities to incorporate Aboriginal history and culture" (City of Ottawa, 2003, 4-53). Within the same chapter, under a subheading "River and Canal Corridors", the city has a policy that says it will "engage with First Nations, in particular with the Algonquins of Ontario, on matters related to the utilization of islands in the Ottawa and Rideau Rivers" (City of Ottawa, 2003, 4-17). Similar conditional commitments to engage First Nations are found in Toronto and Halifax plans. Within a chapter on heritage and conservation, the city of Toronto "plan policies call for an engagement protocol with First Nations and the Metis for heritage properties and archaeological sites that may be of interest to them, as well as ensuring that information is provided to First Nations and Metis where archaeological resources are found to be First Nations or Metis in origin" (City of Toronto, 2015, 3-11). Halifax's plan has a section called "Implementation and Monitoring Plan," within which is a chapter on partnership opportunities that highlight the importance of Indigenous inclusion through collaboration to develop an engagement protocol in accordance with Halifax's statement on First Nation's reconciliation (City of Halifax, 2017). This statement says that Halifax commits to "taking action to ensure the needs and aspirations of Aboriginal people are fully acknowledged" (Woodford, 2015,1). The Edmonton plan commits to building a new model for engaging citizens from Edmonton's aboriginal communities in crime prevention and "developing innovative models for engagement within the Aboriginal communities, which

support and build on cultural ties and approaches to improve community safety” (City of Edmonton, 2010, 120). While these project-based engagement commitments are a good start, they are limited to the particular projects mentioned and restrict other opportunities for engagement.

Recognition of relationship with Indigenous peoples through consultation was found in Halifax and Mississauga plans. Similar to engagement, this was often conditional and was to a particular sphere of activity or aspect of municipal government. For example, within its chapter on plan implementation, Halifax recognizes the "high potential for the incidence of pre and post-contact archaeological resources" and commits to consult with Indigenous peoples to "develop a protocol for the appropriate identification, protection and interpretation of sites of cultural value to Indigenous communities" (City of Halifax, 2017, 152). This is similar to Toronto’s commitment previously mentioned, except that Halifax specifically makes mention of the need to consult with Indigenous peoples in developing the protocol. Similarly, in their chapter on promoting collaboration, Mississauga commits to developing "a consultation protocol with members of Aboriginal communities on planning matters that affect their interests" (City of Mississauga, 2015, 3-2). Windsor has a procedures chapter with general policies that state “consultation with First Nations will take place as part of a development application or detailed planning study” (Windsor, 2006, 10-5).

Perhaps the most common relationship with Indigenous peoples expressed through the plans was one of collaboration. The difference between engagement and collaboration is that engagement implies that Indigenous peoples are being informed as determined by another authority figure, while collaboration implies actual sharing of authority and decision making between both parties. Within its chapter on plan implementation, Halifax has a section on

Indigenous Inclusion stating Halifax "will collaborate with Indigenous governments, organizations, and communities in the development of an engagement protocol" (City of Halifax, 2017, 152). Regina's plan has a goal on inclusion that states the city will "engage with Regina's First Nations, Métis and Inuit communities to determine collaborative strategies and approaches to addressing cultural needs and aspirations" (City of Regina, 2016, 50). The City also commits to collaborating with surrounding First Nations, Métis and Inuit communities to promote shared prosperity and to identify opportunities to support Aboriginal initiatives within the city (City of Regina, 2016). Similarly, Toronto commits, in collaboration with First Nations, Métis, and Provincial Government, to develop a "protocol for matters related to identifying, evaluating and protecting properties and cultural heritage landscapes, where they may be of interest to First Nations or Metis" (City of Toronto, 2015, 3-14). Winnipeg has a broad statement within its "Quality of Life" chapter that it will "collaborate with Aboriginal Winnipeggers to ensure that all Aboriginal residents have opportunities to live, work and play" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, 76). That city has a strategy to collaborate with Indigenous communities to enhance current practices and policies and to respect cultural differences. Winnipeg also commits to collaborating with Indigenous Winnipeggers to ensure all Indigenous residents have necessary opportunities.

Not all plans, however, had commitments towards collaboration with Indigenous peoples had specific strategies for achieving these commitments. Edmonton had a table with "planned initiatives anticipated to be completed in three years 2012-2014" in which it had columns that showed specifics on the lead of the project, funding for the project and status of the project. Others like Halifax, Toronto and Winnipeg simply stated the commitment and left the "how" of it unexplained. This lack of an explanation for "how" this or that will happen, was also noticed of other relationship-based commitments explained below.

Other statements referencing intentions to have some form of interaction with Indigenous peoples came in the form of negotiation, partnership, government-to-government interactions, and notification. Hamilton commits to dialogue with First Nations regarding their interests in archaeological resources and to “notify the nearest First Nation, where a marked or unmarked cemetery or burial place is found” (City of Hamilton, 2015, B3 30). Saskatoon shares a regional area with First Nations and seeks to “maintain mutually beneficial relationships with all these neighbours in the implementation of its plan” (City of Saskatoon, 2017, 2). Winnipeg intends to show leadership and partnership through facilitating the development of Aboriginal Economic Development Zones as well as maintain “strong inter-governmental cooperation around Aboriginal Economic Development opportunities” (City of Winnipeg, 2011, 50). Winnipeg states that the ongoing involvement, participation, and wellness of all of the diverse communities is “critical in shaping the future of Winnipeg—especially for our growing communities such as Aboriginal Winnipeggers and International Newcomers” (City of Winnipeg, 2011, 73). Winnipeg states that it will “negotiate with Treaty Land Entitlement First Nations to include arrangements for the provision of and payment for services, by-law application and enforcement on the Reserve, and a joint consultative process for matters of mutual concern such as land use planning” (City of Winnipeg, 2011b, 123). Winnipeg’s plan also speaks of partnerships with the Indigenous community of the city, to develop collections, services and other library programs and services (City of Winnipeg, 2011).

## **5.2 Culture**

The culture category includes any recognition of Indigenous culture, which took many forms. For example, Indigenous peoples were recognized as a "cultural group," as part of

“multicultural” communities, or as part of Indigenous culture and heritage. The recognition of Indigenous culture also differed in framing as will be explained in more detail below. Some of the plans such as Halifax included culture in their general policy sections, a few like Vancouver in their urban design sections. However, most of the plans, including Ottawa, Mississauga, and Toronto, discussed culture in their conservation and heritage sections.

Recognition of cultural heritage was the most common form of Indigenous cultural recognition in the plans. However, most plans suggest that selection of cultural heritage sites and preservation of cultural heritage is something that will be done for Indigenous groups not with Indigenous groups. For example, London and Mississauga have statements that commit to “consider” First Nation interests but say nothing as to whether this will be done with First Nations input. London’s plan has a chapter on “Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest” in which “the presence of properties representing a design or method of construction which is considered to be of cultural heritage value or interest to the community, region, province or nation” will be considered by council in evaluation of areas for Heritage Conservation District (City of London, 2006, 13-4). Other broad references to the cultural heritage of Indigenous peoples include Mississauga's “Complete Communities” chapter that has a subheading for “Cultural Heritage Resources” in which “Mississauga will consider the interests of Aboriginal communities in conserving cultural heritage and archaeological resources” (City of Mississauga, 2015, 7-9). This is a step up from London, but still vague about how it will plan with Indigenous peoples and still intimates that the city will “consider” interests meaning the city has the final say as to whether or not these interests will be considered based on the city’s best interest. This does not reflect that the city plans on collaborating with Indigenous peoples on consideration of sites for conservation, but instead recognizes Indigenous peoples according to the beliefs and ways of

thinking expressed in settler-colonial structures. This approach also tends to treat Indigenous cultural heritage as an inert “object” (Porter and Barry, 2014), whereas for many Indigenous peoples cultural sites are not inert objects, but living features of their entire ontological belief system (Porter and Barry, 2016; Jacobs, 1996).

This section has shown recognition of Indigenous cultures as inert historical “objects” and not as past and present ways of life (Porter and Barry, 2016). Specific commitments to Indigenous cultural heritage are found in Ottawa and Toronto plans. Ottawa's plan has an Implementation section with a particular subsection on *Algonquin Aboriginal Interests* explicitly referencing the Algonquins cultural heritage landscapes. In this section, the city recognizes that lands within its boundaries lie within the historic Algonquin Territory and commit to “seeks opportunities for mutually beneficial engagement with Algonquins on matters that affect aboriginal history and culture” (City of Ottawa, 2003, 5-18). The section further lists the matters on which the City of Ottawa will engage the Algonquins. Under the heritage conservation section, Toronto makes references to commemoration and interpretation programs that recognize various cultural or ethnic groups “including co-operation with First Nations in programs commemorating and interpreting sites of importance,” and protection of cultural heritage landscapes “where they may be of interest to First Nations, or Metis” (City of Toronto, 2015, 3-14). The City also commits to providing copies of Archaeological Assessment reports to "First Nations or Metis with the closest cultural affiliation as identified by the City" (City of Toronto, 2015, 3-14). The Toronto plan also includes a definition of a Cultural Heritage Landscape that includes cultural heritage of “an Aboriginal community” (City of Toronto, 2015, 3-20). Whether the city or the Indigenous peoples will be doing the preservation of cultural heritage is unclear from the plan excerpts. In some cases, the city commits to consult with Indigenous peoples on

areas of cultural heritage, but it is also unclear who determines these areas of cultural heritage on which to be consulted on and how that is done.

Some plans did try to address recognition specifically and only of Indigenous peoples' cultures and living practices, without linking it or generalizing it with other cultures. For example, Edmonton listed Indigenous peoples culture in the context of general multicultural groups in the city, whereas Winnipeg has Indigenous culture as its general category of issues. The only reference to Indigenous peoples' cultures that was not linked to other cultures was found in Vancouver's Downtown-Eastside/Oppenheimer official development plan and Winnipeg's plan. Vancouver's plan has an "Applications and Intent" section with 12 goals, one specifically recognizing the cultural connection of "Aboriginal people to the Downtown Eastside area and reinforcing this through place-making opportunities" (City of Vancouver, 2014, 6). Winnipeg's plan included a Quality of Life chapter with a subsection specifically addressing quality of life of Indigenous peoples with a strategy to work with Indigenous community partners to "raise the profile of Aboriginal culture" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, 74). Other references of Indigenous culture were generalized with other cultures such as immigrant cultures, under broad categories like cultural groups.

Recognition of Indigenous peoples as a cultural group and listed with other cultural groups or multicultural communities were found in three plans. In Calgary's plan, this Indigenous recognition was found in a section of the plan called *Developed Areas Guidebook* and specifically in the *Urban Design* chapter under a subsection called *Streetscape Character and Public Realm*. This section lists policies that help to define the public realm and among them is a commitment to "incorporate local historical interpretive elements, including those for indigenous populations and other cultural groups through plaques, public art, concrete etchings and other

textual effects" (City of Calgary, 2017, 41). There are ten policies listed and others discuss such issues as accessibility, private development, street trees, and amenities.

Other similar references to Indigenous peoples as "cultural groups" can be found in Edmonton and Halifax plans. Edmonton's municipal development plan includes an implementation plan that specifies the cities' goals and how it intends on reaching their goals. One of these goals is to be a vibrant, connected, engaged and welcoming city by supporting "multicultural and Aboriginal communities in accessing or developing physical spaces to meet and recreate" and developing a strategy for "multicultural and Aboriginal groups" to access sports and recreation (City of Edmonton, 2010b, 112). Another one of Edmonton's goals is to "celebrate life" by "developing a strategy for sports and recreation for multicultural and Aboriginal groups" (City of Edmonton, 2010b, 46). The introduction of Edmonton's implementation plan starts with an explanation of how "Edmonton's People Plan was created with the input of thousands of Edmontonians including seniors, children, youth,...the city's widely diverse multicultural and Aboriginal communities, business, community, arts, sport" (City of Edmonton, 2010, 12). Halifax has a section on General Policies with culture as a subheading in which the city commits to "identification and commemoration of sites of traditional cultural practice" mentioning its intention to work with "Indigenous and other cultural groups" to develop a protocol for this identification (City of Halifax, 2017, 46). This general identification of Indigenous peoples with other cultural groups or multicultural communities was unique to these plans. Others had more distinction between the Indigenous culture and other cultures by not listing them together, that is, separating Indigenous culture either as its own or discussing it specifically within a general category on culture.

### 5.3 History

This category includes all forms of reference to Indigenous peoples' history. This includes recognition of prior occupation and prior management of land. The references included historical stories of First Nation activities on the land, recognition of Indigenous peoples as "original inhabitants," land being historically "managed by Aboriginal peoples," reference to a "time of the First Nations" and reference to land as being "originally" First Nations'. Most plans included such history in their overall plan visions and objectives. Others had specific policy sections that reference some form of Indigenous history significant to the policy.

There were three primary references to the history of First Nations by referring to "a time of First Nations" to present time. These references imply that First Nations had a time in which they existed and were important and that is not the present time. Edmonton's plan ends with a list of appendices one of which is called "City Vision, Principles and Strategic Goals" (City of Edmonton, 2010, 167). The vision is a creative description of Edmonton's future that guides decisions, help set direction and encourages alignment of priorities (City of Edmonton, 2010, 168). Within the vision is a statement "from the water, look up and consider the skyline, the bustling core and the towers and urban villages to the east and west...the people on the sidewalks and trails, from First Nations to new Canadians, linked by a common purpose – to learn, to prosper, to celebrate" (City of Edmonton, 2010, 168). Similar references that state "a time of First Nations" to "a present time" are found in Montreal and Surrey plans. Montreal's plan has a chapter on planning goals, one of which is "an enhanced architectural, archaeological and natural heritage" with an objective to "protect and enhance Montreal's archaeological heritage" (City of Montreal, 2004, 160). Within this objective is a detailed description of how this protection and enhancement will happen including an introductory paragraph with the statement "a number of

boroughs have major archaeological potential, having been occupied successively from the time of the First Nations to the earliest stages of Montreal's urbanization and industrialization" (City of Montreal, 2004, 160). Surrey's plan has a similar statement within the "Policies – Sustainability Pillars" chapter of its plan. Under a subsection on culture and heritage, the plan makes a commitment to protect and celebrate community heritage stating "Surrey has a significant heritage legacy...beginning with the early Semiahmoo and Kwantlen First Nations, this land was established with thriving communities for more than 6,000 years with European settlers first arriving in the mid-1800s" (City of Surrey, 2017, 214).

Another standard reference among plans was the reference to Indigenous peoples as original inhabitants of land or reference to land as "originally" belonging to First Nations. Halifax plan has a chapter called "The Role and Scope of the Centre Plan" with a subsection called "The Regional Centre Context" within which is a subsection called "The Regional Centre's Transformation" (City of Halifax, 2017, 9). In this subsection the plan states:

“the Mi'kmaq First Nations are the original inhabitants of the area now referred to as the Regional Centre, with evidence of permanent settlement ..... originally called K'jipuktuk (che-book-took), the shores were used as fishing. Evidence of seasonal Mi'kmaq campsites exist in various locations” (City of Halifax, 2017, 9).

In the general policies chapter under a culture and heritage subsection, the plan describes the Regional Centre as a “unique complex of institutional, commercial and residential districts whose evolution spans over 250 years of European and African Nova Scotian settlement and thousands of years of First Nations occupancy” (City of Halifax, 2017, 39). Regarding land called the Tuft's Cove, the plan states “use and seasonal occupancy of Tuft's Cove lands by Mi'kmaq peoples is recorded as early as mid-1850's...First Nations peoples' occupation of the area pre-dates the contact era" (City of Halifax, 2017, 43). Mississauga's plan has a section with

citywide policies including a vision chapter with a historical context. Within this historical context, the plan states, "the name 'Mississauga' is reminiscent of the Aboriginal peoples who once occupied the land" (City of Mississauga, 2015, 4-3). A similar reference is found in the "Review of Development Applications" chapter of Ottawa's plan, which refers to First Nations as "Peoples who first inhabited what is now the City of Ottawa and environs" (City of Ottawa, 2003, 4-53). Comparatively, under the heritage conservation section, Vancouver's plan identifies the city as "originally the territory of Coast Salish First Nations" (City of Vancouver-Heritage Conservation Area, 2015, 2). As part of the introduction to its' "Quality of Life" chapter, Winnipeg asserts that "Aboriginal people, the original people of this land, are important to the history and future of the city" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, 72).

The last type of recognition that falls in this history category is of Indigenous peoples' specific use and management of the land including references to First Nations as managers of land and resources. London's plan has a chapter called planning framework with a section on environmental planning that recognizes that the London's landscape of "forests of maple, oak, white pine.... Marshes, swamps, and corn fields were being actively managed by Aboriginal peoples" (City of London, 2006, 2.9.1). Similarly, Toronto's plan has a chapter on heritage conservation in which it shares stories that have shaped Toronto like "a lakefront terrain carved by rivers and valleys that 11,000 years ago first allowed First Nations to hunt and fish and later farm" (City of Toronto, 2015, 3-11). The recognition of First Nations land use and management is often expressed as something of the past and does not recognize that Indigenous peoples are still using the land even though the management of it has been largely taken away.

Recognition of prior occupation of Indigenous peoples in the plans listed above did not include the self-determination and land rights of Indigenous peoples that derive from this prior

occupation. Indigenous peoples were often listed as past inhabitants and no connection provided between earlier First Nations occupants of the land and current occupants. Neither was there an explanation for what happened to these original occupants of the land.

#### **5.4 Public Service Provision**

With the increase in urban Indigenous peoples the absence of relevant services such as settlement services, culturally appropriate services, and other Indigenous specific support services, has become more evident in urban centers. This section captures how Indigenous peoples were recognized to have distinct social service needs different from other members of the cities. As well, this recognition captures where Indigenous peoples are described as marginalized populations that are in need of social service delivery. This category includes references to public services explicitly committed to serving Indigenous peoples such as welcome center, recreation center, justice initiatives, housing initiatives and other support services. Some plans include general references to the importance of having services specific to Indigenous peoples. Other plans are more specific in types of services to be or being offered. Some plans also have reference to service specifically for Indigenous youth.

A few plans, such as Edmonton and Windsor as explained below, made commitments to develop services that would specifically cater to Indigenous peoples. Some general references to services for Indigenous peoples can be found in the planned, yet unfunded initiatives in Edmonton's plan, to "support the Aboriginal communities in accessing or developing physical spaces to meet and recreate" (City of Edmonton, 2010, 35). Planned unfunded initiatives are those that Edmonton has committed to but are listed without any funding in the implementation tables that show how initiatives are being implemented. Windsor's plan has a quality of life

chapter in which they commit to recognizing the “needs of the First Nations communities for housing and support services” (City of Windsor, 2006, 4-2). Edmonton's implementation plan also has planned initiatives with more specific services geared towards Indigenous peoples like the commitments to "develop the concept for an Aboriginal Welcome Centre that provides information, support, programming and space for gatherings" and "develop access strategy to sports and recreation for multicultural and Aboriginal groups"(City of Edmonton, 2010, 35). Another commitment is to "create a city workforce that broadly represents the diversity including an inclusive recruitment program that connects Aboriginal communities to employment opportunities" (City of Edmonton, 2010, 35). In comparison, Surrey mentions Indigenous peoples in its crime prevention strategy aimed at partnering with the Indigenous and other communities to refine a "restorative justice" process for the city. Surrey also mentions various "aboriginal centers" and societies in the city and mentions a Cultural Plan that references more centers and clubs for Indigenous peoples (City of Surrey, 2017, 123).

Rather than listing services offered mainly for the needs of Indigenous peoples, some plans list the provision of services to Indigenous peoples, amongst other groups such as marginalized groups or cultural groups. For example, as part of its city-building direction strategies specifically regarding libraries, Winnipeg's plan committed to developing "support collections, services and programs that enhance quality of life and address the needs of Winnipeggers, including residents at risk, children, youth, seniors, members of the arts and culture community, newcomers, Aboriginal communities and literacy learner” (City of Winnipeg, 2011, 62). This generalization of service needs is potentially problematic since urban Indigenous peoples and general urban cultural groups have different needs. In Edmonton’s Implementation Plan, to fulfill its goal to be a sustainable city, the City has a planned initiative to

"implement the target employment outreach initiatives to underrepresented communities" connecting with job seekers from the "Aboriginal, multicultural, youth and disabled communities" (City of Edmonton, 2010, 100). A similar list of marginalized communities that includes Indigenous communities was found in Vancouver's plan. Vancouver has a *Regional Context Statement Official Development Plan* that outlines a goal to develop complete communities by providing diverse, affordable housing choices. To achieve this, the plan states the city's intention to target "low barrier shelter, supportive housing and social housing to specific populations," the examples given include youth, Aboriginal, mentally ill and women. (City of Vancouver; Regional Context Statement, 2013, 46).

There was a common reference among some plans to services offered to Indigenous youth. Winnipeg's plan has a section on recreation that has a direction to "provide or facilitate community development and recreation opportunities for vulnerable youth" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, 60). Within this section is an objective to "work together with community partners to provide recreation and wellness opportunities to Aboriginal youth, including continuing to implement the Winnipeg Aboriginal Youth Strategy" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, 60). Winnipeg's plan also has a vision within its Quality of Life chapter to "foster opportunities for Aboriginal Winnipeggers, particularly youth, to obtain meaningful employment by building on current civic practices, processes and community partnerships" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, 77). Two of the city's strategies revolves around Indigenous specific employment, mentorship and other programs and services in civil society. These strategies support the efforts of Indigenous based community services that are culturally relevant and accessible to Indigenous youth and work collaboratively with partners to provide training and professional development opportunities to Indigenous youth.

The least common method of Indigenous recognition through public service was in references to municipal service agreements. Municipal service agreements are contracts signed by the municipality and another part, in this case, a First Nation, that states what services will be provided to the First Nation and any other conditions attached to the agreement. This commonly happens when a First Nation is nearby or within a municipality and requires essential services like water and sewer. Usually, the First Nation pays the municipality for the services equivalent to what the city would make in taxes. Within its Complete Communities plan and Our Winnipeg, Winnipeg commits to “negotiate with Treaty Land Entitlement First Nations, Municipal Development and Service Agreements to include arrangements for the provision of and payment for services” (City of Winnipeg, 2011b, 123).

## **5.5 Site Preservation**

This category includes mentions of site preservation, archaeological resource preservation and concerns, Indigenous sites of significance, and other general conservation aspirations to do with Indigenous peoples. This category captures recognition of the preservation and conservation needs and right of Indigenous peoples. This is mentioned explicitly in the TRC and UNDRIP as an essential area for cities to support and work in good faith with Indigenous peoples (UN General Assembly, 2008). These references were often found within chapters dedicated to issues of conservation, but sometimes were addressing specific lands. Some vaguely recognized the presence of First Nation site preservation; others were more specific about how site preservation would happen. This category is different from culture because conservation and preservation would not have come up in searches for culture. More importantly, it was separated from the culture category because UNDRIP states explicitly that Indigenous peoples have the

right to conservation and protection of the environment and the productive capacity of their lands or territories and resources.

Halifax's plan has a chapter on culture and heritage in which the city commits to developing a "protocol for identifying and protecting Indigenous sites of significance" by consulting with "Indigenous peoples to develop this protocol for the appropriate identification, protection, and interpretation of sites of cultural value to Indigenous communities" (City of Halifax, 2017, 46). Hamilton's plan has a chapter on "communities" in which it states, "there are no archaeological concerns within the city" but that a "higher standard of conservation, care, and protection for archaeological resources may be required, based on prevailing conditions and circumstances within the city and results of any dialogue with First Nations and their interests" (City of Hamilton, 2015, B.3 30). As stated previously, Hamilton also commits to dialogue with First Nations regarding their interests in archaeological resources and to "notify the nearest First Nation, where a marked or unmarked cemetery or burial place is found" (City of Hamilton, 2015, B3 30). One of Ottawa's strategic directions is to conduct a "Rideau Corridor Landscape Strategy, along with representatives from First Nations, federal and provincial agencies, to recognize and protect the cultural heritage resource significance of the Rideau Canal UNESCO World Heritage Site" (City of Ottawa, 2003, 4-17). Ottawa recognizes the importance of waterways and islands in the history and culture of Indigenous peoples and commits to engage with First Nations in particular with Algonquins on matters related to the utilization of islands in the Ottawa and Rideau Rivers (City of Ottawa, 2003, 4-17). Toronto has a section of its plan dedicated to heritage conservation, in which First Nations are mentioned as the first users of the lakefront terrain carved by rivers and valleys, to hunt and fish. This plan calls for engagement with First Nations and the Metis for heritage properties and archaeological sites. Toronto

encourages recognition of First Nations in programs commemorating and interpreting sites of importance. In collaboration with First Nations, the city will “develop a protocol for matters related to identifying evaluating and protecting properties, cultural heritage landscapes, archaeological sites and artifacts where they may be of interest to First Nations or Metis” (City of Toronto, 2015, 3-11). Toronto commits to providing Archaeological Assessment reports to those First Nations and Metis with the closest cultural affiliation, to those resources "as identified by the city," and in whose traditional territories the archaeological resources were found prior to the development proceeding (City of Toronto, 2015, 3-11). They have stated that publicly owned lands with significant archaeological resources of First Nations or Metis origin might be deemed not suitable for development.

Mississauga's plan has a less explicit recognition of the importance of site preservation to Indigenous peoples. Within its “Complete Communities” chapter, under a cultural heritage resources subsection, the plan states that the city will “consider the interests of Indigenous communities in conserving cultural heritage and archaeological resources” (City of Mississauga, 2009, 7-8). This site preservation category could be considered a sub section of the history and culture categories previously mentioned. Site preservation includes both Indigenous culture and history. It is separated to highlight the importance of recognition of cultural heritage and prior occupation of Indigenous peoples through recognition of site preservation rights.

## **5.6 Treaty Negotiations**

This category includes all references specifically to Treaty negotiations, ongoing Land Claims, Urban Reserves and Treaty Land Entitlement. It captures recognition of Indigenous peoples as Treaty peoples, as landowners and developers, and as contract holders in the form of

treaties or agreements to do with the land. It also captures recognition of a potential municipal role in addressing outstanding treaty obligations. Such references were found in different sections of the documents. Some were part of the introduction of the plan, others more specific within the plan in sections discussing particular portions of land.

Specific references to land allocations range from details that include the size of the land and the phase the process is in as at plan adoption, other plans briefly state that there is a process underway. Halifax plan has a section on culture and heritage in which it lists "potential cultural landscapes" that include "Tuft's cove" (City of Halifax, 2017, 43). This section has specifics about land that the crown is holding for a First Nation, stating, "the Crown is holding 9 acres abutting the shores of Tuft's Cove proper in favor of the Millbrook First Nation" (City of Halifax, 2017, 43). Less explicit references to lands and Treaty Negotiations are found in Ottawa and Winnipeg. As part of its introduction, Ottawa's plan recognizes "the Algonquin of Ontario Land Claim Interest Lands within the jurisdiction of the City of Ottawa", and acknowledges, "land use planning in the city will, when it is available, take into account the Land Claim Settlement Agreement" (City of Ottawa, 2003, 1-3). In its implementation chapter, the plan recognizes that the city lies within the "historic Algonquin Territory that is part of current Treaty Negotiations with the Federal and Provincial Crowns" (City of Ottawa, 2003, 5-17). Winnipeg's plan offers a fuller story to its Treaty Agreement process within the Complete Communities plan under a chapter called "Aboriginal Economic Development Zones" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, 122). Within this chapter, the plan explains the history of treaties with First Nations in Manitoba, highlighting that "not every First Nation that entered into a treaty received its full amount of land, so Canada continues to owe land, referred to as Treaty Land Entitlement to specific First Nations" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, 122).

Winnipeg and Saskatoon specifically mention the development of urban reserves within the city. Saskatoon's plan states within its implementation chapter on coordination with other jurisdictions, that the city "supports establishment of First Nations Reserve Lands within and near the City Limits, subject to appropriate agreements regarding matters such as compensation for loss of municipal taxation; payment for municipal services; and bylaw compatibility and compatibility of enforcement" (City of Saskatoon, 2017, 88). Having explained the history of treaties, Winnipeg's plan emphasizes "as part of the settlement process, some First Nations that have validated their land claim with Canada, have an opportunity to acquire lands, including those located within urban areas such as the City of Winnipeg" (City of Winnipeg, 2011b, 122).

## **5.7 Geographic Location**

This category includes all references to Indigenous peoples by geographic location including a reference on a map, in the text regarding proximity to the city and references to the region in which both the city and First Nation have jurisdiction. This section captures recognition of Indigenous peoples as neighbours, adjacent governments, and overlapping governments. Mentioning the geographic location of First Nations not only recognizes them as adjacent landowners, but also because the way of life of First Nations including use of natural resources in their surrounding so even if a municipality is not directly adjacent to a First Nation, there will likely be interaction with First Nations belonging to reserves in proximity. Also, geography marginalizes Indigenous peoples in significant environmental decision making since First Nations' geography has been crucial in the production of their current situation (Jackson, 1997; Borrows, 1997). Geography refers to the location of Indigenous peoples and communities. The location of Indigenous peoples has continued to change from the time settlers initially invaded

their lands till now when they are either confined to reserves or living in urban centers ill-equipped to cater for their needs.

Calgary, Regina, and Surrey have maps that show the specific locations of First Nations within or around the cities. Calgary's plan has a section called "Alignment of the MDP" which explains the ways the plans align with the Municipal Government Act, the Calgary Region and with other city policies and principles. Within alignment in the Calgary Region, a map of Calgary's metropolitan area is provided showing the members of this area that includes the Tsuu T'ina Nation (Calgary 2017, 1-5). Regina has a section of its plan dedicated to maps one of which is a Growth Plan map that identifies the Sakimay First Nation as just outside the city limits (City of Regina, 2016, 75). The plan has a "definitions" section that points out that "First Nations Reserve Lands are not included within the Joint Planning Area" depicted on Map 3 – Regional Policy Context, "given their standing as their planning authorities" (City of Regina, 2016, 107). The goal of the "Joint Planning Area" is to "promote sustainable growth and development patterns for the City with the Rural Municipality of Sherwood (RM) through effective joint planning" (City of Regina, 2016, 28). In comparison, Surrey's plan has a chapter on land uses and densities with a General Land Use Designations map intended to reflect the goals and objectives of the Official Community Plan (City of Surrey, 2017). On the legend of this map is a reference to a "First Nations Reserve" identified by a greyish color very similar to the color assigned to "Industrial" (City of Surrey, 2017, 35). These plans mention on maps the city proximity to First Nations communities but do not state details about their planning intentions with these First Nations. In the case of Regina, the plan has joint planning with the adjacent RM but no mention about joint planning with the adjacent First Nations since they have their own "planning authorities" (City of Regina, 2016, 29).

Other geographic location references were found within the text including mentions of city proximity to First Nations and references to geographic locations on which both the city and First Nations have jurisdiction, as well as mentions of territory. Ottawa's plan introduction chapter includes a section called "the role of the official plan" within which there is a subsection called "Algonquins of Ontario Land Claim Interest" (City of Ottawa, 2003, 1-3). In this subsection, the plan states, "lands within the jurisdiction of the City of Ottawa fall within traditional Algonquin territory" (City of Ottawa, 2003, 1-3). Edmonton's plan has a chapter titled "Working within Our Region" that has a section called "Inter-municipal Planning", in which the city states its intentions to "continue to expand our inter-municipal planning activities to include the different types of partners in the Capital Region and address the full range of inter-municipal issues" (City of Edmonton, 2010, 83). Within this section is a list of policies that will help achieve the city's intentions. One of these policies is to "establish effective relationships with inter-municipal planning partners including non-municipal neighbours: Edmonton International Airport; Edmonton Garrison; and the Enoch Cree Nation" (City of Edmonton, 2010, 83). Saskatoon's plan has a chapter on "Fundamental Values" one of which is "Cooperation with other Jurisdictions." In this section, the plan states, "the City of Saskatoon shares the Region with several urban and rural municipalities, First Nations, and other authorities, both within and outside the City Limits" (City of Saskatoon, 2017, 2).

These plans all state the presence of First Nations around them or within the urban centers. Edmonton's reference to First Nations as neighbours is problematic since a 'neighbour to neighbour' relationship is more about "protecting modes of planning" and "is a radically different discourse from commitments to reconcile and allow for different forms of political authority" (Porter and Barry, 2015, 35). Neighbours normally have boundaries and can chose to

interact, or not, when necessary to maintain the boundaries. This is very different from say a community that works together for the good of all parties involved while still respecting the individuality of involved parties. Also, categorizing First Nations as neighbours "tends to limit the conversation to issues that arise out of the fact that they share a geographic boundary" (Barry & Porter, 2016, 114). Other plans refer to First Nations as other jurisdictions but do not explain the nature of the relationship with the jurisdictions. Issues of misplaced authority and lack of proper recognition are bound to arise when the nature of this geographic recognition is not made clear.

### **5.8 Distinct Needs and Talents**

This category captures instances where Indigenous peoples were in some way recognized as a separate group of peoples than the general public with different needs and talents. Edmonton lists "aboriginal communities, business, arts, sports and recreational organizations" as the list of "Edmontonians" that provided input for the creation of the city's plan. Indigenous peoples are also listed as underrepresented communities in the city that need awareness of employment opportunities within the city (City of Edmonton, 2010, 12). These are examples of how Indigenous peoples are recognized as distinct communities having specific needs and rights compared to "the general public." Similar to culture, this distinction of Indigenous peoples was recognized in different ways such as distinct population, marginalized population, underrepresented communities, distinct urban group and in the case of Edmonton, as having a separate plan altogether, dedicated explicitly to Indigenous peoples.

Cities sometimes recognized Indigenous communities in groups of residents or city dwellers. Regina's plan has a chapter on citywide policies in which it has a section on social

development that states "all Regina residents, including First Nations, Metis, Inuit peoples, immigrants, persons with specific needs, seniors and youth, play an essential role in the growth of Regina, sustenance of communities and building of its workforce" (City of Regina, 2016, 55). As previously referenced under culture, Edmonton has a similar list of Edmontonians that helps create the plan through their input, under which they list "multicultural and Aboriginal communities" (City of Edmonton, 2010, 12).

When Indigenous peoples were not recognized as marginalized and disadvantaged groups or as specific city residents, they were just generally recognized as one particular segment of the population. Two plans had a general recognition of the population of Indigenous peoples. Edmonton's Implementation Plan included challenges to the plan within the introduction chapter. Incorporated as a challenge, was "the city is home to Canada's second largest urban Aboriginal population which has a relatively younger cohort compared to the overall population" (City of Edmonton, 2010, 18). Winnipeg had more detailed references of Indigenous population. Included in Winnipeg's plan was a chapter called context and opportunities in which the city highlighted some population statistics like 10.8% speak French, 20.4% either take transit or walk to work and 11.2% are of Aboriginal ancestry (City of Winnipeg, 2011, 6). Furthermore, the plan expands on these population statistics, with a section on "Winnipeg's Aboriginal population" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, 13). It shows the increase in Indigenous peoples in the city over the years, as well as emphasizing that "the Aboriginal population living in Winnipeg is much younger than the non-Aboriginal population" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, 13). This section ends by stating "increased cultural diversity adds to the vitality of communities, schools, business sectors, arts and cultural institutions" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, 13).

Another effort to distinctly recognize Indigenous communities was through dedicating specific sections of the plan to addressing something specific about Indigenous peoples. Edmonton's implementation plan includes a goal to be a caring, inclusive, affordable community and one of the current city initiatives that advance this goal is to "implement Edmonton's Urban Aboriginal Strategy in collaboration with Edmonton's urban Aboriginals" (City of Edmonton, 2010, 59). Ottawa's plan has an implementation chapter that devotes a section specifically on "Algonquin Aboriginal Interests" which are land use policy specific and range from recognition of Indigenous authority to protection of natural resources (City of Ottawa, 2003, 5-18). Similarly, Winnipeg's plan has a chapter on quality of life with a section called "*Our Winnipeg* includes Aboriginal people" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, 76). This section acknowledges "Aboriginal Winnipeggers bring a diverse richness of cultures, traditions, languages, teachings, values, skills and perspectives" and lists some strategies in line with this direction (City of Winnipeg, 2011, 76). While this effort is appropriate since it treats Indigenous groups as different from other groups, it is likely that these cities included these sections due to circumstances that arose such as increased urban reserves and need for municipal services agreements in Winnipeg or legal cases with the Algonquin in Ottawa. Rather than being reactive to the issue of reconciliation, the recommendations provided to Winnipeg will draw on lessons from all the analyzed plans to offer proactive ways of walking the journey of reconciliation.

## **5.9 Summary of Findings**

The categories with the most references to Indigenous peoples were relationships and then history. The default form of recognition of Indigenous peoples in most cities was the reference to the history of the land by mentioning the prior presence of Indigenous peoples on the land. Few cities, however, suggest what that transition from Indigenous occupancy to settler

occupancy looked like or meant, or even mentioned a history of colonialism and its effects on Indigenous peoples. Winnipeg and Ottawa have specific references to Treaty agreements, but other cities mention the presence of Indigenous peoples more on the peripheries of the city. These cities also indicate the need to consult with First Nations that they share boundaries with or have overlapping jurisdiction as in the case of urban reserves that are mentioned in Winnipeg and Saskatoon plans or "neighbours" as mentioned in Regina and Surrey plans. Apart from Edmonton, there is no specific recognition by the plans of the social issues facing Indigenous peoples in the city or the need to engage differently with urban Indigenous peoples. Commitments towards improved relationships, cultural representation and opportunity, and Indigenous-specific public services begin to cater to the particular needs of urban Indigenous peoples by providing services and resources that are go explicitly towards urban Indigenous community development.

Recognition of relationship with Indigenous peoples took many forms from one city to another. Some had specific protocols about improving relations with Indigenous peoples; others had more specific relationship commitments towards partnership, consultation, and collaboration relating to existing projects. Often these relationships were stated as formed as and when "determined by the city." In some cases, the plans noted the city would consider the interests of Indigenous peoples or notify Indigenous groups pertaining projects that may affect them. Much of the statements found in the plans were geared towards planning for Indigenous people not in partnership with Indigenous peoples. These modes of recognition are inconsistent and sometimes even fall short of the ideas of reconciliation developed by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. These inconsistencies will be looked at in greater detail in the next chapter.

## **6.0 Analysis of Documents in Possible Conflict with Carriers of Meaning**

In 2015, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) of Canada released a Calls to Action and Principles of Reconciliation document outlining the principles for reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in Canada (TRC, 2015, 3). The principles of reconciliation outline, among other points: the need for Indigenous peoples to be recognized as original peoples of the country; the need for healing relationships; and, the need for constructive action on addressing the ongoing legacies of colonialism that have had destructive impacts on Indigenous peoples. A more detailed summary of the ten principles of reconciliation is provided in the literature review. This chapter looks at the details of the entire document to bring out some themes to advise cities on how to address reconciliation in the urban environment. The previous chapter was a textual analysis of how Indigenous peoples are referred to in the long-range plans and also shows the ways cities have started to address issues of urban Indigenous peoples' positive coexistence with non-Indigenous peoples.

The TRC document identifies both "barriers to reconciliation and the opportunities for constructive action that currently exist" (TRC, 2015, 4). The document starts by outlining how Canada's Indigenous policies were aimed at eliminating Indigenous governments; ignoring Indigenous rights; terminating the Treaties and; through a process of assimilation, causing Indigenous peoples to cease to exist as distinct legal, social-cultural religious, and racial entities in Canada (TRC, 2015). Reconciliation is about awareness of the past, acknowledgment of the harm it inflicted and action to change that behaviour, and the Principles of Reconciliation report shows how to do that. The TRC recommended that all government bodies meet and explore the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), as a framework for reconciliation in Canada. This UNDRIP document "provides the necessary principles, norms,

and standards for reconciliation to flourish in twenty-first-century Canada” (TRC, 2015, 125).

UNDRIP Article 23 states

Indigenous peoples have the right to determine and develop priorities and strategies for exercising their right to development. In particular Indigenous peoples have the right to be actively involved in developing and establishing health, housing and other economic and social programmes affecting them and, as far as possible, to administer such programmes through their own institutions (UN General Assembly, 2008, 9)

UNDRIP refers to governing bodies as “States” and encourages States to establish ways and means of ensuring participation of Indigenous peoples on issues affecting them (UN General Assembly, 2008, 14). While UNDRIP was targeted at nation-states, this research focuses on how it applies to lower tiers of government, in this case municipalities. UNDRIP is the universal framework used by members of the United Nations as the “minimum standards for survival, dignity, and well-being of Indigenous peoples” (UN General Assembly, 2008, 14). The TRC documents and the UNDRIP are used to inform the previous analysis of plans and advise how reconciliation friendly policy should look. These two documents are used to comment on themes from the long-range planning documents.

This second analysis chapter is a closer look at the TRC Principles of Reconciliation document and how the themes commonly arising in the long-range planning document analysis overlap, or not, with Principles of Reconciliation and UNDRIP. This chapter will answer the first part of research question one “What are the principles of reconciliation?” as well as the third part of the second research question that asks how the planning documents are reflective of principles of reconciliation. The themes arising in the plan analysis do reveal ways in which the plans follow some of the principles of reconciliation outlined by the TRC. For consistency and comparison, I will use the similar headings in this section as in the previous chapter analysis.

## 6.1 History of Indigenous Peoples

Recognition of Indigenous peoples through history took many forms within the plans, some telling stories about Indigenous peoples being the original inhabitants on the land and others stating specific histories of places in relation to Indigenous peoples. The importance of recognizing the history of Indigenous peoples in Canada is emphasized as part of reconciliation:

Too many Canadians know little, or nothing about the deep historical roots of Indigenous and non-Indigenous conflicts and this lack of historical knowledge has serious consequences for First Nations, Inuit, and Metis peoples and Canada as a whole (TRC, 2015, 114).

The TRC document states that this lack of knowledge makes for "poor public policy decisions" that reinforce racist attitudes and fuels public distrust between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples (TRC, 2015, 114). Peoples' lack of understanding of the role of all people, Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, as Treaty peoples comes from a lack of understanding of the history of Canada. Achieving reconciliation takes sustained political will at all levels of government and concerted material resources including communicating the history of Canada's First Nations people (TRC, 2015). The United Nations Declaration of Rights of Indigenous Peoples is;

Concerned that indigenous peoples have suffered from historic injustices as a result of their colonization and dispossession of their lands, territories, and resources, thus preventing them from exercising, in particular, their right to development in accordance with their own needs and interests (UN General Assembly, 2008, 2).

Providing this context and highlighting Indigenous peoples' right to land and resources, provides a better understanding of the circumstances facing Indigenous peoples and gives the necessary historical context required for reconciliation and positive coexistence.

Ten of the eighteen plans had some form of a section explaining Indigenous history. None of them addressed the historical injustices generally or the injustices that are attributed to the field of planning such as forced relocation and excessive natural resource extraction. There were often general statements dealing with the history of Indigenous peoples such as: “original inhabitants” on the land; describing the city as historically a place of First Nation settlement; or mentioning how Indigenous peoples once “managed the land” (City of London, 2006; Mississauga, 2015; City of Hamilton, 2009). Not only are these references to Indigenous peoples primarily depicted as only historical, they are also all missing effects of the "dark side" of planning. Statements concerning the history of Indigenous peoples either depict them as landowners or caregivers, but never as victims of the marginalizing efforts of the field of planning.

## **6.2 Improved Relationships with Indigenous Peoples**

Just as relationships were the most common form of recognition of Indigenous peoples in the plans, relationships are the central message of the Principles of Reconciliation. All 10 Principles of Reconciliation approach reconciliation first as an issue of relationships (TRC, 2015). To practice reconciliation in our everyday lives constructively, Canadians must remain committed to the ongoing work of establishing and maintaining respectful relationships.

For governments, building respectful relationship involves dismantling a centuries-old-political and bureaucratic culture in which, all too often, policies and programs are still based on failed notions of assimilation. Reconciliation offers a new way of living together (TRC, 2015, 126).

UNDRIP Article 15, indicates that “States shall take effective measures in consultation and cooperation with the Indigenous peoples concerned, to combat prejudice and eliminate discrimination and to promote tolerance, understanding and good relations among Indigenous

peoples and all other segments of society” (UN General Assembly, 2008, 7). Article 19 says "States shall consult and cooperate in good faith with the Indigenous peoples concerned through their own representative institutions to obtain their free prior and informed consent before adopting and implementing legislative or administrative measures that may affect them” (UN General Assembly, 2008, 8). The plans’ commitments to collaborate with Indigenous peoples “as identified by the city” (City of Toronto, 2015, 3-14) are contrary to this statement and not in good faith with Indigenous peoples possibly concerned. According to TRC and UNDRIP, improving relationships between governments and Indigenous peoples involves ongoing respectful relationships, deconstructing policies and programs based on assimilation, adequate consultation, and cooperation before moving forward with policies that may affect them.

Even as relationships was the most common theme in the plan, this relationship was often either vaguely defined and or constrained to a particular issue. Cities such as Halifax, Ottawa, Toronto and Regina all had various commitments towards collaboration with Indigenous groups but no further methods of how this would be implemented. Ottawa commits to "work with the Algonquins where proposals provide opportunities to incorporate Aboriginal history and culture" (City of Ottawa, 2003, 4-53). Among other reasons, the purpose of these relationships was addressing cultural needs and aspirations (City of Regina, 2016); identifying, evaluating and protecting property and cultural heritage landscapes (City of Toronto, 2015); and, providing opportunities to live, work and play (City of Winnipeg, 2011). How these initiatives were to be realized was not explicit and sometimes not present at all in the plans. As well, the city was still the deciding figure on when to engage with First Nations. This method of determining if and when engagement is needed is ineffective and disregards all authority of First Nations as governments and for whatever issue the First Nation is consulted, this will be because the city

has granted the authority. This method of deciding for the First Nation what is worthy of consultation is emblematic of planning *for* Indigenous peoples, when both UNDRIP and the TRC's principles are implicitly advocating the idea of planning *with* Indigenous peoples.

### **6.3 Treaties and Agreements**

Treaties were mentioned within plans when there was a negotiation in place or agreements yet to be settled. UNDRIP considers that treaties, agreements and other constructive arrangements, and the relationships they represent, are the basis for a strengthened partnership between Indigenous peoples and the States (UN General Assembly, 2008).

In line with this, there was perhaps an opportunity for Ottawa and Winnipeg to not only mention the Treaties as ongoing negotiations but also use them as a basis for an improved relationship with a strengthened partnership with the particular Indigenous groups. Article 37 of UNDRIP states that Indigenous people have the right to the “recognition, observance and enforcement of treaties, agreements, and other constructive arrangements concluded with States or their successors and to have States honor and respect such treaties, agreements and other constructive arrangements” (UN General Assembly, 2008, 3). Not all cities have treaties in place, but what is said of treaties in the UNDRIP and TRC would apply to other agreements and protocols in place with Indigenous peoples since a treaty is essentially a formalized relationship “developed on the basis of respect” (Craft, 2014, 12). Historically even verbal agreements were considered just as valid as formalized treaties (Craft, 2014). Halifax's commitment to developing an "engagement protocol" for identifying and protecting of cultural sites is an example of such an agreement. As well, Edmonton's Urban Aboriginal Strategy and Toronto's plan propose protocols for matters related to identifying, evaluating and protecting properties and cultural heritage

landscapes. These are all agreements that must be honoured and respected as treaties are acknowledged and respected (City of Halifax, 2017; City of Edmonton, 2010; City of Toronto, 2015).

#### **6.4 Site Preservation**

Since historically Indigenous peoples' lands were forcefully taken from them (TRC, 2015), site preservation is an essential aspect of reconciliation and improving relations with Indigenous peoples. UNDRIP Article 11 states that "Indigenous peoples have the right to practice and revitalize their cultural traditions and customs" (UN General Assembly, 2008, 6). This includes the right to maintain protect and develop the past, present and future manifestations of their cultures, such as archaeological and historical sites, artifacts, designs, ceremonies, technologies and visual and performing arts and literature. UNDRIP Article 29 states:

Indigenous peoples have the right to the conservation and protection of the environment and the productive capacity of their lands or territories and resources. States shall establish and implement assistance programmes for Indigenous peoples for such conservation and protection without discrimination (UN General Assembly, 2008, 11).

Site preservation is a right of Indigenous peoples and cities are advised to have assistance programs for Indigenous peoples to enact this right to conservation of their lands, without discrimination or condition from the State.

Like other categories, this type of recognition occurred in the form of an action done *for*, or sometimes despite, Indigenous groups' interests and rarely *with* Indigenous groups. Few examples of working with Indigenous groups are found in Edmonton's commitment to work "with aboriginal peoples living in the city" and Ottawa's commitment to work "with the

Algonquins" and "engage with First Nations" concerning site preservation. Mississauga committed to "consider the interests of Aboriginal communities" and Toronto to "provide a copy of archaeological assessment reports to First Nations with the closest cultural affiliation as identified by the city." It is evident in statements like these that the municipalities still hold power over decision making about site preservation. The city identifying the First Nations with closest cultural affiliation to a site is problematic since it is First Nation culture that is being assessed. These are examples of conditions from the State identified in UNDRIP.

## **6.5 Culture**

Since Indigenous culture is not only a part of Indigenous peoples' way of life but is ingrained in all of Indigenous peoples' way of life, preservation of culture is an important step in the journey of reconciliation (TRC, 2015). As well, Indigenous peoples are still recovering from the effects of residential schools that sought to eliminate Indigenous peoples culture (da Silva, 2010). UNDRIP Article 31, Part 1 states that:

Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain, control, protect, and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions, as well as the manifestations of their sciences, technologies and cultures, including human and genetic resources, seeds, medicines, knowledge of the properties of fauna and flora, oral traditions, literatures, designs sports and traditional games and visual and performing arts (UN General Assembly, 2008, 11).

They also have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their intellectual property over such cultural heritage, traditional knowledge, and traditional cultural expressions (UN General Assembly, 2008). Part 2 says, "In conjunction with Indigenous peoples, States shall take effective measures to recognize and protect the exercise of these rights" (UN General Assembly,

2008, 12). Practical measures to recognize and protect the exercise of these rights include ensuring no discrimination or condition put up by the State.

In the urban environment maintaining, controlling and protecting Indigenous cultural heritage and sites can take many forms but the one focused on in the plans is services and arts. Having a strategy that is specific to the needs of Indigenous peoples such as the Edmonton Urban Aboriginal Strategy is a step ahead of most of the other city plans analyzed. A standard issue among the plans was the reference to the needs of Indigenous cultural groups as same as other multicultural groups. Calgary, Edmonton, and Halifax listed Indigenous groups with “other cultural groups” which neglects to recognize Indigenous groups as having specific needs very different to “other cultural groups” and thereby failing to provide culturally appropriate services for Indigenous peoples. Recognizing Indigenous peoples in this manner treats them as community stakeholders, thus generalizing their needs and aspirations with other stakeholders and failing to account for their rights as self-determined peoples (Barry & Porter, 2012). None of the plans expressed intentions towards partnering with Indigenous governing bodies to adequately cater to Indigenous cultural groups; instead, Indigenous peoples were framed as passive receivers of services. Framing Indigenous peoples as passive consumers of services offered rather than active participants in shaping the services that are designed for their use is contrary to UNDRIP assertions to control the development of services for their development (UN General Assembly, 2008).

## **6.6 Overall Recognition of Indigenous Peoples’ Rights**

The long-range plan analysis brought out different ways of recognizing Indigenous peoples, all attempting, in different contexts, to guide interactions with First Nations. The TRC

documents, as well as UNDRIP, are fundamentally concerned with the recognition of Indigenous peoples as self-determined peoples. Indigenous peoples have their own rights that derive from their political, economic and social structures, and their cultures, spiritual traditions, histories, and philosophies, especially their rights to their lands, territories, and resources (TRC, 2015; UN General Assembly, 2008). These rights need not only be respected but also promoted (TRC, 2015). The control by Indigenous peoples over developments affecting them and their lands, territories, and resources will enable them to “maintain and strengthen their institutions, cultures, and traditions, and to promote their development in accordance with their aspirations and needs” (UN General Assembly, 2008, 2). Recognition of rights of Indigenous peoples will enhance harmonious and cooperative relations between the state and Indigenous peoples, “based on principles of justice, democracy, respect for human rights, non-discrimination and good faith” (UN General Assembly, 2008, 3). Recognition should take many avenues as described in the TRC statements regarding rights of Indigenous peoples. The documents also call for the promotion of these various rights, and control over developments to promote the advancement of Indigenous peoples in line with their needs and aspirations.

The long-range plans vaguely recognize Indigenous rights. There are various intentions to engage with Indigenous peoples over specific topics and to provide particular services, but there was almost no recognition of the unique political structures of Indigenous peoples. Winnipeg's plan outlining intentions to maintain intergovernmental cooperation was only one reference among the plans to government-to-government interactions with Indigenous peoples. Apart from references in Ottawa, Winnipeg, and Edmonton plans, to the specificity of Indigenous culture, most plans did not recognize the uniqueness of Indigenous cultural structures. Apart from London's reference to lands being historically "actively managed by Aboriginal peoples" there

was no mention of how land management in Indigenous and non-Indigenous contexts differs and what that difference would look like from an urban planning standpoint. The conflict in how Indigenous peoples are recognized versus how they should be recognized validates Coulthard's "politics of recognition" in which recognition-based models seek to reconcile Indigenous assertions with Crown sovereignty (Coulthard, 2009, 4). This type of recognition maintains the very political structures that reconciliation is against, as is evident in the plans in which the cities largely determine how and when to recognize Indigenous peoples even when it has to do with something as personal as deciding First Nations that are in closest cultural affiliation with a site.

## **6.7 Summary of Findings**

The TRC Principles of Reconciliation along with UNDRIP outlines some specifics about what reconciliation should look like. The articles highlighted in this section can be used to inform policymakers on how to address the themes of culture, heritage, history, and relationship. In some instances, the TRC is explicit with what a mutually respectful relationship should look like and in others it is broad. For example, it is clear that Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain traditional knowledge or protect cultural heritage; however, what that should look like is not described in these documents. Therefore, understanding whether the recognition expressed in Chapter 5 is in line with recommendations shown in Chapter 6 can be tricky since it is up to the reader's discretion to determine whether or not a particular program or an initiative is adequately fulfilling that right to maintain traditional knowledge. Clarity on such issues would be based on communication with local urban Indigenous peoples and groups, which is an avenue for future research. The documents do, nevertheless, provide a framework for how to tackle

reconciliation with specific reference to how lack of reconciliation efforts contributes to “poor public policy decisions” (TRC, 2015, 114), which is the core issue of this research.

There was often reference to a time of Indigenous peoples and then a current time of new Canadians, without explanation of what that transition looked like or whether the time of Indigenous peoples still exists. References to traditional territory that was originally occupied by First Nations imply that the land is no longer traditional land and no longer managed and occupied by First Nations. The statistics of urban Indigenous peoples and development or urban reserves shows that this is far from the truth since many Indigenous peoples live in urban cities and are still self-governed peoples with land and resource rights.

There is an overall reliance on Indigenous recognition through history and environmental conservation and less emphasis on opportunities for government-to-government interactions with Indigenous groups to improve the living conditions of Indigenous peoples in the city. There is an effort by most cities to enhance the relationships with Indigenous peoples by different forms of engagement and consultation. The plans in general mainly contradict the aspirations of the TRC and UNDRIP. As previously outlined, many plans fall short of fully recognizing Indigenous authority and rights within the city and still pose as the deciding authority even over Indigenous specific issues.

## **7.0 Discussion**

---

This research has aimed to develop a better understanding of how Official Community Plans across Canada are addressing reconciliation, and to consider some lessons for the review of *OurWinnipeg*. The outline of this research was organized to first guide the reader through a journey of understanding reconciliation as a planning issue. The hope is that the reader can then apply this understanding in a critical analysis of existing urban planning policy to determine where and how reconciliation is framed within the plans. The analysis is intended to be not only critical of how the plans address reconciliation, but also visionary in exploring recommendations for revised policy. This chapter provides a summary of the key findings from the previous two chapters and presents lessons to support the review of *OurWinnipeg*.

### **7.1 Key Findings**

The first phase of this research aimed to understand how cities across Canada address reconciliation within their long-range plans. Eighteen of Canada's twenty-two big city plans were gathered to determine the discourse within the plans that addressed Indigenous peoples. A total of eight categories were considered to be significant: relationships, culture, history, public service provision, site preservation, treaty negotiations, geographic location, and distinct needs and talents. These categories were selected through a detailed analysis of the long-range plans for the contexts in which Indigenous peoples were mentioned. The second phase of the research aimed to understand how the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) advises governing bodies to address reconciliation and compare that, with how cities have addressed reconciliation in long-range planning documents. Together the two phases answer the second research question by highlighting what is omitted and what is privileged in the plans; what strategies are used to

address Indigenous reconciliation; and how the documents are reflective of principles of reconciliation. This section seeks to capture some key findings from the research. The results have been broken up into four categories: varied contexts, misplaced authority, inactive reconciliation and omitted history.

**Varied contexts.** Findings from the two previous chapters show that the strategies used by different cities to address reconciliation are diverse. For example, Toronto, Mississauga, and Halifax all commit to developing some form of engagement or consultation protocol with First Nations. However, the context in which these are to be developed and the purpose of the protocols varies among the plans. While the Halifax protocol aims to identify sites of cultural value to Indigenous communities, the Toronto protocol seeks to address matters related to identifying, evaluating and protecting First Nation properties and cultural heritage landscapes. In contrast, the Mississauga protocol is more generally for planning matters that affect the interests of Indigenous communities. Unlike Mississauga, the Halifax and Toronto protocols seek to constrain Indigenous interests to a particular issue thereby failing to recognize the interests of Indigenous peoples as not only confined to that issue.

**Misplaced authority.** Some of the plans indicated intentions to preserve Indigenous culture and heritage but stated that the city would be the determinant of what is classified as Indigenous culture and heritage. An example of this is Toronto's commitment to provide copies of Archaeological Assessment reports to "First Nations or Metis with the closest cultural affiliation as identified by the city" (City of Toronto, 2015, 3-14). The city being the determining authority of what is and is not Indigenous culture, is counter to TRC and UNDRIP declarations, which state that Indigenous peoples are to have control over preservation of their culture and resources (UN General Assembly, 2008). In fact, UNDRIP states that cities should establish

“assistance programmes” (UN General Assembly, 2008, 11) to help Indigenous peoples preserve their culture. This means that complete authority over issues relating to preservation of Indigenous culture and resources should be in complete control of Indigenous peoples, with *assistance* from the city.

**Inactive reconciliation.** Most of the cities that made commitments to improve relations with Indigenous communities, or to provide specific services, did not specify how these initiatives would be implemented. After figuring out what needs to be done, active reconciliation is evident in implementation. Since the focus of this research is not on the implementation of the plans, part of the analysis was to find implementation strategies for the proposed initiatives towards Indigenous reconciliation. Edmonton was the only city with a detailed implementation plan for its initiatives. Edmonton’s implementation strategy included the funds committed to the initiative and the lead actors that would facilitate the initiative. Among the plans, there was generally an absence of a connection or explanation for how to get from conceptual, to actual changes, proposed in the plans. Winnipeg, Saskatoon, Hamilton and Halifax all have commitments to develop better relationships through partnerships and various protocols, but the who, and how, of these commitments is vague in all plans. Edmonton, however, not only commits to provide services specific to Indigenous peoples, but the plan outlines the lead on the initiative, the timeline and the funds assigned to it.

**Omitted history.** There was generally no connection made in the plans between planning policy and historical, and ongoing, injustices towards Indigenous peoples. Apart from references to Indigenous peoples as the first inhabitants and managers of the land, there was no connection made between planning and issues facing urban Indigenous peoples. Winnipeg mentioned the increase in their urban Indigenous population but did not explain what that means for urban

planning. There was generally no recognition among the plans of the role that municipalities have played in displacing Indigenous peoples and the impact of municipal colonialism (Stanger-Ross, 2008) on urban Indigenous peoples. UNDRIP and TRC have stated that a lack of understanding of the role of all people, Indigenous and non-Indigenous, as Treaty peoples comes from a lack of understanding of the history of Canada. Achieving reconciliation takes sustained political will at all levels of government and concerted material resources including communicating the history of Canada's First Nations people (TRC, 2015).

## **7.2 Lessons and Recommendations for *OurWinnipeg***

In 2017, the City of Winnipeg began a 2-year review process for *OurWinnipeg* involving three phases of public engagement; understanding what is essential and imagining the future; confirming the vision and exploring possibilities, and finalizing the plan which will include updating *OurWinnipeg* based on the feedback received. A Community Advisory Committee has been formed to provide input into community-based issues including exploring gaps or opportunities in policies and building relationships with specific sectors typically underrepresented (Speak Up Winnipeg, 2017). This research is timely in that it can provide recommendations to the City for policy development that considers reconciliation. Winnipeg could, therefore, be an example to the rest of the country showing how to positively coexist, and address reconciliation productively. To my knowledge, this is the first study to look at how long-range municipal plans are addressing and can be revised to address Indigenous reconciliation.

Winnipeg is one of the few cities that, as part of its plan, had a section explaining the population growth in the city and explicitly recognizing the increase in urban Indigenous peoples

in the city. The plan also has a section with two “directions” that are specific to Indigenous Winnipeggers:

Direction 5: Acknowledge that Aboriginal Winnipeggers bring a diverse richness of cultures, traditions, languages, teachings, values, skills and perspectives to our city.

Direction 6: Foster opportunities for Aboriginal Winnipeggers, particularly youth, to obtain meaningful employment by building on current civic practices, processes and community partnerships (City of Winnipeg, 2010, 76-77).

These directions have enabling strategies that focus on the details that actualize the directions. Such strategies are “collaborate with Aboriginal communities to enhance practices and policies to respect cultural differences” and “work collaboratively with partners to provide training and professional development opportunities to Aboriginal youth” (City of Winnipeg, 2010, 76). The recommendations provided come from the findings of the plans analyzed that addressed reconciliation differently from Winnipeg.

**The first recommendation** is to recognize Indigenous peoples, not as another community group needing services, but specifically as self-determining peoples requiring necessary support to provide resources for community members. This approach offers the capacity building tools essential for Indigenous community leaders to resource the services they know their communities need, rather than the municipality deciding what services are required by the Indigenous communities. Being aware of the nuances present in policy language used like engage, collaborate and consult, is essential to ensuring that the control over rights to service and resources, lies within the Indigenous community. An example of how to do this can be found in Edmonton's plan to "implement the Edmonton Urban Aboriginal Strategy in collaboration with urban Aboriginals. The purpose of this is to increase the capacity of urban Aboriginals in identifying their priorities and taking action for improving and enhancing their quality of life in

the city" (City of Edmonton, 2010, 59). Not only is this statement inline with UNDRIP's declaration for cities to provide assistance programmes to Indigenous peoples for preserving their way of life, but the plan also provides an implementation strategy. The implementation strategy states that the initiative will be implemented in three years by "Community Services" with "\$80K" funding (City of Edmonton, 2010, 59).

**The second recommendation** is to recognize the increase in urban Indigenous peoples as a planning issue, and intentionally develop necessary strategies in collaboration with Indigenous communities to address the distinct needs of Indigenous peoples, and create an environment for positive coexistence. Indigenous reconciliation is an issue that affects all municipal departments that have anything to do with the land. Recognizing this through the thoughtful telling of the history of Indigenous peoples, will provide a more complete story of how Indigenous peoples have not only been dispossessed of their lands, but also "of the political, cultural and socio-economic responsibility to govern those lands according to customary law" (Barry & Porter, 2016, 1). While no plan reviewed in this research did this, some examples of plans that fulfilled part of this recommendation are Edmonton and Winnipeg. Under a section on Aboriginal Economic Development Zones, Winnipeg outlines a brief history of treaties and Canada's responsibility in owing land to First Nations. Though this is specific to Aboriginal Economic Development Zones, it could also be expanded upon in the introduction of the plan to remind readers that development of land is an Indigenous reconciliation issue. Edmonton's Urban Aboriginal Strategy does not have much on the history of Indigenous peoples in Edmonton, but compared to other plans, has by far the most detailed focus on program and service availability for urban Indigenous peoples.

**The third recommendation** is to not only have a strategy designed explicitly for Urban Indigenous peoples, such as the Edmonton Urban Aboriginal Strategy but also have a tracking system that formalizes initiatives and suggests the implementation of proposed initiatives. Edmonton's Urban Aboriginal Strategy includes information about urban partnerships and lists barriers and gaps in service delivery to Indigenous peoples. The strategy also has a desired future state that proposes some implementation methods that would bridge the listed gaps. Even if Edmonton is ahead of other cities in recognizing the increase in urban Indigenous peoples as a planning issue, this strategy is mostly service-based and does not include a history of Indigenous peoples in Edmonton or planning issues such as land use and zoning. The revision of *OurWinnipeg* could include an emphasis on planning in partnership with Indigenous communities, and consideration for how to preserve Indigenous teachings that affect land development, such as the seven generations model, in modern-day urban planning.

These recommendations can be implemented by revising *OurWinnipeg* to better reflect Indigenous partners as authority figures; being careful with language used that implies authority where it is not due; and, include reference to the City's intentions for the growing urban Indigenous population. Aside from policy revisions, the City could collaborate with First Nation partners to incorporate First Nations planning models to the city's planning efforts. The complication that arises with implementation of any recommendations at the local government level is that the authority over the all city planning initiatives is the Planning Act, which is developed by the Province. As outlined by Walker (2008), the relationship between First Nations and local government is complicated because of the indirect government structure between the two. This is not something that was addressed in this research, but is worth mentioning since it affects the implementation of the provided recommendations.

## **8.0 Conclusion and Suggestions for Future Research**

The initial inspiration for this research was a document released by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities called *Pathways to Reconciliation*. This document was the response of Canada's 22 big cities to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission Calls to Action. The document indicated the municipalities' commitments to honoring the "Commission's efforts and ensuring that rights and aspirations of Indigenous people are acknowledged in policies and practice" (FCM, 2016, 1). This research situates this commitment in an urban planning context and looks at what these city plans say about Indigenous peoples, and compares that with the TRC Calls to Action that included Principles of Reconciliation. The Official Community Plans were used because they are, generally, looked at as the main planning policies that guide city growth and development. The purpose of this comparison is to gather strategies for how cities are currently dealing with reconciliation in urban planning policy, and provide recommendations for how rights and aspirations of Indigenous people can be better acknowledged and addressed in policies. Just like the Pathways to Reconciliation document is a "tool meant to help share, sustain and grow our efforts" (FCM, 2016, 1), this research is an addition to such tools that document how Canada's reconciliation journey is going, and how it can be improved. The FCM makes specific mention of the efforts of municipalities towards growing urban Indigenous populations:

Across the country, mayors and councils are working with Indigenous leaders and organizations to create better cities by acknowledging and addressing the experience and needs of the growing urban Indigenous population (FCM, 2016, 4).

The analysis of the long-range plans gives a window into how mayors and councils are working to create better cities for the growing urban Indigenous population, and confirms the challenge faced by planning in addressing Indigenous reconciliation.

As mentioned in the literature review and shown in the long-range plan analysis, reconciliation and recognition discourse have influenced the framing of Indigenous policy despite the contradictions that exist in the meanings of these and other terms such as inclusion. Such inconsistencies were confirmed in the long-range plan analysis that showed how some plans recognized Indigenous culture or history, but still had the city as the dominant authority figure and decision maker on these issues. Coulthard's (2009) "master/slave" (26) argument, regarding the recognizer and the recognized, was evident in most of the plans that positioned Indigenous peoples as passive recipients of recognition instead of fellow mutually respected governments. Most plans had Indigenous peoples referenced in culture and heritage sections, and three of the big city plans analyzed had no references to Indigenous peoples. One of the main issues recognized in this research is that issues facing Indigenous peoples are generally not considered as urban planning issues, which further complicates then how to address these issues in urban planning policy.

Hibbard et al. (2008) confirm this finding in his suggestion that the political and spatial characteristics of the recognition of Indigenous rights and title, place-specific responsibility on planning systems that are often not recognized in the field. Often the cities expressed intentions towards *planning for* Indigenous communities, instead of planning *in partnership* with Indigenous communities. This type of planning goes against the principles of reconciliation that declare that Indigenous peoples are self-determined peoples and self-governed, and therefore do not depend on their "colonizers" for their freedom and authority, including, for example, authority over site preservation (Coulthard, 2014). This approach also fails to recognize Indigenous governance aspirations and structures because the text appoints "Indigenous peoples

to predefined positions and create authority structures that are grounded in Western legal and political conventions” (Barry and Porter 2011, 182).

This research has aimed to explore how the long-range strategic plans of Canada's 22 Big Cities align (or not) with the TRC's Principles of Reconciliation. Specifically, the research examined 18 of the 22 Official Community Plans of Canada's big cities for how they were addressing Indigenous reconciliation. The study has sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the principles of reconciliation? How can they be applied to urban policy?
2. How is Indigenous reconciliation being addressed in the official municipal planning documents of Canada’s 22 Big Cities?
  - a. What is privileged and what is omitted?
  - b. What strategies are being used to address Indigenous reconciliation?
  - c. How are the documents reflective of principles of reconciliation?
3. What lessons can be learned for the review of *OurWinnipeg*?

To help guide the analysis of the 18 plans, the study used interpretive policy analysis to sort through the documents and determine a methodology for analysis. Since the documents were being analyzed for content regarding Indigenous reconciliation, the process had to include a framework for analysis. This research used the TRC Principles of Reconciliation as a framework for analysis. The long-range planning documents were analyzed, first, to determine the context in which Indigenous peoples were referenced. Once this context was established and organized into themes, these themes were searched for in the TRC documents to determine if, and how, the plans were reflecting what was in the TRC documents. This chapter explains in some detail the

answers to the research questions and how each question was answered. The section concludes by offering some suggestions for future research.

Question One asks, what are the principles of reconciliation and how can they be applied to urban policy? This question was answered by a detailed literature review that provided a journey of information, starting with definitions of reconciliation and the principles of reconciliation, then exploring how reconciliation applies to the urban environment and specifically urban planning, ending with what reconciliation and urban planning policy have to do with each other. This allows the reader to track and understand how Indigenous reconciliation is an issue to be considered in the urban environment. The principles of reconciliation are summarized in the literature and expanded on in Chapter 6. The answer to, how they can be applied to urban policy is evident in the attempts made by the long-range plans to address issues pertaining to reconciliation. Reconciliation can be applied to urban policy by recognizing the rights of Indigenous peoples, as outlined by TRC and UNDRIP, throughout the long-range planning documents. As shown in the document analyses, this can take many forms such as recognition of history and culture. As well, it can take the form of recognition of the effects that planning has had on Indigenous peoples to emphasize the responsibility of the field in improving the quality of life of Indigenous peoples. Since reconciliation, as defined by the TRC, is based on mutually respectful relationships, urban policy must also reflect commitments to improve relations with Indigenous communities.

Question Two asks, how is Indigenous reconciliation being addressed in the official municipal planning documents of Canada's Big Cities? What is privileged and what is omitted? What strategies are being used to address Indigenous reconciliation and how are the documents reflective of the TRC Principles of Reconciliation? This question was answered by the analysis

of the long-range plans to determine if, and how, Indigenous peoples were referenced, and thereby determine how Indigenous reconciliation, which begins with the recognition of Indigenous peoples, was addressed in the plans. Indigenous reconciliation was mainly addressed through the lens of relationship, culture, history, public service provision, site preservation, treaty negotiation, geographic location and recognition of distinct needs and talents. The analysis also answered the two parts of the question by showing what was privileged in the plans through the document analysis of the long-range plans and indicating what was omitted by the document analysis of the TRC Principles of Reconciliation and UNDRIP, to show themes not present in the plans. Most plans recognized Indigenous peoples through culture and site preservation. The significant omissions include implementation plans for the proposed initiatives and an account of the history of Indigenous peoples including the injustices they suffered due to poor planning. The last part of the question was answered by the analysis of the long-range plans that showed how Indigenous peoples were referenced in the plans, be it through a culture or site preservation lens. These “lens” is what is referred to as a strategy in the last part of Question Two. The long-range planning documents generally either contradicted the TRC and UNDRIP, or did not address issues brought up by the TRC and UNDRIP, such as planning’s history of injustice and responsibility towards urban Indigenous peoples.

Question Three asks, what lessons can be learned for the review of *OurWinnipeg?* This was answered in the previous section providing three recommendations specifically for the City of Winnipeg’s review process. The first is to recognize Indigenous peoples as self-determining peoples and not as just another culture that is part of a multicultural category. The second is to recognize the increase in urban Indigenous peoples and the circumstances they face as urban planning issues and to develop necessary strategies in collaboration with Indigenous

communities to address their distinct needs and create an environment for positive coexistence. The third is to have formalized initiatives and implementation strategies to ensure the proposed initiatives are implemented and are in collaboration with Indigenous communities.

### **8.1 Suggestions for Future Research**

This research has contributed to the information available on how municipalities can address Indigenous reconciliation and furthermore, provided examples of how this has been done around the country. The recommendations previously provided are specific to the *OurWinnipeg* review process, but can be further explored in other cities that have similar planning policy contexts as Winnipeg.

The research can be complemented in many ways. One is to include an analysis of whether Indigenous peoples were included and consulted in the creation of the plan. Another is to examine how the commitments towards Indigenous peoples, such as site preservation and implementation of protocols, are implemented. The engagement process that leads up to a plan usually goes on for several months and sometimes longer than a year. These processes are often structured to have different phases, different methods of engagement and various partnerships and committees formed to ensure transparency and equity. Such a process is what led to the creation of the plans analyzed. A possible option for future research is to look into such engagement processes and determine to what extent the necessary partners are efficiently consulted in the process. The UNDRIP calls for cities to “consult in good faith with Indigenous peoples” over development that affects them (UN General Assembly, 2008, 12). This certainly includes consultation over long-term development plans.

Another future research opportunity is to connect the statements in policy to what is implemented in practice. Barry and Porter suggest that "a fuller understanding of this textual mediation of behavior cannot arise out of the study of texts alone, but rather through the study of how these texts are interpreted and applied" (Barry & Porter, 2011, 183). An implementation model such as the table of initiatives outlined in Edmonton's plan would greatly benefit the progress of reconciliation efforts by tracking whether proposed initiatives are implemented and if they are useful. Monitoring how policy is put into action can provide the necessary foundation for determining whether the policy is valid or not.

The plans analyzed show that there is much to learn on this journey of reconciliation, and fortunately, there are parties on both sides showing interest in improving the quality of life of urban Indigenous peoples, and improving the various forms of relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous parties. It is essential for planners to recognize that since cities and their urban wealth and privilege are built on the dispossession of Indigenous peoples, it follows that cities have a responsibility to address the effects of this dispossession. I hope this research contributes to the literature available on how cities can develop policies that work towards positive reconciliation with Indigenous communities and positive coexistence in the urban environment.

## References

---

- Aboriginal Healing Foundation (AHF). (2009). *Response, Responsibility, and Renewal: Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Journey*. Retrieved from <http://www.ahf.ca/downloads/trc2.pdf>
- Alcantara, C., & Nelles, J. (2016). *A Quiet Evolution: The Emergence of Indigenous-Local Intergovernmental Partnerships in Canada*. Toronto, Ontario.
- Andersen, C., & Strachan, J. (2011). Urban Aboriginal Programming in a Coordination Vacuum: The Alberta (dis)Advantage. In E.J. Peters (Ed.), *Urban Aboriginal Policy Making in Canadian Municipalities* (pp. 127–159). Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Anderson, R. B., Schneider, B., & Kayseas, B. (2008). *Indigenous Peoples' Land And Resource Rights*. Vancouver. Retrieved from [http://fngovernance.org/ncfng\\_research/robert\\_anderson.pdf](http://fngovernance.org/ncfng_research/robert_anderson.pdf)
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). *A Ladder of Citizen Participation*. JAIP 35(4), 216-224.
- Assembly of First Nations (AFN). (2005). *Our Nations, Our Governments: Choosing Our Own Paths*. Ottawa.
- Berg, B. (2007). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (6th ed.). Boston; Montreal: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- Borrows, J. (1997). Living Between Water and Rocks: First Nations, Environmental Planning and Democracy. *University of Toronto Law Journal*, 47(4), 417-468. <https://doi.org/10.2307/825948>
- City of Calgary. (2015). Calgary Urban Aboriginal Initiative (CUAI). Retrieved January 14, 2018, from [http://www.calgary.ca/CSPS/CNS/Pages/First-Nations-Metis-and-Inuit-Peoples/Calgary-Urban-Aboriginal-Initiative-\(CUAI\).aspx](http://www.calgary.ca/CSPS/CNS/Pages/First-Nations-Metis-and-Inuit-Peoples/Calgary-Urban-Aboriginal-Initiative-(CUAI).aspx)
- City of Calgary. (2017). *The City of Calgary Municipal Development Plan Amendment Bylaw Date Description*. Calgary. Retrieved from <http://www.calgary.ca/PDA/pd/Pages/Municipal-Development-Plan/Municipal-Development-Plan-MDP.aspx>
- City of Edmonton. (2012). *The Way We Live: Edmonton's People Plan - Implementation Plan*. Edmonton. Retrieved from [https://www.edmonton.ca/city\\_government/city\\_vision\\_and\\_strategic\\_plan/the-way-we-live.aspx](https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/city_vision_and_strategic_plan/the-way-we-live.aspx)

- City of Edmonton. (2010a). *The Way We Live: Edmonton's People Plan*. Edmonton. Retrieved from [https://www.edmonton.ca/city\\_government/city\\_vision\\_and\\_strategic\\_plan/the-way-we-live.aspx](https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/city_vision_and_strategic_plan/the-way-we-live.aspx)
- City of Edmonton. (2010b). *The Way We Grow: Municipal Development Plan*. Edmonton. Retrieved from [https://www.edmonton.ca/city\\_government/city\\_vision\\_and\\_strategic\\_plan/the-way-we-live.aspx](https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/city_vision_and_strategic_plan/the-way-we-live.aspx)
- City of Edmonton. (2015). *Edmonton Community Plan: Urban Aboriginal Strategy*. Edmonton. Retrieved from [http://www.cnfc.ca/uploadedFiles/documents/downloads/Edmonton-UAS-Plan\\_March-2015.pdf](http://www.cnfc.ca/uploadedFiles/documents/downloads/Edmonton-UAS-Plan_March-2015.pdf)
- City of Halifax. (2017). *Centre Plan 2017*. Halifax. Retrieved from <https://www.halifax.ca/about-halifax/regional-community-planning/community-plan-areas>
- City of Hamilton. (2013). *Urban Hamilton Official Plan*. Retrieved from <https://www.hamilton.ca/city-planning/official-plan-zoning-by-law>
- City of London. (2006). *City of London Official Plan*. Retrieved from <https://www.london.ca/business/Planning-Development/Official-Plan/Pages/OfficialPlanDocument.aspx>
- City of Mississauga. (2015). *Mississauga Official Plan*. Mississauga. Retrieved from <http://www.mississauga.ca/portal/residents/mississaugaofficialplan>
- City of Montreal. (2004). *Montreal Master Plan*. Retrieved from [http://ville.montreal.qc.ca/portal/page?\\_pageid=5977,126205639&\\_dad=portal&\\_schema=PORTAL](http://ville.montreal.qc.ca/portal/page?_pageid=5977,126205639&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL)
- City of Ottawa. (2003). *City of Ottawa Official Plan: Section 5 - Implementation*. Ottawa. Retrieved from <https://ottawa.ca/en/city-hall/planning-and-development/official-plan-and-master-plans/official-plan>
- City of Regina. (2013). *Design Regina: Official Community Plan*. Regina. Retrieved from <http://www.designregina.ca/official-community-plan-3/>
- City of Saskatoon. (2017). *Official Community Plan ByLaw NO. 8769*. Saskatoon. Retrieved from <https://www.saskatoon.ca/business-development/planning/community-plans-strategies/official-community-plan>
- City of Surrey. (2013). *Plan Surrey 2013 Official Community Plan*. Retrieved from [https://www.google.ca/search?q=city+of+surrey+official+community+plan&rlz=1C5CHFA\\_enCA707CA707&oq=city+of+surrey+offi&aqs=chrome.2.0j69i57j0l4.5147j0j4&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8](https://www.google.ca/search?q=city+of+surrey+official+community+plan&rlz=1C5CHFA_enCA707CA707&oq=city+of+surrey+offi&aqs=chrome.2.0j69i57j0l4.5147j0j4&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8)

- City of Toronto. (2015). *Toronto Official Plan*. Toronto. Retrieved from <https://www.toronto.ca/city-government/planning-development/official-plan-guidelines/>
- City of Vancouver. (2014). *City of Vancouver: Official Development Plan By-laws*. Vancouver. Retrieved from <http://vancouver.ca/your-government/official-development-plan-bylaws.aspx>
- City of Windsor. (2000). *Official Plan*. Retrieved from <https://www.citywindsor.ca/residents/planning/Plans-and-Community-Information/Windsor---Official-Plan/Pages/Windsor-Official-Plan.aspx>
- City of Winnipeg. (2016). An Overview of Best Practices for the Establishment of and Development within Aboriginal Economic Development Zones. Retrieved November 23, 2017, from <http://clkapps.winnipeg.ca/DMIS/ViewPdf.asp?SectionId=438566>
- City of Winnipeg. (2011). *OurWinnipeg*. Winnipeg. Retrieved from <http://www.winnipeg.ca/interhom/CityHall/OurWinnipeg/pdf/OurWinnipeg.pdf>
- City of Winnipeg. (2017). SpeakUpWinnipeg. Retrieved July 23, 2017, from <https://speakupwinnipeg.ca/process/>
- Coulthard, G. S. (2009). Subjects of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and the “Politics of Recognition” in Canada. *Contemporary Political Theory*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.cpt.9300307>
- Coulthard, G. S., & Alfred, T. (2014). *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. <https://doi.org/10.5749/j.ctt9qh3cv>
- Craft, A. (2013). Breathing life into the Stone Fort Treaty: An Anishinabe understanding of Treaty One. Saskatoon: Purich Publishing Ltd.
- Craft, A. (2014). Living Treaties, Breathing Research. *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law*, 26(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cjwl.26.1.1>
- da Silva, J. (2010). Hashinoqwah. In L. Simpson & L. Kiera (Eds.), *This is an Honour Song: Twenty Years since the blockades, an anthology of writing on the “Oka crisis”*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Pub.
- Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM). (2016). *Pathways to Reconciliation: Cities respond to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission Calls to Action*. Retrieved from [https://fcm.ca/Documents/tools/BCMC/Pathways\\_to\\_reconciliation\\_EN.pdf](https://fcm.ca/Documents/tools/BCMC/Pathways_to_reconciliation_EN.pdf)
- Friedmann, J. (1971). The Future of Comprehensive Urban Planning: A Critique. *Public Administration Review*, 31(3), 315–326.

- Friedmann, J. (2002). *The prospect of cities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Given, L. M. (2008). Qualitative Research (Journal). In *The Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*, 1043. The MIT Press  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412963909>
- Hibbard, M., Lane, M. B., & Rasmussen, K. (2008). The Split Personality of Planning: Indigenous Peoples and Planning for Land and Resource Management. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 23(2), 136–151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0885412208322922>
- Hodge, G. (2003). *Planning Canadian Communities: An Introduction to the principles, practice and participants* (4th ed.). Toronto: Nelson Thomson Learning.
- Howitt, R., & Lunkapis, G. J. (2010). Coexistence: Planning and the Challenge of Indigenous Rights. *The Ashgate Research Companion to Planning Theory: Conceptual Challenges for Spatial Planning*, (3), 109–133.
- Hyslop, J., & Bone, H. (2015). *Dtantu balai betl nahidei: Our relations to the newcomers* (Volume 3). Winnipeg: Joe Hyslop, Harry Bone, and the Treaty & Dakota Elders of Manitoba.
- Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. (2017). Urban Reserves. Retrieved from <https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100016331/1100100016332>
- Innes, J. (1987). Myths and the Definition of Policy Problems: An Exploration of Homeownership and public-private partnerships. *Policy Sciences*. 20.
- Jackson, S. U. E. (1997). A disturbing story. *Australian Planner*. 34:4, 221-226.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07293682.1997.9657792>
- Jacobs, J. M. (1996). Urban Dreamings: The Aboriginal Sacred in the City. *The Edge of Empire: Postcolonialism and the City*. London: Routledge.
- Jojola, T. (2013). *Indigenous planning: Towards a seven generations model*. In *Reclaiming Indigenous Planning*. (pp. 457-473). Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Kingston, R. (2010). Participatory planning. In B. Warf (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of geography* (pp. 2127-2129). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Inclusion. (2010). In *Oxford English Dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/inclusion>
- Lang, C., Price, J. A., Pedersen, A.-M., & Trovato, F. (2011). Economic Conditions of Indigenous Peoples in Canada. In *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/aboriginal-people-economic-conditions/>

- Library and Archives Canada. (2016). Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. Retrieved from <https://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/discover/aboriginal-heritage/royal-commission-aboriginal-peoples/Pages/introduction.aspx>
- Lister, R. (2007). From object to subject: Including marginalised citizens in policy making. *Policy and Politics*, 35(3), 437–455. <https://doi.org/10.1332/030557307781571579>
- Lombe, M., & Sherraden, M. (2008). Inclusion in the Policy Process: An Agenda for Participation of the Marginalized. *Journal of Policy Practice*, 7(2–3), 199–213. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/15588740801938043>
- Maaka, R., & Fleras, A. (2005). *The politics of indigeneity: Challenging the state in Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand*. Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.
- Maddison, S., Clark, T., & De Costa, R. (2016). *The Limits of Settler Colonial Reconciliation Non-Indigenous People and the Responsibility to Engage*. SpringerLink.
- Marshall, T. (2013). Oka Crisis. In *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/oka-crisis/>
- Matunga, H. (2013). Theorizing Indigenous planning. In *Reclaiming Indigenous Planning*. (pp. 3–32). Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Maxwell, K. (2014). Historicizing historical trauma theory: Troubling the trans-generational transmission paradigm. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 51(3), 407–435. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1363461514531317>
- McLeod, F., Viswanathan, L., Macbeth, J., & Whitelaw, G. S. (2017). Getting to Common Ground: A Comparison of Ontario, Canada's Provincial Policy Statement and the Auckland Council Regional Policy Statement with Respect to Indigenous Peoples. *Urban Planning*, 2(1), 72–87.
- Miller, J. R. (2009). *Compact, contract, covenant: Aboriginal treaty-making in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Mountjoy, T. (1999). Municipal government perspectives on Aboriginal self-government. In J. H. Hylton & P. Fontaine (Ed.), *Aboriginal self-government in Canada: Current trends and issues* (2nd ed., pp. 310–328). Saskatoon: Purich Publishing Ltd.
- Parliament of Canada. (1999). *The Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*. Retrieved June 24, 2017, from <http://www.lap.parl.gc.ca/content/lap/researchpublications/prb9924-e.htm>
- Perry, R. (1996). *From Time Immemorial: Indigenous Peoples and State Systems*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Peters, E. J. (2002). "Our city Indians": Negotiating the meaning of First Nations urbanization in Canada, 1945-1975. *Historical Geography*, 30, 75-92.
- Peters, E. (2005). Indigeneity and marginalisation: Planning for and with urban Aboriginal communities in Canada. *Progress in Planning*, 63(4), 327-404.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.progress.2005.03.008>
- Porter, L., & Barry, J. (2016). *Planning for coexistence?: Recognizing Indigenous rights through land-use planning in Canada and Australia*. London: Routledge.
- Porter, L., & Barry, J. (2015). Bounded recognition: urban planning and the textual mediation of Indigenous rights in Canada and Australia. *Critical Policy Studies*, 9(1), 22-40.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2014.912960>
- Porter, L. (2013). Coexistence in cities: The challenge of Indigenous urban planning in the twenty-first century. In R. Walker, T. Jojola, & D. Natcher (Eds.), *Reclaiming Indigenous Planning* (pp. 283-310). Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Porter, L. (2006). Planning in (post) colonial settings: Challenges for theory and practice. *Planning Theory and Practice*, 7(4), 383-396. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649350600984709>
- Recognition. (2010). In *Oxford English Dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/recognition>
- Reconciliation. (2010). In *Oxford English Dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/reconciliation>
- Residential School Settlement. (1998). Schedule N. Settlement Agreement. Retrieved July 10, 2017, from <http://www.residentialschoolsettlement.ca/settlement.html>
- Richards, L. (1999). *Using NVIVO in Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Ryks, J., Howden-Chapman, P., Robson, B., Stuart, K., & Waa, A. (2014). Maori participation in urban development: challenges and opportunities for indigenous people in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Lincoln Planning Review*, 6(1-2), 4-17.
- Sandercock, L. (1998). *Making the Invisible Visible: A Multicultural Planning History*. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 6(1), 97-98.
- Short, D. (2003). Reconciliation, Assimilation, and the Indigenous Peoples of Australia. *International Political Science Review*, 24(4), 491-513.
- Simon-Kumar, R., & Kingfisher, C. (2011). Beyond transformation and regulation: Productive tensions and the analytics of inclusion. *Politics & Policy*, 39(2), 271-294.

- Stanger-Ross, J. (2008). Municipal Colonialism in Vancouver: City Planning and the Conflict over Indian Reserves, 1928–1950s. *Canadian Historical Review*, 89(4), 541–580. <https://doi.org/10.3138/chr.89.4.541>
- Truth and Reconciliation Canada (TRC). (2015). *What we have learned. Principles of Truth and Reconciliation*. Winnipeg. Retrieved from [http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/File/2015/Findings/Principles\\_2015\\_05\\_31\\_web\\_o.pdf](http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/File/2015/Findings/Principles_2015_05_31_web_o.pdf)
- Tully, J. (1996). *Strange multiplicity*. *The Good Society*, 6(2), 28-31
- Tully, J. (2004). ‘Recognition and Dialogue: The Emergence of a New Field’. *Critical Review of International, Social and Political Philosophy* 7 (3): 84-106.
- UN General Assembly. (2008). United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. *United Nations General Assembly*. Retrieved from [http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS\\_en.pdf](http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf)
- United Nations. (2007). UNDESA Division For Inclusive Social Development Indigenous Peoples. UNDRIP: Historical Overview. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/declaration-on-the-rights-of-indigenous-peoples/historical-overview.html>
- Walker, R. C. (2008). Improving the Interface between Urban Municipalities and Aboriginal Communities. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 17(1), 20–36.
- Walker, R., & Belanger, Y. (2013). Aboriginality and Planning in Canada’s large prairie cities. In *Reclaiming Indigenous Planning* (pp. 193–216). Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press.
- Walker, R. (2013). *Reclaiming Indigenous Planning*. (T. Jojola & D. Natcher, Eds.). Montreal: Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press.
- Walker, R., & Barcham, M. (2010). Indigenous-inclusive citizenship: The city and social housing in Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. *Environment and Planning A*, 42(2), 314–331. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a41314>
- Wallace, M. (2000). Where Planning Meets Multiculturalism: A View of Planning Practice in the Greater Toronto Area. *Plan Canada* 40(4): 19-20.
- Woodford, Z. (2015). “Respect and recognition:” Halifax adopts statement of reconciliation with indigenous peoples. Retrieved February 2, 2018, from <http://www.metronews.ca/news/halifax/2015/12/08/halifax-adopts-reconciliation-statement-indigenous-peoples.html>

Yanow, D. (2000). *Conducting Interpretive Policy Analysis (Qualitative Research Methods)*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications. (Vol. 47). <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412983747>

Yanow, D. (1996). *How Does a Policy Mean? Interpreting Policy and Organizational Actions*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

## Appendices

---

### Appendix A: Initial OCP Analysis

City	Name of Plan	Date of Document	Last Amendment	Reference to Indigenous peoples?	Comments
Brampton	Our Brampton Our Future 2006 Official Plan	2006	2015	No	
Calgary	Municipal Development Plan	2009	2017	Yes	
Edmonton	The Way We Grow Municipal Development Plan	2010		Yes	
Gatineau					Translation not received
Halifax	Centre Plan 2017	2017		Yes	
Hamilton	Urban Hamilton Office Plan	2013	2015	Yes	
Kitchener	A Complete and Healthy Kitchener City of Kitchener Official Plan	2014	2015	No	
Laval					Translation not received
London	City of London Official Plan	1989	2006	Yes	
Longueuil					Translation not received
Mississauga	Mississauga Official Plan	2009	2015	Yes	
Montreal	Montreal Master Plan	2004		Yes	
Ottawa	City of Ottawa Official Plan	2003		Yes	
Quebec					Translation not received
Regina	Design Regina Official Community Plan	2013	2016	Yes	
Saskatoon	City of Saskatoon Official Community Plan	2009	2017	Yes	
St. John's	St. John's Municipal Plan	2003	2016	No	
Surrey	Plan Surrey 2013 Official Community Plan	2013	2017	Yes	
Toronto	Toronto Official Plan	2002	2015	Yes	
Vancouver	Vancouver Official Development Plan Bylaws	*various documents	2015	Yes	

Windsor	Official Plan	2000	2006	Yes	
Winnipeg	OurWinnipeg Municipal Development Plan	2011	2017	Yes	

*Appendix B: Table summary of findings- List of Nodes and Cities*

<b>Node</b>	<b>Node Description</b>	<b>City</b>
<b>Culture</b>	Specific mention of Indigenous culture or cultural groups, associations with multicultural initiatives including cultural heritage	Calgary, Edmonton, Halifax, Mississauga, Ottawa, Surrey, Toronto, Vancouver
Art and Urban Design	Mentions of public art and urban design as Indigenous culture	Ottawa, Vancouver
<b>Distinct talents and interests</b>	Reference to Indigenous peoples as particular groups having specific needs, Mentioned in a list of other urban groups	Edmonton, Regina, Windsor
Separate population	Mention specifically of indigenous population	Edmonton, Winnipeg
Marginalized group	Listing indigenous groups among marginalized groups	Vancouver
Separate plan	Mention of a separate plan that is solely Indigenous focused	Edmonton, Winnipeg, Surrey
<b>Geographic location</b>	Mention of geographic location of a First Nation usually on a map	Calgary, Edmonton, Halifax, London, Ottawa, Regina, Saskatoon, Surrey, Toronto, Winnipeg
<b>History</b>	History of First nation presence in and around the city	Halifax, Hamilton, London, Mississauga, Montreal, Ottawa, Surrey, Toronto, Vancouver, Winnipeg
<b>Public Service</b>	Mention of various public services specifically for Indigenous peoples	Edmonton, Saskatoon, Surrey, Windsor, Winnipeg
<b>Relationship</b>	Reference to some form of general relationship based or relationship building initiative between Indigenous and non-Indigenous parties	Edmonton, Halifax

Collaboration	Mention of collaboration efforts and possible partnerships	Edmonton, Halifax, Ottawa, Regina, Toronto, Winnipeg
Consultation	Consultation with Indigenous peoples regarding land disturbance, development of protocols, and other issues affecting First Nations	Halifax, Hamilton, Mississauga, Ottawa, Toronto Windsor
Government	Specific government to government relationships mentioned	Winnipeg
Inclusion	Specific Indigenous inclusion initiatives	Halifax, Saskatoon, Winnipeg,
Notification	Notification of First Nations	Hamilton
<b>Site Preservation</b>	Protection of Indigenous sites of significance, sites with archaeological concerns and resources and heritage conservation	Halifax, Hamilton, Mississauga, Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto
<b>Treaty Negotiation</b>	Specific mention of ongoing Treaty and Land Claim negotiations	Ottawa, Winnipeg
Land	Specific First Nation land claim settlement agreement and establishment of First Nation Reserve Lands, and land acquisition.	Ottawa, Winnipeg