INTRODUCTION

Origins and Context
In January 1997, the First Nations Summit (FNS) and Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM) jointly organized a unique conference. Called a “Community to Community Forum”, the event marked the first time that local government and First Nation leaders from around the province gathered together for discussion of their issues and their common interests. The desire to begin this dialogue was born out of a recognition that local governments and First Nations governments have much in common. They face the many of the same challenges in providing services to their residents. As neighbouring communities, they live with the same regional economic and environmental realities. For too long, it was felt, many neighbouring First Nations and local governments had lived in isolation from one another, and most community leaders had come to recognize that this would not serve them well in a future that includes greater self determination for First Nations and growing economic development on First Nations lands.

The success of the 1997 province-wide Community to Community Forum was built on a spirit of goodwill and a lively exchange of concerns, ideas, and constructive viewpoints. There was a consensus amongst all the participants who attended that similar events at the regional level ought to be encouraged.

In 1999, a regional Community to Community Forum program was launched with funding from the provincial government, which continues today under federal funding. The program, administered by UBCM, provides financial support to local governments and their neighbouring First Nations who wish to organize a Community to Community Forum event to deal with local issues. With over thirty events sponsored around the province to date, the program continues to bring local government and First Nation community leaders together to focus on increasing understanding and long-term government to government relationships.

A Second Province-Wide Forum
On March 6, 2001, the UBCM and the FNS hosted the second province-wide Community to Community Joint Forum in Vancouver. This second Community to Community Joint Forum built on the success of the conference in 1997. It also provided an opportunity to share the experience gained from the many regional Community to Community Forums that have been held across the province between individual local governments and First Nations.

The overall goal of this Community to Community Forum was to create an opportunity for dialogue between local government and First Nations leaders in British Columbia, through which stronger relations between the governments can be fostered. Over 150 delegates attended the meeting, with representatives from First Nations and local governments around the province, including those involved in treaty negotiations and those not currently engaged in negotiations. Representatives from the federal and provincial governments also attended as well as a number of other interested groups, all of whom contributed to building understanding on the issues.
The key objectives of the forum were:

1. To provide a forum for open dialogue to share information, educate each other and discuss opportunities.

2. To forge new relationships, strengthen old relationships and build stronger links between First Nations and local governments.

3. To hear presentations on case studies that highlight examples of effective relationships and joint projects throughout BC.

4. To generate a toolkit of resources for First Nations and local governments wanting to work more effectively together.

Session Summary

The session began with an opening prayer by Robert Joseph from the Squamish Nation. This was followed by opening remarks by event co-chairs, UBCM President Jim Abram and FNS Task Group Member Kathryn Teneese. Both speakers emphasized the benefits of working better together, and the need to build mechanisms for linking local governments and First Nations governments now and for the future (introductory remarks are included in Appendix B).

Four case studies highlighting effective partnerships followed. Councillor Bill Matthews of the District of Campbell River and Robert Duncan from the Campbell River First Nation presented on a joint economic development project known as Discovery Harbour. Mayor Sylvia Pranger of the District of Kent, and Councillor Clem Seymour from the Seabird Island First Nation, reviewed their accomplishments jointly lobbying the provincial and federal governments regarding Fraser River management during their Community to Community Forum. Councillor Deanna Hamilton from the Westbank First Nation, and Director Robert Hobson, Central Okanagan Regional District Chair, presented on the Gallagher Canyon Agreement and promoting coordination in the Okanagan. Director Jim Ogilvie, Regional District of East Kootenay Chair together with administrator Lee-Ann Crane, joined Dean Martin and Matthew Ney of the Shuswap First Nation in presenting on economic development and service arrangements unique to their region. The final presentation was by George Watts, from the Tseshahat First Nation, and Mayor Gillian Trumper of Port Alberni, who spoke on the topic of their governments’ working relationship and recent arrangements for First Nation participation on the regional district board.

In his address, the Honourable Robert Nault, Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs, underscored the federal government’s support for First Nations-local government relationship-building and remarked that the Community to Community Forum was an innovative model for achieving this (see Appendix C for a transcript of the Minister’s remarks).

During the morning break-out session, members participated in discussions around establishing a vision and related objectives for First Nations-local government relations, concentrating on the topic areas of economic development, natural resource management, land use coordination and service delivery, and government to government linkages. Benefits to improving relations and obstacles to achieving the “vision objectives” were also identified.

The afternoon small group discussion session asked participants to identify the tools needed to achieve the vision objectives. Drawing from the case studies and their own experiences, participants described examples of how relationships could be strengthened in the topic areas listed above, and identified possible short- and long-term actions that could support their objectives. Possible roles for other governments and agencies were also discussed.
The day ended with a plenary session where discussion groups shared some of their best ideas in the form of recommendations, listed at the end of the report. Overall, improving communication was a fundamental theme, with emphasis on initiating opportunities for dialogue at both the political and staff levels. Other key recommendations focused on the importance of joint projects as an important way of better serving local communities efficiently and effectively.

The need for cooperation is essential to all communities, both now and in a post-treaty environment. By bringing together community leaders to discuss important issues of mutual concern, with the support of sponsors, the forum successfully achieved its objectives. The UBCM and FNS would like to thank participants and sponsors for contributing to this important opportunity for relationship building and dialogue between local governments and First Nations.

**Organization of the Report**

The report summarizes the opening remarks, case studies, small group discussions and the final plenary session. In the middle section, marked by the tabs, the report contains a “Toolkit” organized according to the four topic areas addressed at the conference:

- Economic Development
- Natural Resource Management
- Service Delivery and Land Use Coordination
- Government to Government Linkages

In this “Toolkit” section each topic area, divided by a tab, contains three separate parts:

**Case Studies**

Summaries of the case study presentations given through the day by local government and First Nations presenters.

**Ideas and Opportunities**

A consolidation of the input recorded by each group during the morning and afternoon small group discussion sessions.

The input has been categorized according to common themes, and highlights the vision objectives and related benefits and barriers as well as some short- and long-term actions and roles of other agencies that were identified.

**Participant Input**

Charts containing the information recorded during the morning and afternoon small group discussions recorded on worksheets completed at individual tables.
MEETING SUMMARY FLOW CHART

VISION: The “What and Why”
Morning Session
Improving the effectiveness of our relationships – what are the benefits and obstacles?

CASE STUDIES
Examples from BC of effective relationships and partnerships

IDENTIFYING THE TOOLS: the “How”
Afternoon Session
Identify tools we already use, and would use in the future to improve the effectiveness of our relationships

Plenary
Report back from PM Session and Identify Key Actions

Forum Report
Contains toolkit for establishing effective relationships and Key Actions
AGENDA

Morning

8:30 am  Coffee and registration
9:30 am  Welcome and Introduction
  • Robert Joseph (Opening Prayer)
  • Kathryn Teneese, Task Group, First Nations Summit
  • Director Jim Abram, President, UBCM
9:50 am  Small Group Discussion I – Creating a Vision
10:30 am  Case Study 1 Economic Development
  • Councillor Bill Matthews, District of Campbell River
  • Robert Duncan, Business Manager, Campbell River Band
10:55 am  Case Study 2 Natural Resource Management
  • Mayor Sylvia Pranger, District of Kent
  • Councillor Clem Seymour, Seabird Island Band
11:20 am  Break
11:40 am  The Honourable Robert Nault Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada
11:55 am  Case Study 3 Service Delivery and Land Use Coordination
  • Chair Robert Hobson, Regional District of Central Okanagan
  • Councillor Deanna Hamilton, Westbank First Nation
12:30 pm  Lunch

Afternoon

1:30 pm  Case Study 4 Service Delivery
  • Chair Jim Ogilvie, East Kootenay Regional District
  • Lee-Ann Crane, Administrator, East Kootenay Regional District
  • Dean Martin, CEO Kinbasket Development Corporation
  • Matthew Ney, Kinbasket Development Corporation
1:55 pm  Case Study 5 Government to Government Linkages
  • Mayor Gillian Trumper, City of Port Alberni
  • Chief George Watts, Tseshaht Band
2:20 pm  Introduction to Small Group Discussion
2:30 pm  Small Group Discussion II – Achieving the Vision
3:45 pm  Break
3:55 pm  Report back from small group discussion – Building a toolkit
  Plenary Discussion – Key recommendations for action
4:45 pm  Final Plenary and Closing Remarks
  • Robert Joseph (Closing Prayer)
  • Kathryn Teneese, Task Group, First Nations Summit
  • Director Jim Abram, President, UBCM
5:00 pm  Adjourn
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
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  - Joint Tourism Initiatives
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  - Vision Objectives
  - Benefits and Barriers

Participant Input from Afternoon Discussion Session:
  - Vision Objectives
  - Short- and Long-Term Actions
  - Actions by Other Governments and Agencies
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Case Study Summary

Campbell River’s Discovery Harbour Development

Presenters:
- Councillor Bill Matthews, District of Campbell River
- Robert Duncan, Business Manager, Campbell River Indian Band

Summary

Campbell River is located on the east coast of Vancouver Island, 150 kilometres north of Nanaimo. In the late 1980s, the Campbell River Indian Band and the District of Campbell River shared the view that major construction was needed to revitalize the Campbell River downtown area. The Band took the initial step to build a closer relationship with the local government as a means to achieve a specific goal – economic development, to meet their needs and those of the community at large. The local government and First Nation entered into a Master Agreement in 1989 which paved the way for the Campbell River Indian Band to reclaim land in the harbour area and undertake development on those lands. The master agreement provides for integrated servicing and application of all municipal standards to the development.

In 1991, construction of a new marina began. In 1995, the Band, interested in job creation and economic development, engaged in a joint venture with a developer to build what is now the major development on the land, the Discovery Harbour Shopping Centre. The District and the Band worked together on the shopping centre design and came to agreement on issues such as landscaping, bicycle and pedestrian access, (a Waterfront Boardwalk was created). In total, almost 400,000 square feet of retail space was created, and when it opened in 1998, Discovery Harbour was the largest shopping centre developed since Metrotown in Burnaby.

Other projects proposed for the Discovery Harbour area include a destination casino and combined waterfront hotel/convention centre and cruise ship terminal. The municipality and the Band are currently collaborating on a joint research project to investigate the feasibility of a cruise ship dock.
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Case Study Summary

Campbell River’s Discovery Harbour Development

Benefits Achieved
Through the cooperation of the Band and the District, Discovery Harbour was revitalized, a successful shopping mall was developed with four major chain stores to service the community and about 1,000 new jobs were created in the community.

In summary, benefits of the development include:

- Harbour area/downtown revitalization
- Increased services to area including new marina and shopping centre
- Attractive development
- Job creation
- Training for Band members
- Public access to waterfront for pedestrians and cyclists
- Cost sharing
- Dispelled some myths about development on reserve lands
- Band became a major economic player in the community
- Better relationship between local government and the First Nation

Hurdles and Challenges

- Servicing arrangements
- Design and access issues
- Accommodating commercial area
- Time commitment required
- Protection of environmentally sensitive area
- Public opposition to casino
- Slow provincial approval process

Lessons Learned

- With respect to business ventures that bring economic benefits, both lenders and future tenants require that harmony between government jurisdictions is established and that agreements are in place.
- By working together, First Nations and local governments can create greater employment and business opportunities that benefit the community at large.
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Ideas and Opportunities

JOINT TOURISM INITIATIVES

Vision Objectives: As one of the most important growing areas of the economy, tourism is a centre point for economic development throughout BC. Joint tourism initiatives rely on cooperation and joint visions, and offer a chance to combine what both Aboriginal and local government communities have to offer while limiting the expenditure of scarce resources in attracting visitors.

Benefits
Key benefits of working on joint projects for economic development relate to efficiency and effectiveness. Smaller and more remote communities – First Nations and non-First Nations – can maximize resources by partnering to co-market their tourism products, particularly when they are of an eco-tourism nature. By offering the public a broader product, tourism to isolated areas can increase with the same marketing expenditures. Tourism targeted at the international market can highlight the natural and cultural features unique to BC.

Barriers
Joint projects depend on collaboration and establishing trust and communication between parties. Relationship building takes time and commitment. Aboriginal involvement in the economy may be seen as new competition.

Special Aboriginal cultural needs must be respected, particularly where joint projects using the land are concerned. Funding for joint projects is difficult to access. Capacity building is still in process, and investment is difficult with the current Indian Act. Joint support of educational initiatives needed, and infrastructure for communications between partners needs to be developed.

Actions – Short-Term
⇒ Generate joint visions, priorities and objectives
⇒ Inventory existing attractions and jointly advertise
⇒ Identify possible future attractions and determine impact assessments that may be needed
⇒ Examine capacity and consider shared administration of tourism projects (e.g. Tourism commission)
⇒ Monitor environmental impacts to consider Aboriginal interests

Actions – Long-Term
⇒ Secure long-term funding
⇒ Develop long-term strategy, e.g. for eco-tourism
⇒ Link tourism to regional land use planning and strategically plan land use to maximize tourism opportunities
⇒ Support tourism training initiatives
⇒ Collaborate with other agencies, e.g. museums, etc.
⇒ Increase profile of First Nations via geographic name changes

External Support
⇒ Provide access to provincial and federal funding to support local government-First Nation economic development initiatives
⇒ Focus on supporting locally generated solutions
⇒ Provide incentives and opportunities for private-public partnerships (e.g. marketing)
**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Ideas and Opportunities**

**JOINT PLANNING**

**Vision Objectives:** Planning is key to any economic development strategy. It can result in a common vision and coordinated strategy for economic development in the community. Local governments and First Nations can pool resources and save time by jointly participating in economic development reviews and assessments that will help them develop strategies which balance benefits and impacts.

**Benefits**
By planning for economic development together, local governments and First Nations can share ideas and expertise, gain a better understanding of each others needs and develop consistent views. Joint economic assessments can lead to identification of potential areas of land development and prioritize areas that are mutually beneficial. Including a broad spectrum of interested parties in the planning process results in broad based economic strategies that involve the private sector. When economic development strategies are linked to regional resource plans and local land use plans, this leads to maximum effectiveness and a shared regional perspective and approach to issues.

**Barriers**
Joint planning for economic development requires that communication channels be established. Another challenge is to find adequate financial and human resources to undertake this work. The planning process takes time, as does the trust and insight it creates.

**Actions – Short-Term**
- Begin meetings and other dialogues together and with business community
- Identify capacity
- Look at viability of investments
- Contribute ideas to Land and Resource Planning process, if applicable
- Develop Strategy: take part in regional planning exercise and look at diversification opportunities and study rural/urban differences

**Actions – Long-Term**
- Complete strategy
- Identify actions needed by public and private sectors to implement strategy
- Ensure integration with long-term land use plans in the area
- Identify and pursue long-term funding sources to support regional economic development

**External Support**
- Federal support for First Nations participation in the planning process
- Increase federal/provincial communication during planning process while encouraging locally generated solutions
- Identify any legislative or regulatory measures needed to support plan
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Ideas and Opportunities

COMMUNICATION AND EDUCATION

Vision Objectives: To achieve any common goals or take part in joint initiatives, improved communications and education are key. Improving cross-cultural understanding among politicians, government officials and through our education system will create the environment needed for neighbouring communities to know and trust each other. Improving understanding of respective government functions, realities and restraints is also necessary.

Benefits
Implementing solutions to any problem is much easier when neighbours understand one another and have established communication networks. Both communication and education result in the development of respectful relationships. By incorporating education about First Nations and their history in school programs, we raise awareness among young Canadians about the place of First Nations in our communities. By providing educational opportunities to those working in government, chances of effective implementation of plans and strategies are improved.

Barriers
The media tends to be negative and sensationalist in their coverage of First Nations, focusing on problems and barriers in communities. Some lack of acceptance in the education system of including First Nations issues in programming exists. The non-native community does not always realize that economic success in First Nations communities benefits everyone. Perhaps the biggest barrier is the fact that in many cases, no formal communication channels exist to allow education and flow of information between First Nations and neighbouring communities. These need to be created and supported.

Actions – Short-Term
- Hold workshops to educate each other on respective roles and responsibilities of local government and First Nations governments
- Develop ways of improving staff-to-staff communication
- Develop ways of designing education that is not focused on integration but that recognizes differences

Actions – Long-Term
- Establish Memorandums of Understanding committing parties to improved communication
- Work to include First Nations programming into school curriculums

External Support
- Federal and provincial government funding for meetings and workshops
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Ideas and Opportunities

OTHER ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IDEAS

Vision Objectives: Having a sense of specific projects local governments and First Nations could undertake together creates momentum and excitement. These projects contribute to the broader vision of healthy and more sustainable communities in which all residents can enjoy a high quality of life. Some ideas for joint initiatives that would stimulate economic growth, employment and generate related community benefits are:

- Value-added forestry initiatives
- Joint Forest Management
- Co-sponsorship of Joint Economic Development Commission
- Joint participation in regional transit system
- Industrial parks on First Nations lands, serviced by local governments
- Campgrounds within municipal boundaries developed in collaboration with First Nations
- Infrastructure partnerships
- Public Private partnerships involving First Nations and local governments

Benefits

Working to provide services and meet community needs through joint projects means that local governments and First Nations can pool resources and energies and avoid the problems that arise when economic development efforts are not coordinated. Supporting infrastructure is easier to plan for and provide as needs increase.

Supporting Actions

- Support private sector projects involving joint management of natural resources
- Access existing funding to pool for common projects
- Joint application for forestry grants
- Provincial legislative reform to remove any barriers
- Promote capacity building (e.g. training) within local governments and First Nations governments
- Ombudsperson for appeal of local government-First Nations disputes
- Develop public-private partnerships
- Access First Nations Finance Authority

External Support

The provincial and federal governments can best support joint First Nation-local government projects through creating an environment conducive to their growth. This means designing accessible and responsive grant programs for public-private partnerships, infrastructure, forestry and industry.
Participant input from morning discussion session:
Vision Objectives, Benefits and Barriers

1. JOINT TOURISM INITIATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural tourism (e.g. Using municipal parks)</td>
<td>☐ bands and municipal councils cooperating for mutual benefits</td>
<td>☐ challenges in respecting cultural connection to land while seeking tourism opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>☐ increase First Nation (FN) employment and regional tourism</td>
<td>☐ resistance from non-native community, seen as unfair competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ belief that some non-native groups do not want to see native businesses succeed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ active opposition, thinly veiled racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-marketing in tourism</td>
<td>☐ increased tourism to isolated areas</td>
<td>☐ no joint funding on and off reserve available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International marketing and eco-tourism niche</td>
<td>☐ large tracts of land lending themselves to eco-tourism</td>
<td>☐ lack of investment funding, (possibly access from FN finance authority and world markets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of natural and joint parks</td>
<td>☐ cultural benefits as well as economic</td>
<td>☐ lack of communications infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. JOINT PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic assessment</td>
<td>☐ identification of potential areas of land development, prioritize areas that are mutually beneficial</td>
<td>☐ communication lines need to be established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ lack of human resource capacity and dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint participation in economic development review</td>
<td>☐ consistent views on economic development issues utilizing expertise from both</td>
<td>☐ financial and human resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Joint Planning, cont’d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balancing benefits &amp; impacts of economic development</td>
<td>⇒ increased revenues for all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Create joint vision of economic development in the community | ⇒ better understanding of each others needs  
⇒ increased development  
⇒ trust and insight | ⇒ lack of communication |

### 3. COMMUNICATIONS AND EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication (applies to all topic areas)</td>
<td>⇒ much easier to move forward with solutions when you communicate with your neighbours through education</td>
<td>⇒ media is a negative and sensationalist focusing on problems and barriers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Educate non-native community on FN issues And inform about realities of funding for FN business via media and other means | ⇒ increase in understanding  
⇒ respectful relationships  
⇒ result in higher FN economic activity | ⇒ lack of understanding/ knowledge of situation of FN  
⇒ lack of acceptance by educational establishment of FN programs, including resistance from provincial government  
⇒ non-native community doesn’t realize that FN economic success will help them |
| Incorporate First Nations education programs into high school & university programs | ⇒ raised awareness among young Canadians about First Nations history and current issues | ⇒ FN communities sometimes don’t have access to the same programs as other communities |
| Educate the next generation in the need to share common long term goals | ⇒ a sense of community brought forward to managerial levels of all bureaucracy | ⇒ no recognized format in place yet |
| Cross cultural and generational knowledge | ⇒ cooperation & joint momentum | ⇒ no education and information channels |
### 4. JOINT PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value added forestry</strong></td>
<td>➔ more jobs, access to grants</td>
<td>➔ no access to timber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access existing programs &amp; services</strong> and contribute these to a common/joint project</td>
<td>➔ avoid barriers, funding, longer projects possible, municipal authority able to access dollars- allows for pooling of funds with FN</td>
<td>➔ possible denial of funding (outside of policy), lack of understanding between FN &amp; local government, reserve lands-problems with bank’s openness to lending based upon nervousness with bank’s security, treaty talks have created problems surrounding ‘formalization’ of processes that were working really well informally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-management of resources (e.g. fish processing plant)</strong></td>
<td>➔ increased employment and revenue</td>
<td>➔ some areas are applicable to aboriginal people only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-sponsorship of economic development corporation</strong> which collectively provides land, dollars, and expertise for the benefit of the regional territory</td>
<td>➔ strong single voice, globally competitive land and cash base</td>
<td>➔ financing, local resistance, lack of trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. LONG-TERM VISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healthy Indian reserve community</strong></td>
<td>➔ Increased dollars on reserve</td>
<td>➔ pressures on reserve to prevent development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Better standard of living for First Nations people through increased employment</strong></td>
<td>➔ more opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ less drug and alcohol abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ less social assistance which all leads to sustainable communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant input from afternoon discussion session:
Vision Objectives, Short and Long Term Actions

1. JOINT TOURISM INITIATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Short-Term Actions</th>
<th>Long-Term Actions</th>
<th>Actions By Other Gov’ts &amp; Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tapping international interest in aboriginal culture</td>
<td>➔ advertising ➔ inventory existing attractions ➔ inventory future attractions</td>
<td>➔ find funding ➔ establish museums ➔ change geographic names to focus on First Nations more</td>
<td>➔ funding support ➔ Heritage Canada and other high profile agencies ➔ senior Trade Commissioners support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco-tourism</td>
<td>➔ create shared administration ➔ training ➔ inventory activities</td>
<td>➔ eco-tourism strategy</td>
<td>➔ incentives ➔ BC Parks increase its flexibility ➔ Public Private Partnerships for marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take BC tourism appeal to an international market</td>
<td>➔ direct advertising ➔ inventory examples</td>
<td>➔ find funding</td>
<td>➔ focus on community driven solutions – federal and provincial gov’ts “step back” ➔ senior gov’ts to provide funding support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased tourism via private-public partnerships (e.g. golf, eco-tourism development)</td>
<td>➔ environmental impact assessments ➔ identify land opportunities</td>
<td>➔ growth management planning ➔ training</td>
<td>➔ no role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific regional tourism opportunities (e.g. Trans Canada trail)</td>
<td>➔ environmental impact concerns ➔ identify land opportunities and objectives ➔ goal setting and trust</td>
<td>➔ training ➔ interest driven solution ➔ growth management</td>
<td>➔ no role</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. JOINT PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Short-Term Actions</th>
<th>Long-Term Actions</th>
<th>Actions By Other Gov’ts &amp; Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set our vision together</strong></td>
<td>⇒ begin communications without federal or provincial gov’ts</td>
<td>⇒ put business plans in place</td>
<td>⇒ when the time comes, bring in the provincial and federal gov’ts to make sure we work through proper process such as legislation and how our ideas will or will not effect the bc or nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordinated economic development</strong></td>
<td>⇒ dialogue and meetings with local gov’ts and business community</td>
<td>⇒ see short-term</td>
<td>⇒ try to develop and plan without senior levels of gov’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generate broad-based economic objectives</strong></td>
<td>⇒ involve all local groups</td>
<td>⇒ bring solutions to provincial and federal gov’t</td>
<td>⇒ Federal government should enable FN to be included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ involve FN in local government Official Community Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ need changes to federal mandates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ increased federal/provincial communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>More involvement in Province’s Land &amp; Resource Management Planning (LRMP) process</strong></td>
<td>⇒ phase one – involvement of all levels of gov’t and FN in assessing designations of lands</td>
<td>⇒ phase two – forest/land act – include establishment of long-term use of land in area</td>
<td>⇒ band councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ FN interests included in legislation (not just policy)</td>
<td>⇒ provincial gov’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ enabling documents that involve line ministries</td>
<td>⇒ local gov’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Joint Planning, cont’d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Short-Term Actions</th>
<th>Long-Term Actions</th>
<th>Actions By Other Gov’ts &amp; Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated land management plans including joint regional planning</td>
<td>➔ develop sustainable community action plan</td>
<td>➔ more community based decisions</td>
<td>➔ INAC to reform election procedures to allow longer terms for chief and councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ diversification – not single industry</td>
<td>➔ more funding to regional economic development</td>
<td>➔ sr. gov’t leave us alone on local decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ study rural/urban differences &amp; aspirations on both sides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ partnerships – e.g. mentoring program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ think regional not individual communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ MOUs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ regional approach and decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ fire protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ service agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on common approach (e.g. Private-public partnerships)</td>
<td>➔ local govt’ to act as facilitators – bring FNs and private sector together</td>
<td>➔ treaty process only one option – build business agreements outside of treaty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. COMMUNICATIONS/EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Short-Term Actions</th>
<th>Long-Term Actions</th>
<th>Actions By Other Gov’ts &amp; Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase communication to improve relationships and jurisdictional understanding</td>
<td>➔ information exchange regarding each jurisdiction</td>
<td>➔ MOUs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ not just politicians but be inclusive in our communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint regional activities to increase local political influence</td>
<td>➔ sustainable community Action Plan</td>
<td>➔ community based decisions</td>
<td>➔ FN/DIAN increase to 4-5 year term for elected officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ diversity away from mines to eco-tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the difference between FN gov’t and local gov’t realities</td>
<td>➔ education that is not focused on integration but that recognizes differences</td>
<td>➔ defining roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>➔ federal/provincial funding for meetings and workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Joint Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Short-Term Actions</th>
<th>Long-Term Actions</th>
<th>Actions By Other Gov’ts &amp; Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit systems</strong> (e.g. Mt. Currie/Pemberton to Whistler)</td>
<td>⇨ need to get to jobs&lt;br&gt;⇨ initiated by Mt. Curry&lt;br&gt;⇨ began small, worked up in partnership with other local gov’ts</td>
<td>⇨ increase services – e.g. plane, rail</td>
<td>⇨ BC transit&lt;br&gt;⇨ private funds (i.e. regional corporations or developers)&lt;br&gt;⇨ regional districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial parks</strong> (on FN lands, but serviced by local gov’t)</td>
<td>⇨ service delivery (e.g. water, fire protection)&lt;br&gt;⇨ joint application for forestry grant</td>
<td>⇨ future increases to services as needs increase</td>
<td>⇨ infrastructure grant process via regional districts&lt;br&gt;⇨ Forest Renewal grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campgrounds</strong> within city limits, collaboration with FN</td>
<td>⇨ general public-private partnership</td>
<td>⇨ enhance tourism&lt;br&gt;⇨ creates more jobs</td>
<td>⇨ municipal gov’t&lt;br&gt;⇨ Band council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Economic Development Commission</strong></td>
<td>⇨ invitations sent out&lt;br&gt;⇨ information sharing&lt;br&gt;⇨ explain financial benefits</td>
<td>⇨ develop strategy</td>
<td>⇨ industrial funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure partnerships</strong></td>
<td>⇨ building relationships, continuity&lt;br&gt;⇨ identify barriers</td>
<td>⇨ ombudsman group for FN and local gov’t disputes</td>
<td>⇨ Public-Private incentives&lt;br&gt;⇨ senior gov’ts get out of the way of agreements&lt;br&gt;⇨ senior gov’ts – funding for linkages between FN and local gov’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint forest management</strong></td>
<td>⇨ protocol agreement</td>
<td>⇨ legislative reform&lt;br&gt;⇨ capacity building within local gov’ts and FN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnerships between industry, FN, and local gov’t</strong></td>
<td>⇨ bands/councils cooperating for mutual benefits</td>
<td>⇨ challenges in respecting cultural connection to land while seeking tourism opportunities</td>
<td>⇨ partner with feds or BC or Regional Districts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5. LONG-TERM VISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Short-Term Actions</th>
<th>Long-Term Actions</th>
<th>Actions By Other Gov’ts &amp; Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| View area economic development as a win-win for all communities | ⇒ local area meetings to discuss partnership possibilities  
⇒ capacity building and education opportunities | ⇒ Infrastructure process to sustain partnerships  
⇒ training and access | ⇒ federal/provincial programs have a role, but arms-length |
| Achieve sustainable FN community | ⇒ meet to look at restoration of values  
⇒ don’t buy from large companies unless certified | ⇒ FN do own i.e. sub-lease create opportunities | |
| Sustainable economic development for FN and local gov’t | ⇒ assessments (environmental, social, etc.)  
⇒ opportunity  
⇒ building trust  
⇒ fire side chats  
⇒ invitations to participate in community initiatives | ⇒ develop capacity  
⇒ mutual aid agreements  
⇒ service delivery and agreements | ⇒ communication links to Community to Community Forums  
⇒ provincial gov’t participation in funding joint ventures (e.g. emergency response services) |
| Enhance existing economy | ⇒ open communication  
⇒ cooperation  
⇒ resource planning | ⇒ industrial interaction  
⇒ resource management | ⇒ cooperation with FN  
⇒ federal/provincial funding |
| Reduce existing FN unemployment rates | ⇒ communication  
⇒ establish plan, short-term and long-term goals | ⇒ integration  
⇒ education | ⇒ cooperation with FN  
⇒ federal/provincial funding |
| Focus on practical outcomes, not theories | ⇒ learn from case studies, e.g. Campbell River | ⇒ translate learning into tangible agreements | |
| Improve social development | ⇒ good infrastructure  
⇒ capacity building plans healthy people – prevention  
⇒ educating non-Aboriginals  
⇒ review and address systemic barriers | ⇒ development of public private partnerships  
⇒ implementation  
⇒ develop a finance authority | ⇒ federal infrastructure grants  
⇒ community-developed health plans |
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NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT: 
Case Study Summary

The Fraser River

Presenters:

- Mayor Sylvia Pranger, District of Kent
- Councillor Clem Seymour, Seabird Island First Nation

Summary

The District of Kent and Seabird Island First Nation are located in the Fraser Valley between Chilliwack and Hope. Last year, the District of Kent, with support of the Fraser Valley Treaty Advisory Committee, successfully applied for regional Community to Community Forum funding and invited five area First Nations to participate in the event, planning the agenda and themes together. The result was a two-part session held in November 2000, which focused first on local community control over the Fraser River and an afternoon relationship-building session.

At the Community to Community Forum, there was a realization that the local government and First Nation had a common interest in protecting the Fraser River while balancing this with protecting the land and people who lived by the Fraser from flooding. Balancing the needs for environmental protection on the river, is something First Nations, viewing themselves as traditional stewards of the river, take seriously; however, the river can also be a threat to area Indian Reserves and homes. They discovered other common concerns with the river relating to gravel extraction and park creation. The federal and provincial governments manage the river but there was a sense that they do not really understand local concerns and have been prioritizing external environmental concerns over protection of community homes, business and lands. Individually, the District of Kent and the Seabird Island First Nation were each having a hard time being heard; however, since the November Forum they have found that using a common voice has been a more effective way of being heard by these two governments.

Another common issue raised was the provincial government’s initiation of a Protected Area Strategy for riverside areas. It was felt that this was conducted without full consultation or agreement by either First Nations or local governments and residents of the local communities generally.

The result of the discussions at the Community to Community Forum, at which stakeholders, local politicians and provincial and federal representatives played a role as
observers and listeners, illustrated considerable shared interests by the local governments and First Nations. Subsequently, joint letters were issued expressing local concerns, and communication sharing was improved with regards to activities on this topics.

The Community to Community Forum has spurred on considerable intergovernmental relations between Seabird Island and Kent, with joint servicing projects begin planned. **Benefits Achieved**

By working together to better articulate the need for a balance of interests in the management of the Fraser River, the two groups achieved more than they could have alone. Benefits achieved included:

- Developing a relationship based on common interests, shared opinions and improved understanding of one another
- Building honesty and trust – bringing back mutual respect
- Better articulation of local views and issues concerning management of the river
- A coordinated approach (e.g. through joint letters) creating a stronger voice for expressing local concerns to federal and provincial governments

**Hurdles & Challenges**

- Being heard by provincial and federal government representatives
- Finding time and funding to continue the dialogue

**Lessons Learned**

- Discussions must be based on trust, honesty and mutual respect, which was the case at the Forum and continues to be the basis of the relationship.
- Beginning with issues of common concern is easier than trying to solve long-term issues as a first project – no need to try to solve all the problems at once
- We are both here for a long time and we need to work together
- Dialogue cannot be confined to a single meeting but must continue on a regular basis
NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT: Ideas and Opportunities

PROMOTING SUSTAINABILITY

Vision Objectives: Management of natural resources in a way that sustains them for the long term is a priority for First Nations and local governments alike. This involves full cost accounting and balancing the interests and impacts of natural resource use. Promoting a balance between world market demands and locally sustainable resource extraction is also essential. Local governments and First Nations can be actively and effectively involved in promoting a sustainable resource base in and around their communities.

Benefits

Through promoting sustainable natural resource management, communities will achieve a solid base for their economies and certainty that resources will be there to serve needs long term. Finding a balance creates win-win solutions for communities that allows development of stable economies and healthy communities.

Barriers

Management of resources by provincial and federal governments means much local control is lost. Acceptance of short-term gain versus long-term management needs to change. Confrontation is also a barrier to doing the work we need to do together.

Actions – Short-Term

- Organize meetings among decision makers
- Promote improved understanding of the resources
- Contribute to Land and Resource Management Planning (LRMP) where applicable
- Organize meetings to exchange views and priorities
- Develop approaches to non-timber forest use (e.g. berries, mushrooms) including value-added options
- Support certification

Actions – Long-Term

- Develop stewardship agreements
- Engage in long term resource management planning
- Support education that promotes a shift in thinking from exploitation of resources to proper management of resources for their sustainability
- Encourage real cost accounting

External Support

- Need equal standards for natural resource management and extraction in neighbouring communities
- Less federal and provincial government involvement needed
- BC Assets and Lands need to consult more with local communities before making decisions that affect them
- International education campaign promoting sustainability of natural resources
NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT:
Ideas and Opportunities

LOCALLY-BASED NATURAL RESOURCE PLANNING

Vision Objectives: Planning for natural resource use and management is central to sustaining resources over the long term. Aboriginal and non-aboriginal people working together in resource management planning processes can lay the groundwork at the local level for actions that result in sustainable and healthy communities.

Benefits
Planning together can mean more local control, greater certainty and efficient use of resources. Where individual communities develop separate resource plans, coordination increases the chance that both communities will receive economic benefits of resource use. Trust evolves from joint planning that results in successful outcomes.

Barriers
Insufficient resources, both human and financial, is a barrier. Communication lines need to be established to enable discussions to take place and a process to be developed.

Actions – Short-Term
▷ Involve all levels of government and First Nations in assessing designation of land uses
▷ Support coalitions of groups interested in a specific resource (e.g. Fraser River Coalition).

Actions – Long-Term
▷ Ensure First Nations interests are reflected in provincial actions (and not just policy)
▷ Support initiatives that build trust
▷ Create different coalitions of First Nations and local government

External Support
▷ Less provincial and federal government involvement needed
NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT: Ideas and Opportunities

CO-MANAGEMENT

**Vision Objectives:** Co-management of resources allows communities to work together to preserve and protect the natural environment. Initiatives such as community forest partnerships are achievable now; other co-management strategies can be established for the future.

**Benefits**
Greater First Nations involvement in the management of natural resources ensures their communities can share in the economic benefits including employment opportunities. Local control in the management of resources ensures local benefits. Working together is an excellent way to reduce barriers and increase trust. Increased local pride through stewardship is also a benefit.

**Barriers**
There are some fears around co-management of resources; there are concerns that this could be more damaging to resources than the status quo. Understanding the values inherent in differing views regarding resource use is challenging. Finding funding for meetings and planning can also be a barrier, as can capacity of parties.

**Actions – Short-Term**
- Establish better communication
- Support initiatives that look beyond fish and logging to other resources
- Support review of Agricultural Land Reserve through a new land inventory

**Actions – Long-Term**
- Develop long-term resource management plans
- Explore ways to build capacity within First Nations
- Provide First Nations with lands through concluding treaties

**External Support**
- Lobby for less management by provincial ministries and agencies
NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT:
Ideas and Opportunities

COOPERATION AND COMMUNICATION

Vision Objectives: By meeting regularly, First Nations and local governments can take the first step in establishing strong relationships which promote cooperation. Encourage efforts to communicate and consult with multiple groups to increase insight and integration of needs.

Developing protocols specific to a particular resource (e.g. water) can be useful. Dispute resolution mechanisms should also be available.

Benefits
Establishing ways to communicate directly and regularly allows sharing of expectations and interests over time. A means of resolving disputes is essential since it allows communication and cooperation to endure through conflict.

BARRIERS
Bureaucracy can sometimes be an impediment to communication. Lack of education for youth on First Nations issues can also be a barrier to developing and maintaining ties between communities.

Actions – Short-Term
☞ Initiate talks and establish areas of common concern and priorities
☞ Support joint training opportunities, e.g. for conducting environmental impact studies
☞ Support joint ventures on natural resource uses, e.g. community forest application

Actions – Long-Term
☞ Develop Protocols and Accords
☞ Establish means for resolving disputes

☞ Raise public awareness of the common interests of neighbouring communities in natural resources

External Support
☞ Work with all levels of government and their agencies to improve communication and cooperation, e.g. Ministries of Aboriginal Affairs and Environment, Lands and Parks, other line ministries and federal Department of Fisheries
Participant input from morning discussion session:
Vision Objectives, Benefits and Barriers

### 1. PROMOTING SUSTAINABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable management is the goal, full cost accounting</td>
<td>➞ renewable goes on forever, solid base</td>
<td>➞ management of fish by central gov’t.  ➞ certification is the answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local gov’ts and FN promotion of sustainable resource base (gravel, fish stocks, wildlife, minerals, forests)</td>
<td>➞ certainty of resource base to serve long term needs</td>
<td>➞ greed, short-term gains vs. long-term management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address the relatedness of natural resources</td>
<td>➞ all healthy relationships can agree to decisions</td>
<td>➞ sharing of knowledge and understanding, funding for education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of interests-habitat, fish, gravel</td>
<td>➞ works for both sides, can find balance that affects both communities- environment, economic use &amp; tourism</td>
<td>➞ confrontation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. LOCALLY-BASED NATURAL RESOURCE PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Advisory Boards</td>
<td>➞ water quality issues addressed</td>
<td>➞ human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable healthy communities</td>
<td>➞ local control, certainty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-aboriginal people &amp; aboriginal work together in resource mgmt planning (e.g. Clayoquot-Isaak Resources)</td>
<td>➞ better use of resources return to ancient understanding of sustainability, prospect of much improved management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize the need for different resource plans</td>
<td>➞ economic benefit to individual communities</td>
<td>➞ communications lines need to be established, lack of human and resource capacity and money</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. CO-MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community forest partnerships</td>
<td>⇒ local control</td>
<td>⇒ new and uncharted territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ local benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-management of natural resources:</strong> working together to preserve &amp; protect the natural environment</td>
<td>⇒ working together takes down barriers automatically</td>
<td>⇒ some people believe that FN co-management will be more damaging to resources than the status quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ increase local pride in stewardship</td>
<td>⇒ funding for meetings &amp; planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-management strategies need to be established</strong></td>
<td>⇒ create sustainable use for benefit of all parties</td>
<td>⇒ communication about values inherent in different uses of resources, reactive rather than proactive, no $ and minimum capacity among parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN involved in the management of their natural resources</td>
<td>⇒ sharing resources leads to increased FN employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. COOPERATION AND COMMUNICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local gov’t and FN meeting on a regular basis</td>
<td>⇒ opportunity to discuss and define expectations and integrate these</td>
<td>⇒ bureaucracy on both sides of negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with FN and industry</td>
<td>⇒ increase insight &amp; integration of needs</td>
<td>⇒ lack of education for youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant input from afternoon discussion session:
Vision Objectives, Short and Long Term Actions

### 1. PROMOTING SUSTAINABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Short-Term Actions</th>
<th>Long-Term Actions</th>
<th>Actions By Other Gov’ts &amp; Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Due diligence” practiced by all parties involved</td>
<td>➔ communications among parties (local decision makers) ➔ LRMP in some places</td>
<td>➔ streamline the process through legislative reform</td>
<td>➔ see long-term actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of all non-renewable resources</td>
<td>➔ better understanding of resources ➔ better communication through meetings</td>
<td>➔ develop stewardship agreements ➔ long-term resource management planning</td>
<td>➔ equal standards ➔ less federal/provincial involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration – shared resource</td>
<td>➔ education and communication (i.e. cultural components)</td>
<td>➔ communication and education</td>
<td>➔ local committees can do better without federal/provincial involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote balance between world market “push” and sustainability</td>
<td>➔ explore future joint meetings ➔ policy development on non-timber forest issues (value-added options)</td>
<td>➔ shift thinking on resource issues – view resources not as owned by us, but as needing proper management to be sustained</td>
<td>➔ world market ➔ BC Assets and Lands needs to consult more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. LOCALLY-BASED NATURAL RESOURCE PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Short-Term Actions</th>
<th>Long-Term Actions</th>
<th>Actions By Other Gov’ts &amp; Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LRMP process working through gov’t to gov’t relationship (e.g. central coast – first LRMP with considerable FN input)</td>
<td>➔ involvement of all levels of gov’t and FN in assessing designation of land use</td>
<td>➔ FN interests included in legislation (not just policy) ➔ build trust</td>
<td>➔ less federal/provincial involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner Fraser River</td>
<td>➔ support Fraser River Coalition</td>
<td>➔ create different coalitions of FN and local gov’ts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 3. Co-Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Short-Term Actions</th>
<th>Long-Term Actions</th>
<th>Actions By Other Gov’ts &amp; Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-management strategies</td>
<td>⇒ better communication</td>
<td>⇒ long-term resource management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-management of resources</td>
<td>⇒ FN look beyond fish, logging</td>
<td>⇒ attract non-FN managers initially to build capacity</td>
<td>⇒ less management by BC agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural land commission re-vamped</td>
<td>⇒ do another land inventory</td>
<td>⇒ give back lands to FN (via treaties)</td>
<td>⇒ lobbying by local gov’t for changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ take out lands for new uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 4. Cooperation and Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Short-Term Actions</th>
<th>Long-Term Actions</th>
<th>Actions By Other Gov’ts &amp; Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on FN perspectives on natural resources and common goals</td>
<td>⇒ voicing the needs of and concerns of all</td>
<td>⇒ acting on these needs/concerns</td>
<td>⇒ work with all levels of gov’t to address this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ invite all to participate in discussions</td>
<td>⇒ establish protocols (e.g. on water)</td>
<td>⇒ funding and representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish protocol for dispute resolution for all levels of government</td>
<td>⇒ initiate talks and establish priorities</td>
<td>⇒ set up severe penalties</td>
<td>⇒ MAA, MELP, DFO, Regional Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ participation</td>
<td>⇒ guidance and encouragement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building on environmental issues</td>
<td>⇒ FN trained in environ-mental impact studies</td>
<td>⇒ deliver service to economic development opportunities in area, partner with each other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint venture on sustainable natural resource use</td>
<td>⇒ e.g. Klahouse development and Cortez Society MOU re: community forestry application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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LAND USE COORDINATION: Case Study Summary

The Gallagher Canyon Master Agreement

Presenters:
- Chair Robert Hobson, Central Okanagan Regional District
- Councillor Deanna Hamilton, Westbank First Nation

Summary
The Regional District and First Nation are located in the Kelowna area of the Okanagan Valley. The Westbank First Nation bought 662 hectares of land on the east side of Lake Okanagan in the Gallagher Canyon area, and in the early 1990s made an application to the federal government to convert the land to Indian reserve status with the idea of building housing for band members. Initially, local governments in the area expressed concerns about development on the Gallagher Canyon lands. Discussions between the First Nation and the Regional District eventually resulted in a Master Agreement between the First Nation, the Central Okanagan Regional District, City of Kelowna and two irrigation districts.

The Master Agreement records the parties mutual understanding and their rights and obligations to each other with respect to the Gallagher Canyon Lands. The Master Agreement deals with consultation, servicing and dispute resolution. Among the commitments in the agreement are:
- Existing easements protected
- Green-way to be extended
- Existing water licenses recognized
- Water quality and development standards would meet or beat provincial standards
- Future land use plans of the two parties will be compatible
- Joint consultation on development and road improvements
- Development cost charges to be paid by the Band beyond the first 100 units
- Dispute resolution process
- Aboriginal rights and treaty negotiations not affected
LAND USE COORDINATION:
Case Study Summary
The Gallagher Canyon Master Agreement

Benefits Achieved
- High level of certainty on the use of the proposed reserve lands
- Better understanding of the potential value of the lands
- Gained understanding of each other’s values and interests
- Capacity building for the First Nation
- Learned patience and to take time to negotiate the desired agreement

Hurdles and Challenges
- Political environment
- Concern about proposed land uses
- First Nation governments often understaffed and overworked
- People did not understand the Westbank First Nation’s history or connection to the lands
- Some concern about whether an agreement would stick with the West Bank First Nation
- Concern about proposed land uses
- First Nation governments often understaffed and overworked
- People did not understand the Westbank First Nation’s history or connection to the lands
- Some concern about whether an agreement would stick with the West Bank First Nation

Lessons Learned
- Good intergovernmental relationships are needed now and cannot wait for resolution of treaties; Memorandums of Understanding are a good start
- Time and patience are required
- Do not negotiate through the press
- Understand each other’s constraints
- Keep lines of communications open
- Through good will, individuals can make a difference
SERVICE DELIVERY:
Case Study Summary

First Nation Provision of Services at Lake Windermere

Presenters:
- Chair Jim Ogilvie, Regional District of East Kootenay
- Lee-Ann Crane, Administrator, Regional District of East Kootenay
- Dean Martin, CEO, Kinbasket Development Corp. and Shuswap First Nation
- Matthew Ney, Kinbasket Development Corporation

Summary
The Shuswap First Nation is located near Invermere in the East Kootenays. This is a resort area popular for recreation. The Shuswap First Nation cares about the state of the lands in their entire traditional area, not just their reserve lands. They are also actively pursuing economic development opportunities. The Kinbasket Development Corporation has been developing the Eagle Ranch Golf Course and other commercial properties for several years. As part of the development, they have created a sewer and water system with a large capacity.

There has been a growing problem of pollution of Lake Windermere created by uncontrolled development around the lake with most of the properties on septic systems. The local government couldn’t get approval from their population to put the infrastructure in. The First Nation and local government worked toward a win-win solution to the environmental problem and now the First Nation, through a servicing agreement with the local government, supplies sewer and water services to one development on the lake with the potential to service all developments on the east side of Lake Windermere.

Benefits
- Protection of Lake Windermere
- Win-win solution for First Nation and local governments in servicing residents of the region
- Improved trust between the regional district and the Shuswap First Nation
- Opened the door for future cooperation
- First Nation is a major contributor to the regional economy

Hurdles and Challenges
- Skepticism – would this arrangement between the local government and First Nation work?
- Inexperience – neither party had ever negotiated such an agreement
- Pressure from developers

Lessons Learned
- First Nations can supply services for local governments, not just the other way around
- Win-win solutions to local problems can be found when there is cooperation and collaboration by First Nations and local governments
- First Nations can be a contributor to financing of regional infrastructure
SERVICE DELIVERY AND LAND USE COORDINATION:
Ideas and Opportunities

JOINT INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING

Vision Objectives: Infrastructure projects are a key focus for both First Nations and local governments. There is considerable opportunity to better serve communities by planning for future sewer, water and other needs together. This can result in optimum use of resources and a more regional approach to service delivery.

Benefits
By planning for future needs together, scarce resources and funding is maximized and duplication is minimized. Limited land for building projects can be maximized by planning for extending services or building new infrastructure together (e.g. sewage treatment plants).

Barriers
Joint planning takes commitment of time and staff. It also takes political will to work through the challenges of a joint project. Some uncertainty over First Nation jurisdiction remains, as well as concerns over First Nations’ capacity. Staff relationships must be established in advance of joint projects.

Actions – Short-Term
⇒ Begin establishing relationships now
⇒ Hold regular joint technical staff meetings now
⇒ Initiate mutual referral processes
⇒ Identify potential future needs to one another to prevent duplication

Actions – Long-Term
⇒ Seek joint funding from the province or federal government
⇒ FN participate in growth management planning
⇒ Focus on sustainable resource use (e.g. water)

External Support
⇒ Offer joint funding packages
⇒ Negotiate treaties in support of local relationship building, not treaties that undermine relationships or encourage separateness and lack of cooperation
SERVICE DELIVERY AND LAND USE COORDINATION:
Ideas and Opportunities

HARMONIZING PLANNING AT REGIONAL AND LOCAL LEVELS

Vision Objectives: Local governments and First Nations have opportunities to improve upon the use of lands within their jurisdiction by ensuring their land uses are coordinated. At a regional level, negative aspects of rapid community growth can be mitigated by both governments participating in regional planning processes. At a local level, a framework for coordinating land use planning helps to minimize incompatible uses on adjacent lands. Harmonization is not about a veto, but rather maximizing opportunities.

Benefits
By cooperating together and sharing information on projected uses of lands, jurisdictions can ensure their neighbours’ plans will work effectively with their own and conflicts are minimized. First Nations can share their different perspectives on land use, based on a long-term relationship with the land. Local governments can share their experience with regional and local land use planning processes, including public involvement.

Barriers
Communication and mutual respect is key. Dispute resolution mechanisms are not currently available to First Nations and local governments. Framework for coordinating planning has yet to be developed. Bureaucracy sometimes limits input of one jurisdiction into another’s activities. Funding is not available for joint planning or First Nations’ participation in local government processes (e.g. RGS). First Nations may base land use planning decisions on different objectives and principles than traditional local government planning.

Actions – Short-Term
⇒ Begin establishing dialogue now
⇒ MOUs on mutual consultation
⇒ FN involvement in RGS and other consultation processes
⇒ Create ombudsperson/group or dispute resolution mechanism

Actions – Long-Term
⇒ Clarify jurisdiction over lands
⇒ Educate one another on land use planning principles and overarching goals
⇒ Create opportunities for joint discussion on short- and long-term planning
⇒ Cultural protocol agreements
⇒ Move towards self-sustaining models

External Support
⇒ Ensure treaties or self-gov’t/land use planning legislation provide opportunities for mutual consultation on land use planning
⇒ Provide funding to allow for education and joint planning
SERVICE DELIVERY AND LAND USE COORDINATION: Ideas and Opportunities

JOINT PROJECTS AND PARTNERSHIPS

Vision Objectives: Once joint planning is complete, capitalizing on opportunities for joint infrastructure projects will help reduce costs of service provision for neighbouring communities. Agreements to co-fund and co-operate services will need to be developed to guide the partnership.

Benefits
Lower cost of projects results from increased partners. Often higher volume of service (e.g. water) does not result in significant cost-increases. Working together on projects builds relationships.

Barriers
Funding is often not available on a joint-basis. Negotiating fair servicing agreements, where both governments share the benefits and responsibilities including costs is necessary. With funding for First Nations coming primarily from the federal government, there is also a challenge in accessing multi-year capital funding. Cultural differences may require some education as part of project management.

Actions – Short-Term
⇒ Initiate joint-planning processes to identify mutual needs
⇒ Investigate potential funding sources

Actions – Long-Term
⇒ Initiate projects
⇒ Change Indian Act to allow for different First Nations financing
⇒ Increase funding to both governments
SERVICE DELIVERY AND LAND USE COORDINATION:
Ideas and Opportunities

SERVICING ARRANGEMENTS

Vision Objectives: Effective and fair servicing agreements are the basis of good relationships. Servicing agreements have been the most common type of formal arrangements between local governments and First Nations in BC to date. Usually they have involved local government providing services to Indian Reserve residents. In the future, as First Nations economic development activities grow, it is very likely that increasingly First Nations will provide services to neighbouring communities off their lands as well.

Benefits
Cost-effectiveness is a key benefit to one government purchasing locally provided services from another. Often Aboriginal populations are smaller than those of neighbouring local governments, but accessing the broader services lowers the costs for the First Nation and may provide a higher quality service. Where First Nations also have services to offer local governments, relationships can flourish based on mutual benefits. Certainty and prosperity result from good servicing agreements.

Barriers
In some cases, historical conflicts prevent First Nations and local governments from effectively working together. Local governments, frustrated over changing land use jurisdiction, may use servicing as a mechanism for increased control. First Nations funding may be different than that of local governments, making payment difficult. Lack of funding support by the federal government puts pressure on First Nations to pay for services when there is not yet a large property tax base on which to draw.

Actions – Short-Term
• Develop effective servicing agreements
• Conduct research on servicing agreements to find out what works well and what doesn’t
• Institute dispute resolution mechanisms

Actions – Long-Term
• Explore options for future projects together
• Develop opportunities for mutual servicing
Participant input from morning discussion session:
Vision Objectives, Benefits and Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To work with local gov’t for servicing development on</td>
<td>money to local gov’t, ability for first nations to sell leases on</td>
<td>negotiating fee for service agreement, understanding of the service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN land</td>
<td>infrastructure</td>
<td>agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint planning of services and infrastructure, e.g.</td>
<td>affordable, economies of scale, health benefits, environmental, economic</td>
<td>funding, inability of FN to make decisions for themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water, sewer, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint planning on infrastructure</td>
<td>anticipate future infrastructure growth in area as a region</td>
<td>no mutual referral system to notify of expansion needs; no staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional caucus, local gov’t and FN on service delivery</td>
<td>everyone know what the plan is and where the services are</td>
<td>relationships established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint planning &amp; project commission</td>
<td>maximize use of land resource, minimize environmental impact</td>
<td>concern about jurisdiction over shared lands &amp; resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimum use of resources</td>
<td>infrastructure in place</td>
<td>don’t want to see further development in area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. HARMONIZING PLANNING AT LOCAL AND REGIONAL LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common vision on land use, cooperative decision making to ensure delivery of services</td>
<td>✗ cost savings, better use of infrastructure spreads the capital cost to a greater number</td>
<td>✗ red tape, resistance, tradition-the old way, trust reluctance to change, lack of vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint land use plan, Official Community Plans</td>
<td>✗ services sized right, cost savings</td>
<td>✗ need more thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainty over land base</td>
<td>✗ clarity</td>
<td>✗ negotiations still not complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educating as to due process</td>
<td>✗ a clearer view of how to attain goals</td>
<td>✗ funding &amp; promotion of planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish linkages between staff, i.e. city planners and FN staff</td>
<td>✗ joint planning</td>
<td>✗ no referral process has been established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint regional growth management planning</td>
<td>✗ establish principles/policies that apply to both to ensure logical, controlled development</td>
<td>✗ financial and human resources, possibility of new councils every 2 years resulting in having to start over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On land use issues, everyone needs to listen more</td>
<td>✗ the highest and best use, integration no joint development</td>
<td>✗ needs respectful dialogue, lots of consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open up regional planning dept to help FN</td>
<td>✗ mentoring, capacity building</td>
<td>✗ FN planning not necessarily the same method as local gov’t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. JOINT PROJECTS AND PARTNERSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leasing of FN land for development</td>
<td>◇ economic possibilities for First Nations</td>
<td>◇ must use shorter term leases to better reflect growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint partnerships, e.g. FN &amp; local gov’t joint capital projects and planning</td>
<td>◇ economics, stability</td>
<td>◇ cooperation and information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build road to connect communities</td>
<td>◇ Make transportation easier would help to open up communities</td>
<td>◇ unsure how to approach FN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing development with municipal servicing</td>
<td></td>
<td>◇ lack of cooperation/ communication, outside community local area plans, treaty stalling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership among FN bands</td>
<td>◇ common denominators for FN identified</td>
<td>◇ time &amp; cultural differences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. SERVICING ARRANGEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure everyone has access to same services at the same cost</td>
<td>◇ joint infrastructure funding-common servicing</td>
<td>◇ adequate funding from federal gov’t to First Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get on with negotiations</td>
<td>◇ certainty &amp; definition for all</td>
<td>◇ lack of funding &amp; support from fed gov’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability of FN to get services like any local gov’t</td>
<td>◇ ability to communicate about issues affecting both FN and local communities, revenues, better relationship, economic. prosperity of FN would result as economic benefits of whole city</td>
<td>◇ municipality not willing to provide services to FN (water, sewage) unless they are able to set parameters (e.g. limit economic development) conflicting land use plans within a municipality that includes lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local service agreements</td>
<td>◇ shared info</td>
<td>◇ DIAND required to sign off on agreements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Participant input from afternoon discussion session:**
Vision Objectives, Benefits and Barriers

### 1. LAND USE COORDINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Short-Term Actions</th>
<th>Long-Term Actions</th>
<th>Actions By Other Gov’ts &amp; Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>joint land use planning</td>
<td>⇒ joint meetings</td>
<td>⇒ growth management planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develop sustainable communities</td>
<td>⇒ joint land use planning committees</td>
<td>⇒ integrate land use plans</td>
<td>⇒ minimize their involvement but maximize funding potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ refer development plans to one another</td>
<td>⇒ minimize environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ increased communication</td>
<td>⇒ joint boards/committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compatible planning by the parties</td>
<td>⇒ begin with informal meetings and communication</td>
<td>⇒ streamline processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safer communities (personal and community)</td>
<td>⇒ recognize that must develop ongoing dialogue which takes time</td>
<td>⇒ MOUs and Servicing Agreements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative land-use coordination</td>
<td>⇒ build better rapport through community to community dialogue</td>
<td>⇒ agreement about reciprocal consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative resource development</td>
<td>⇒ begin talks immediately</td>
<td>⇒ self-sustaining</td>
<td>⇒ federal funding and cooperation of federal gov’t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. SERVICING ARRANGEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Short-Term Actions</th>
<th>Long-Term Actions</th>
<th>Actions By Other Gov’ts &amp; Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **utilize existing infrastructure services for all, identify common issues of concern to communities (e.g. water quality)** | ⇒ immediate communication and cooperation participation | ⇒ training and opportunity to utilize the FN skills in this area | ⇒ funding to offset FN contribution  
⇒ cooperation of federal gov’t |
| **seamless community**                                                          | ⇒ share services to for cost effective-ness  
⇒ FN explain governance models to local gov’t’s | ⇒ fee simple status for I.R.s  
⇒ longer terms for FN politicians |                                                                                       |
| **remove perceived walls**                                                       | ⇒ education via communication                                                      |                                                                                   | ⇒ funding to promote cooperation and education |
| **work together to resolve disputes**                                            | ⇒ create ombudsperson or group to manage disputes                                 |                                                                                   |                                                                                       |
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GOVERNMENT TO GOVERNMENT LINKAGES:
Case Study Summary

City of Port Alberni & Tseshaaht First Nation

Presenters:
- Mayor Gillian Trumper, City of Port Alberni and Alberni-Clayoquot Regional District member
- Chief George Watts, Acting Chief of Tseshaaht Indian Band and Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council member

Summary
There has always been a good working relationship between the local government and the First Nation. Because it is a small town, local politicians always knew most people in town, aboriginal and non-aboriginal. There is a shared history that has lead to a respect and recognition of each other’s governments. Primarily, they have had a business relationship with each other, not a politically based one. The First Nation has always believed that it is important to contribute to community services that they use, such as the hockey rink. The City of Port Alberni and the Tseshaaht First Nation have had a servicing agreement for 30 years. Currently, the Tseshaaht First Nation which is a member of the Nuu Chah Nulth Tribal Council (NTC), is taking part in an economic development project in the community.

The NTC approached the Alberni Clayoquot Regional District (of which the City of Port Alberni is a member) about First Nation membership on the regional district board and last year both parties took part in a regional Community to Community Forum to discuss this issue. The result is that the NTC has a non-voting member who sits on the board and attends some committee meetings. They are continuing discussions on the First Nations role on the board.

Benefits Achieved
In summary, benefits of the development include:

⇒ Local government and the First Nation have an established and successful working relationship which is of benefit now and will be after a treaty is signed
⇒ Opportunity to dispel some misunderstandings at the regional Community to Community Forum
⇒ Sparked interest in holding another forum and continuing dialogue
⇒ political rhetoric has been kept out of the relationship by maintaining a business type working relationship.

Hurdles and Challenges

⇒ The treaty process has created some new challenges with respect to managing the First Nation-local government relationship.

Lessons Learned

⇒ Need to work with change and not run from it by establishing solid foundations for intergovernmental relationships now; do not wait for treaties to be signed
⇒ Relationships need to be formed on a “business” basis not a political basis
GOVERNMENT TO GOVERNMENT LINKAGES: Ideas and Opportunities

**COMMUNICATION**

**Vision Objectives:** Communication is an essential element of intergovernmental relations. Communication is the basis of relationship building and the key element upon which mutual respect and recognition is built. Historically, the two governments have often lived as “two solitudes” and today there is growing interest in developing both formal and informal opportunities for dialogue. Effective communication must take place at both the elected and staff levels.

**Benefits**
The key benefit of improved communication is the building of relationships. It also provides opportunities for the two governments to better understand their respective functions, challenges, strengths and limitations. Through a variety of communication methods, each jurisdiction better understands and clarifies its roles vis-a-vis the other one, leading to mutual respect and recognition.

**Barriers**
Effective communication requires time, effort, interest and long-term commitment. The challenge is to make this communication a priority in the midst of growing responsibilities and diminishing resources. Trust takes time to build, however, and both governments must base their communication on mutual respect and recognition, not paternalistic ways of the past.

**Actions – Short-term**
- Establish staff-to-staff connections
- Exchange of resource materials
- MOUs and meetings with joint agendas
- Education on FN and LG organizations, cultural information sessions
- Forums and other specific opportunities for face-to-face dialogue
- Community-based events (e.g. feasts)
- LG and FN tours of one another’s communities
- Focus on interpersonal relationships – designate liaison people

**Actions – Long-Term**
- Develop formal long-term linkages
- Broad educational programs at government and community level
- Refocus communications around intergovernmental relations on people instead of governments
- Formalize relationships (MOUs, Regional District role?)
- Large-scale community dialogue

**External Support**
- Consider development of FN-LG dispute resolution processes to ensure communication during conflicts
- Change Local Government Act to allow more opportunities for partnerships, communication and involvement
- Limit external governments’ roles to facilitation, not dictating rules
GOVERNMENT TO GOVERNMENT LINKAGES:
Ideas and Opportunities

MOUs AND PROTOCOLS

Vision Objectives: Formal Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) or Protocol Agreements can be very useful to frame ongoing intergovernmental relations. They can help address fears and concerns, but also lay out areas of opportunity and indicate mutual respect and recognition. For local governments, MOUs may serve to define a role for First Nations Governments with Regional Districts or other public institutions, and provide for the foundation of future relationship building.

Benefits
The benefits of formal written understandings is that they provide leadership, vision and political direction to staff responsible for carrying out the daily interactions between the governments. They also provide a formal opportunity for mutual recognition, and can serve to promote understanding.

Barriers
A key barrier to developing formal MOUs or other tools is often capacity. These projects take time and elected officials and staff to coordinate. In some cases, provincial or federal legislation limits what can be accomplished in MOUs, although this is changing as self-government processes advance.

Actions – Short-Term
⇒ Develop increased communication
⇒ Appoint elected and staff liaisons

Actions – Long-Term
⇒ Negotiate MOUs and/or Protocol Agreements
⇒ Lobby for changes to legislation, as necessary, to make intergovernmental relations more effective

External Support
⇒ Funding for joint programs allowing communication and agreement planning (e.g. Community to Community Forums)
⇒ Ensure provincial and federal legislation or treaty negotiations do not prohibit or diminish opportunities for agreements
GOVERNMENT TO GOVERNMENT LINKAGES: 
Ideas and Opportunities

SPECIAL MEETINGS

Vision Objectives: Special meetings between First Nations and local government Councils can assist in providing the political directions necessary in developing intergovernmental relations. Continuing initial projects, such as Community to Community Forum events, with regular meetings can provide the time for specific projects, such as MOUs or joint economic initiatives, to be worked out. Relationships also require time to develop – meeting in person is the best way to accomplish this. Evolving into joint Council and increased joint activity at other levels, e.g. school boards’ sessions can be goals.

Benefits
Key benefits in holding special meetings between First Nations and local government officials is the ability to communicate and exchange ideas while developing relationships. Barriers are broken down through face-to-face meetings, and commitment is made to the process by assigning time to the events.

Barriers
Barriers to holding special meetings are based on the challenges of time in a busy world. Committing time for special meetings is difficult when both governments have increasing responsibilities and decreasing time availability.

Actions – Short-Term
- Initiate dialogue with the context of a specific program (e.g. Community to Community Forum)
- Establish staff-to-staff relationships to assist in carrying through with events
- Assign liaison people, at elected and staff level
- Establish commitment of a certain number of events within a year

Actions – Long-Term
- Make Council-to-Council meetings part of yearly work cycle
- Increased involvement in other formal local government/First Nations activity (e.g. conventions, larger events)
- Joint lobbying may result from ongoing dialogue on key issues of interest

External Support
- Federal and provincial government funding for meetings and workshops
- Treaty negotiations must encourage local government-First Nations discussions
GOVERNMENT TO GOVERNMENT LINKAGES: Ideas and Opportunities

IMPROVING EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

Vision Objectives: Public pressure for the effective use of public funds, be it those supporting First Nations communities or local governments, is increasing, resulting in a need for accountability, efficiency and effectiveness in delivering services. First Nations and local governments, often serving closely associated communities, will depend on partnering and collaborating to reduce costs while maintaining service levels.

Benefits
Effective intergovernmental relations allows for increased efficiency and effectiveness in governance generally. Eliminating hurdles to local control over decision-making and service delivery is a way to increase effectiveness as well. Increased trust and openness in First Nations-local government relations improves governance generally which has direct benefits for all community residents.

Barriers
Barriers to improving effectiveness could be issues relating to capacity and opportunity for joint projects. Enhanced self-government for First Nations is necessary before effective joint servicing of communities can be established, although in the interim servicing agreements can assist. Effective dispute resolution is necessary, and legislation to provide for joint projects may be needed.

Actions – Short-Term
⇒ Solicit UBCM assistance
⇒ Begin cooperation immediately
⇒ Training, education, capacity building
⇒ Focus on community needs, not egos and political positions
⇒ Honesty, trust and respect needs attention
⇒ Increase opportunities for cross-cultural sharing

Actions – Long-Term
⇒ Begin streamlining service delivery generally
⇒ Increase local control (to local government and First Nations government)
⇒ Establish effective servicing agreements
⇒ Return to the basic programs of government
⇒ Increase local provision of services
⇒ Consider formal roles/relationships between local governments and First Nations

External Support
⇒ Continue public involvement in treaty negotiations and reconciliation processes
Participant input from morning discussion session:
Vision Objectives, Benefits and Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>regular formal and informal communication</strong></td>
<td>✴ to earn about how each group functions, their abilities and their limitations</td>
<td>✴ willingness to participate, time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>mutual respect, and cooperation integrate FN into regional district</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>✴ lack of respect, paternalistic attitudes of town council; opposed to development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>open and improved communication</strong></td>
<td>✴ a whole complete community, turning negative to positive</td>
<td>✴ industrial driven, make money and get out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **gov’t communication** | ✴ want self sufficiency | ✴ loss of benefits in surrounding community  
✴ local city councils blockading reserve future |
| **stop ignoring each other** | ✴ building blocks to responsibility | ✴ funding for storefront information to define perceived market |
| **development of local gov’t and FN partnerships** | ✴ increased understanding and increase tailoring to unique circumstances | |
| **establish linkages between staff and education** | ✴ may eliminate court cases regarding consultations | |
| **time & attention to governance** | ✴ grasping the concept and laws of jurisdiction | ✴ trust and respect needs fostering |
## 2. MOUs AND PROTOCOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protocol between FN and RD</td>
<td>⇒ address fears in the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gov’t to gov’t relationship between FN and local gov’t</td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ legislative framework prevents FN to be integrated as members of regional districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establish protocol for communication between administrations</td>
<td>⇒ enable administrations to deal with each other on a regular basis-each feels free to contact the other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN representation at a district level</td>
<td>⇒ increased exchange of info and an increased mutual understanding</td>
<td>⇒ provincial legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutual recognition</td>
<td>⇒ promote understanding</td>
<td>⇒ communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establish inter-governmental working group</td>
<td>⇒ promote understanding</td>
<td>⇒ staffing capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3. SPECIAL MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>forum on a regional basis and regional districts</td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ FN are stretched to the limit and can’t attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regularly scheduled meetings with FN and local gov’t</td>
<td>⇒ opportunity to define and integrate expectations</td>
<td>⇒ bureaucracy on both sides of negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meetings to share past experiences</td>
<td>⇒ new TAC groups &amp; FN exchange history</td>
<td>⇒ time seems to be a rare commodity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>council to council dinner meetings</td>
<td>⇒ buy-in from parties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dinner meetings/overcoming assumptions</td>
<td>⇒ breaking down barriers</td>
<td>⇒ prejudice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. EXAMPLES OF JOINT PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katzie-invite community groups, UBC field school or exchange students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| FN and local gov’t joint capital project and planning before and during treaties | ⇧ lower costs, higher efficiencies | ⇧ Provincial and federal policies do not always encourage local gov’t and FN joint projects  
|  |  | ⇧ No local understanding by fed/prov bureaucracy |
| no duplication | ⇧ facilities need to be common to all, no wasting money competing | ⇧ segregationist thinking, fear of new solutions |

### 5. IN Volvement of Other Governments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>joint lobbying to other levels of gov’t or other institution (banks)</td>
<td>⇧ Increased influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| local gov’t recognition as an equal partner as defined in the local gov’t act |  | ⇧ FN capacity, FN governance style undefined  
|  |  | ⇧ treaty making is impeding progress on a daily business  
|  |  | ⇧ IMs and TRMs everyone hesitant to set precedent |
### 1. COMMUNICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Short-Term Actions</th>
<th>Long-Term Actions</th>
<th>Actions By Other Gov’ts &amp; Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>staff-to-staff</strong></td>
<td>➞ lending staff/job shadowing</td>
<td>➞ see short-term list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➞ material exchanges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>attaining goals set today (at event)</strong></td>
<td>➞ MOU and Agendas</td>
<td>➞ learning and growing together</td>
<td>➞ dispute resolution guidelines, with support by Ministries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>establish relationships now</strong></td>
<td>➞ build trust between communities</td>
<td>➞ develop a formal linkage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>improve communications</strong></td>
<td>➞ presentations with FN on local gov’t and vice versa</td>
<td>➞ pursue the education of people</td>
<td>➞ change local gov’t act to provide more opportunity for partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>communication</strong></td>
<td>➞ forums and other opportunities for dialogue</td>
<td>➞ need to take the “high road” at times to circumnavigate potential conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➞ create synergy, not negativity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>relationship building</strong></td>
<td>➞ community feast</td>
<td>➞ focus on people, not gov’ts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>improve communication and understanding</strong></td>
<td>➞ tours for FN of local gov’t process</td>
<td>➞ ongoing relationship should be formalized</td>
<td>➞ involvement by other gov’t - facilitation role only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➞ local gov’t tours of FN community</td>
<td>➞ also informal e.g. invitations to significant community events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>need for both informal and formal relationships</strong></td>
<td>➞ build interpersonal relationships</td>
<td>➞ community to community level dialogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➞ ground up to leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. JOINT MEETINGS OR FORMAL EVENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Short-Term Actions</th>
<th>Long-Term Actions</th>
<th>Actions By Other Gov’ts &amp; Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>relationships between school boards, health councils, etc.</td>
<td>regular meetings&lt;br&gt;build trust through variety of ways</td>
<td>quarterly meetings (Council to Council)&lt;br&gt;develop framework for formalized communications, linkages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joint Council</td>
<td>sit on hospital Boards, etc.&lt;br&gt;joint council of council meetings&lt;br&gt;communicate on governance issues&lt;br&gt;capacity building projects</td>
<td>see short-term list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sponsor community-based events</td>
<td>cross cultural events, education&lt;br&gt;community events to increase participation&lt;br&gt;engage our constituents i.e. increased attention to FN history in school curriculum</td>
<td>see short-term list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 3. Improving Efficiency and Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Short-Term Actions</th>
<th>Long-Term Actions</th>
<th>Actions By Other Gov’ts &amp; Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eliminate the many hurdles to doing things locally</td>
<td>⇒ solicit assistance of UBCM</td>
<td>⇒ change and streamline red tape</td>
<td>⇒ speed up response to quality of life needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ cooperate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partnering</td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ economic development</td>
<td>⇒ include some of these long-term elements in treaties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ political lobbying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ environmental protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>streamline services</td>
<td>⇒ training</td>
<td>⇒ more powers to local gov’ts</td>
<td>⇒ get endorsement by UBCM, federal and provincial gov’ts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase transparency and trust</td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ joint gov’t to gov’t protocols</td>
<td>⇒ maintain public involvement in treaty negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seamless community FN and local gov’t</td>
<td>⇒ don’t wait for treaties to be completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>return to original concept of government being “good guidance”</td>
<td>⇒ remove egos from objectives</td>
<td>⇒ municipal servicing agreements</td>
<td>⇒ possible Regional District involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ observers seat, voting seat or liaison person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reconcile FN self-gov’t issues recognize the inevitability of this</td>
<td>⇒ honesty, trust, respect</td>
<td>⇒ public schools provide more balanced curriculum re: FN history etc. to all students</td>
<td>⇒ federal and provincial gov’ts must support local connections, not undermine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ greater cross-cultural understanding between all communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding directly to FN</td>
<td>⇒ spend money way from INAC, HRDC</td>
<td>⇒ service provided by local people</td>
<td>⇒ not a cookie cutter approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4. COOPERATION AND CAPACITY BUILDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Objectives</th>
<th>Short-Term Actions</th>
<th>Long-Term Actions</th>
<th>Actions By Other Gov’ts &amp; Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>capacity building achieve full participation</strong></td>
<td>⇒ joint venture</td>
<td>⇒ education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ individuals taking training (fire fighting, road construction, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ MOUs in place that will help develop capacity · job shadowing (e.g. McLeod Lake)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>understanding and improved cooperation</strong></td>
<td>⇒ recognition of limited responsibility</td>
<td>⇒ more opportunity to education youth about treaty process and FN culture/history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>progress of any sort between local gov’t and FN gov’t</strong></td>
<td>⇒ dialogue</td>
<td>⇒ trust conceives action</td>
<td>⇒ establish MOUs for guidance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSIONS

The Toolkit

Analysis of the input from participants at the conference reveals many common objectives and visions for the future. Some of the ideas generated clearly reflect the origins of the suggestion, some more from a local government perspective than a First Nation perspective, and vice versa. Given that participants were given the difficult task of identifying specific actions to achieve their objectives, the range and volume of ideas generated is impressive.

Economic development was the topic area that received the most attention from participants and generated the most ideas. This attention to economic development underscores the many common interests neighbouring communities have, in this case an interest in increasing employment and opportunities for investment in their regions. This topic area was closely linked to discussions on natural resource management.

Within the four topic areas (economic development, natural resource management, land use and servicing, and government linkages) improving communication and the importance of education were dominant themes. Local government and First Nation leaders recognized that their governments are still learning how to approach and work with one another. To accomplish this, new communication channels need to be developed and a willingness to learn about each other must be present. Public education, through schools and by governments, was also emphasized as an essential element in building knowledge and trust.

Participants focused frequently on formal ways of linking First Nations governments and local governments. Mechanisms identified included representation on regional district boards and/or in regional processes, and the development of Memorandums of Understanding and Protocols on Communication and Cooperation.

An interest in joint planning in all topic areas was also a dominant theme, although it was noted that this does not replace the need for communities to plan for their individual needs. The most commonly cited reason for undertaking joint planning was that it provides an opportunity for the sharing of ideas (including community needs and aspirations) and expertise. It also provides an opportunity to create a regional perspective on issues, which builds on those of a local nature.

The vast majority of short- and long-term actions that were generated are joint ones. The benefits of undertaking joint actions were clearly articulated by participants. Participants were able to see beyond any current conflicts that may occur to a period when, as a result of building strong working relationships through processes like the Community to Community Forum, resolution to issues will be found.

Participants also identified barriers to working together more effectively. The most common barrier to achieving the objectives of increased collaborative action in relation to the four themes of the Forum was the lack of human and financial resources. Local government and First Nations
government representatives recognized that key ingredients for relationship building are time and commitment, and noted that the lack of time and expertise for dealing with their common issues is an on-going barrier.

With respect to short- and long-term actions that could be undertaken to achieve their objectives and visions for the future, participants generated a long list of concrete and achievable ideas. Some of the ideas for action generated by participants could be easily achieved now, whereas others would require substantive changes to current structures and processes. Even though many local governments and First Nations are still in the early stages of building their relationship, many of the actions listed would require a well developed working relationship. This clearly indicates a sense of optimism that if an effective working relationship is not already present, it would be developed relatively quickly through jointly pursuing short- and long-term goals.

When asked what kinds of support are needed from other governments or agencies to achieve the goals, there were two common answers. Firstly, most local government and First Nations leaders felt that most solutions pertaining to the four topic areas needed to be generated locally, with little or no federal or provincial government involvement. Secondly, it was felt the most significant contribution the provincial and federal governments could make would be the provision of financial support for local initiatives, since lack of human and financial resources are the most common barriers. The need for better communication with the federal and provincial governments was also frequently noted.

The Conference

The process involved in this Community to Community Forum is as important as the products. It is the process that allowed personal relationships to be formed or strengthened, familiarity with each other’s perspectives and issues to be gained, and an opportunity to dispel some misconceptions or assumptions and draw new conclusions about how to work together.

During the final plenary session, the comment was made that the spirit of cooperation apparent at this conference demonstrated the progress made since the 1997 Community to Community Forum. Participants felt the atmosphere was considerably more relaxed than at the first meeting and that this allowed for a more open and honest exchange of ideas and viewpoints.
RECOMMENDATIONS

This list of key recommendations from the conference has been assembled from:

- Report-back summaries from each of the small group discussions
- Final plenary session
- Participant evaluations of the conference

These recommendations pertain to relationship building and ideas for future conferences.

1. Key Recommendations for Local Government-First Nation Relationship Building

- Create as many opportunities as possible to meet face to face to allow identification of issues of common concern and community driven solutions
- Actively pursue education and training activities between governments
- Consider differing perspectives, e.g. in resource use, governance structures
- Work to change legislation impacting local governments and Indian Bands where it creates barriers to effective working relationships
- Jointly pursue public-private partnerships as cost-effective ways of developing infrastructure and services
- Participate in joint planning processes
- “One size does not fit all” – there is no one way to build relationships because the history and local context in each case will be different
- Continue to explore ways of linking decision-making bodies
- Hold regional forums including through the UBCM/FNS Community to Community Forum program
- Pursue local control of resources, e.g. forest resources
- Look to joint tourism as a key focus for joint projects
- Begin planning within a framework of community sustainability
- Actively oppose racism – undertake education programs
- Be preventative where disputes are concerned and develop dispute resolution mechanisms to be used when all else fails and, above all, don’t go to court
2. **Recommendations for Future Conferences**

- Extend conference to one and a half days to allow more time for discussion and more focus on individual topic areas
- Work towards an equal number of First Nation and local government representatives to ensure balance of ideas and advice
- Hold event in First Nation community
- Provide agenda and other conference information in advance
- Schedule more unstructured time for free-flowing discussions

3. **Recommendations for Topics for Future Regional and Province-Wide Forums**

- Differences between urban and rural, large and small communities
- Information and topics for Indian Bands that are not in the treaty process
- Development of First Nations governance models
- Education on the treaty process for municipal and regional district staff and for school children
- Provide examples of good and bad treaty negotiations
- More information about how First Nations governments operate
- More case studies
- More success stories
- More information specifically on servicing agreements
- More education on constitutional and BC Consultation processes
- Cultural information sessions at the beginning of the conference
- Follow-up on the short-term goals and implementation processes discussed at meetings
- Learning to meet with First Nations and partnering in business development
- Working and partnering with Indian Affairs Department
- Information on sharing natural resources
- More time allotted for asking question within the plenary sessions
- Provide examples of working memorandums of understanding and contacts
- Private and public partnerships; lack of funding issues
- First Nations involvement in Land and Resource Management Planning processes
- Municipalities and First Nations: contributions, support and competition
- Provide maps showing regional districts
- Ombudsman and other dispute resolution ideas
- Education on dealing with racist attitudes
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Good morning everyone. As Jim said, my name is Kathryn Teneese and I’m one of the three members of the executive of the First Nations Summit. And I’m here on behalf of my colleagues, Gerald Wesley and Bill Wilson and I will be acting with Jim as co-chair to help move discussions ahead today.

I’d like to begin by thanking Robert for the opening prayer and also welcome everyone who could be here today. I also want to take this time to acknowledge the Coast Salish people, on whose lands we are meeting, and thank them for the opportunity to use their place. As a representative of the First Nations Summit Task Group, I welcome my First Nations colleagues and representatives of local governments who have gathered from throughout British Columbia.

Our meeting today marks the first time we have formally met as a group since 1997 in this forward-looking forum. We are gathered here to discuss important issues of mutual concern and our joint objective is to build new relationships and strengthen old relationships in order to build stronger links between local governments and First Nations in British Columbia.

In the time I’ve been allotted for my opening comments, there really isn’t adequate time to discuss activities that are affecting First Nations, particularly around the treaty process. But I will say that there continue to be many challenges facing the treaty process today. Aboriginal peoples in British Columbia are faced with building and negotiating a new relationship with the Federal and British Columbia governments after a history of well over 125 years of other interests and other priorities being paramount. This reality and the status quo that has resulted have created multiple layers of complexity to the negotiation equation. It’s taking longer than we thought to work through the situation. However, I remain optimistic. For along with the challenges, we also have a series of important opportunities. Our forum today is to focus on how these opportunities relate to the future relationship between First Nations and local governments. As the treaty process evolves, and aboriginal self-government becomes a reality, there will be many opportunities for us to seek ways to work together to maximize efficiencies and to learn and benefit from one another. I say this because, while public opinion and support for the treaty negotiations varies around the province and within political parties, there are some self-evident realities.

First Nations peoples desire to have control over their own lives. Like everyone else in British Columbia, First Nations also want an adequate standard of living, decent healthcare, culturally
appropriate education for our children, a vibrant and diversified local economy, a healthy and sustainable environment, and reduced unemployment. The general goals we hope to achieve through political negotiations match the goals of most other British Columbians and local governments also. In order to meet our goals, we will need to include our neighbours. This task begins with building new relationships as this process takes place over time. Our task is large, for each First Nation is unique with a distinctive history, culture and geography. Similarly, local government organizations also reflect a great amount of diversity. We can make progress if we commit to continue to seek ways to work together. I look forward to the work we have ahead of us today, and in the future, and I hope that you share my sense of optimism.

So what we have in front of us today are some examples of things that have worked. But I also want to remind us that there are some areas in this province that are experiencing difficulties in terms of their relationship. While we are not going to talk about those today, I think we need to be very cognizant of the fact that the discussions we have here hopefully can help us avoid some of the difficulties that are taking place in parts of the province between First Nations and local governments. But I look forward to the work that we’ve outlined for ourselves today and I hope that we will all come away from the day having learned something new that’s going to help us do the work that we have in front of us. I’d now like to call on Jim for his opening comments.
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First I’d like to say how pleased I am to see all of you here at this Community to Community Joint Forum. This event is both significant and important. It is significant because it sends a strong message that we in this room and those we represent, are committed to building relationships between our communities and our governments. We acknowledge that there are relationships between neighbouring First Nations and local governments in this province that have run into difficulties, and we have some recent examples, such as in Nanaimo and Burns Lake that attest to that fact.

We can’t and shouldn’t deny these examples exist. They illustrate the need to continue to find ways to resolve our differences and build understanding. I think fundamentally that is what we are here for at this conference. We recognize that cooperative government to government relationships at the local level bring direct economic, social and environmental benefits for all of us.

As I said, not only is this a significant event, it is also important because it allows us to continue the work of building our relationships by pooling our experience. Our discussions give us an important opportunity to exchange ideas and better understand each others perspectives. Also important are the products we hope to generate as a group, which I will focus on in a moment.

As many of you know, this is the second time UBCM and the First Nations Summit have worked together to organize an event of this kind. The Community to Community Joint Forum in January 1997, which some of you attended, was the start of our partnership aimed at improving intergovernmental relationships. One of the legacies from that event was the recommendation that this work continue at the local level.

Over the last two years, with funding provided by both the federal and provincial governments, UBCM has administered a regional Community to Community Forum program. Through it, about ten events have already taken place and another fifteen have been sponsored.

Many of you will be able to share the lessons learned from your own forums in today’s session. This has been a very successful program, and one of the recommendations coming out of today’s session may be that it be continued.

As I mentioned at the outset, we have a very full agenda and I’ll take a few minutes now to discuss the plan for the day.

You’ll see from this flowchart (see page 4) that the majority of our time today will be spent on hearing from each other, through five case study presentations and two small group discussions, one in the morning and one in the afternoon.
The first small group discussion that will start in a few minutes, asks you at your table to create a vision for local government-First Nation relationships. In other words, you’ll be identifying WHAT you want to achieve and WHY. There are four topic areas you’ll be focusing on when talking about improving relationships. These four areas are:

1. Economic Development
2. Service Delivery and Land Use Coordination
3. Natural Resource Management
4. Government to Government Linkages

The case studies we will hear about today have been chosen to provide examples of First Nation-local government partnerships in these same four topic areas.

The afternoon small group discussions are when you’ll continue the work you started this morning.

This afternoon we’re asking you to identify the “tools” you already use and could use in the future to improve the effectiveness of our relationships. This is really answering HOW you think the vision or objectives you discussed in the morning’s session could be achieved.

The final Plenary Session at the end of the afternoon will then provide us with the opportunity to do two things:

1. Share the results of our discussions and in doing so build a toolkit of ideas and actions that we can use in our individual communities, and
2. Generate key recommendations for action from this conference

These key recommendations, directed at ourselves, at other levels of government and the organizations that represent us, will create a framework for continuing partnerships.

We’re asking you to bring forward what you believe are critical steps you or others could be taking that will facilitate more effective working relationships in the short- and long-terms.

Also on our agenda we are pleased to have the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs, the Honourable Robert Nault, who will be here at about 11:30 to provide his welcome.

I would like to personally thank each one of our sponsors, the Government of Canada, the Government of BC, BC Hydro and the Municipal Finance Authority for their generous support for this conference.

Thanks also to each of you for taking time out of your busy schedules to be here and be part of this opportunity to shape the future of local government-First Nation relationships.

Ultimately I believe that is what we are all doing. And with that in mind I invite you to sit forward, not back in your chairs and really take hold of this opportunity we have today. I’d also encourage you as we have with all of our speakers, to learn from what has not worked, as well as what has proved successful when creating cooperative and effective partnerships between yourselves as neighbours.

I’m asking you to dig deep for your best ideas and actively share your experience with those around your table.

With that said, I’d like now to lead you right into the first small group discussion.
Thank you to the Union of British Columbia Municipalities and the First Nations Summit for inviting me to join you today.

I am very pleased to be here and would like to take this opportunity to recognize the important work you have done and continue to do to help build better relationships between First Nations and their neighbours.

Canada is pleased to support the Community to Community Forum, as we recognize that important initiatives like this provide an opportunity to demonstrate cooperation, as well as help identify shared interests and establish common objectives between First Nation and local government leaders.

I am pleased to learn that the response to the initiative has been good and that interest has been very high.

Thanks to your efforts, we are building strong relationships between First Nation communities, expanding understanding, fostering trust and creating an environment that can lead to mutually beneficial partnerships and enhanced economic opportunities.

So, congratulations to all of you for your fine work.

In many ways, I think we can all learn a great deal from the approaches you are developing here in BC. You have clearly recognized that far more can be achieved by working together than apart; that there are many more things which unite us than divide us; and that at the end of the day, it’s really all about building opportunity.

Today I would like to share a few thoughts about how we can help to build opportunity with First Nations right across the country.

Notice I said “with” First Nations and not “for” First Nations. The truth is that governments have tried being the generator of economic activity in Aboriginal communities for too long and it just hasn’t worked.

If we’ve learned anything over the years, it is that the answer to building stronger Aboriginal communities does not lie in some government program, it lies in developing capacity within the Aboriginal communities themselves.

Part of that involves economic development, because there can be no social justice without economic justice – without a fair chance to become self-reliant.

Part of that involves strengthening governance, because that is what creates and sustains the conditions under which social and economic development is achieved.
And building opportunity means developing our north – by expanding the infrastructure that will knit its communities together and open its resources to sustainable development.

Let me just touch on each of these.

First, economic development.

Recent years have seen huge growth in First Nations’ businesses. In fact, the growth rate of Aboriginal entrepreneurship is twice the Canadian average. There are now over 22,000 Aboriginal businesses across the country.

Across Canada, there are more than 25,000 First Nation university and college graduates, providing the basis for a dynamic new business class.

Today, we see Aboriginal entrepreneurs developing new products, new services, new ideas and bringing them to market.

We also see non-Aboriginal business leaders discovering the enormous potential of Aboriginal people – not only as consumers and as markets, but also as partners and associates in joint ventures.

One thing is clear; economic development is not something that Aboriginal people are prepared to leave to others. It is something they are creating for themselves.

These positive changes must continue. Change that puts the tools of economic self-sufficiency into the hands of First Nations. Tools that will end the cycle of social assistance. Tools that will open new doors and end old practices.

Economic development means addressing the same challenges as any non-Aboriginal community would face: getting access to capital, gaining exposure to wider markets, ensuring the development of labour force skills and creating business-friendly communities.

Overcoming these challenges is the key to unlocking the potential in our Aboriginal communities. And these are the areas where all of us need to focus our efforts.

Economic development is vital if we are going to expand opportunities for First Nations. But we also know that unless that development is built on a foundation of sound and stable governance, we build on shifting sand.

I hear this again and again wherever I go. I hear it when I talk with Elders, with young people, with women. They want to talk about things like accountability, conflict of interest and good governance.

These are the priorities of First Nations – and they are my priorities.

There has been a lot of discussion about a new Governance Act. Let me just give you my perspective.

First, let’s dispel some rumours. This new Act will not replace treaties or treaty negotiations. It will not replace the Indian Act. And it will not implement self-government.

What it will do is provide First Nations operating under the Indian Act with the tools they need to exercise transparent, responsive and financially accountable governance.

The last major overhaul of the Indian Act was in 1951 – just fifty years ago. That was still a time of Indian Agents. They were phased out years ago, leaving Chief and Council to fend for themselves regarding proper administrative and financial practices.

As a result, procedures evolved without basic standards and without consistency throughout the country. At the same time, there are no guidelines on accountability between First Nations leaders and citizenship.

Good governance means an effective system of checks and balances. It means redress when there are wrongs. It means a clear understanding of everyone’s rights.

The bottom line is that First Nation people are entitled – more, they are demanding – effective,
accountable and responsive local government for their communities.

There is no hidden agenda, no secret, pre-determined outcome. I want genuine and extensive discussions – not only with the leadership, but also with First Nations people themselves.

And I want to keep it simple. If it stays simple, it will be very effective. If it gets cluttered and cumbersome, it will bog down.

Economic development, hand-in-hand with good governance, are two key components of our efforts to extend opportunity across this country.

The third element is the need to expand in our northern communities the basic infrastructure they need to be greater participants in the economic life of our country.

Just as the southern half of this country was opened by the construction of the railways, the time has come to expand the northern half to further sustainable development and economic progress.

I firmly believe that a long-term plan must be implemented, involving all levels of government, especially First Nations themselves. That plan must provide the roads, energy and telecommunication infrastructure which will make business development possible.

We know that there are vast, untapped resources just waiting to be explored. Developing them will contribute further to the national economy. It will boost exports. It will allow some isolated communities to interact, not only with one another, but with the rest of the world, opening up opportunities we can only imagine.

It will provide jobs and greater purpose to our northernmost citizens. And it will complete the nation-building begun by our forbears 134 years ago.

Then, and only then, can we truly say that the promise of Canada has been realized.

With your help, I am confident that we can do all of these things. We can promote economic development, we can establish good governance and we can open up the north.

The UBCM and First Nations Summit have key roles to play in helping us get there. I look forward to working with you as we build that future together.

In closing I would like to commend Jim Abram and others in the Union of BC Municipalities and the First Nations Summit for building on the good work accomplished to date and wish all of you every success as you work together to strengthen relations between First Nations and local government.

I am confident that, like previous forums, today’s joint, First Nation Summit and UBCM province-wide Forum will be a success and I am certain that, along with local government and First Nation leaders, Canada will benefit from the discussion that happens here today and in the future.
ORGANIZERS

The Union of BC Municipalities

Since 1905, the common interests of local governments in our province have been brought together by the Union of BC Municipalities.

UBCM is an association which represents the interests of municipalities and regional districts in the province. It works in three ways to meet the needs of its members:

- **Representation** of local government concerns to senior government;
- **Information and Assistance** to local government decision-makers;
- **Member Services** that can be best provided for on a cooperative basis.

Through its nineteen-member executive, comprised of mayors, councillors and regional district directors from communities throughout the province, UBCM works with both provincial and federal governments, in an effort to improve upon current legislation, regulations and funding arrangements.

The 2000 - 2001 UBCM Executive Table Officers are:

- **Director** Jim Abram, Comox-Strathcona Regional District, President
- **Chair** Hans Cunningham, Central Kootenay Regional District, First Vice President
- **Councillor** Patricia Wallace, Kamloops, Second Vice-President
- **Mayor** Frank Leonard, Saanich, Third Vice-President
- **Mayor** Steve Thorlakson, Fort St. John, Past President

The First Nations Summit

The First Nations Summit provides a forum for First Nations in British Columbia to address issues related to treaty negotiations. The Summit allows full and equal representation of all First Nations in BC without any preconditions that could affect the autonomy of each Nation.

The First Nations Summit has mandated the First Nations Task Group (who are Kathryn Teneese, Bill Wilson and Gerald Wesley) to act on its behalf. The Co-Chairs of the Summit are Justa Monk and Danny Watts.

In December 1990, First Nations and the federal and provincial governments established a BC Claims Task Force to recommend how the three parties could begin treaty negotiations and what those negotiations should include. On June 28, 1991, the BC Claims Task Force tabled their report with 19 recommendations, including the establishment of an independent BC Treaty Commission to facilitate the process of treaty negotiations. The recommendations were accepted by Canada, BC and the First Nations Summit.

The British Columbia treaty process began with the December, 1993, opening of the doors of the BC Treaty Commission. The first step in the process is the filing of a Statement of Intent to negotiate by the First Nations. Funding, in the form of loans and contributions, is in place for First Nations to prepare for and carry out negotiations. At the present time, forty-six First Nations are at various stages in the treaty negotiations process, ranging from readiness (Stage 2) to the Agreement in Principle (Stage 4).
SPONSORS

The Community to Community Joint Forum would not be possible without the generous support and assistance from the following organizations:

BC Hydro

Indian and Northern Affairs
Canada

Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs

Municipal Finance Authority