

BC ARCHAEOLOGY SURVEY 2016 – SUMMARY RESULTS

The 2016 BC Archaeology Survey was an effort to collect the opinions and priorities of those who participate in the study, stewardship, management, protection and promotion of heritage values in BC. It was designed to capture, and continue, the conversation about roles, issues and opportunities in heritage research and management in British Columbia.

It was completed by 209 professional archaeologists, Indigenous heritage managers, fieldworkers, researchers, cultural experts, municipal leaders and administrators, regulators, Aboriginal engagement workers, realtors, developers, museums specialists, archaeology educators and students. The survey was online between November 2016 and February 2017 and was open to anyone part of, or interacting with, the BC heritage management community. A huge thank you to everyone who responded to and shared the survey!

This document contains the summary data from the quantitative questions and individual answers to the long-form qualitative questions. A spreadsheet containing all individual answers is available at www.republicofarchaeology.ca/bcas2016. I encourage other uses of these results and the spreadsheet data, especially those that help to create a more equitable and relevant heritage management.



The BC Archaeology Survey 2016 by [Joanne Hammond](#) is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](#).
Based on a work at <http://republicofarchaeology.ca/bcas/>.

The survey citation is:

Hammond, Joanne, 2016. The BC Archaeology Survey. www.republicofarchaeology.ca/bcas2016

You can contact me by email: joanne@pacificheritage.ca

[Part 1. Summary data for short answer questions](#)

[Demographics and career](#)

[Challenges in CRM](#)

[Regulatory Matters](#)

[The Heritage Conservation Act](#)

[Money Matters](#)

[Aboriginal Interests and Consultation](#)

[Aboriginal Participation in the Heritage Industry](#)

[Heritage Policy](#)

[Public Outreach and Education](#)

[Part 2. Individual data for long answers questions](#)

[16. Would you support a licensing system under a Professional Archaeology Act?](#)

[24. If you think the costs of archaeology should be subsidized, please briefly describe what a fair and sustainable funding source might be.](#)

[39. In terms of archaeology, what is the most important way that CRM can support the principles of UNDRIP and TRC calls to action?](#)

[56. What is the most important thing you think the public should know BC archaeology](#)

[57. One last chance: is there anything you'd like to say about BC CRM?](#)

1. Summary data for short answer questions

Demographics and career

1. How old are you?

16.7 %	19-29 years
55.5%	30-49 years
27.3%	50-79 years
0.5%	80 years or older

2. What's your gender?

54.4%	Male
45.1%	Female
0.5%	Other

3. Do you identify as an Aboriginal person (First Nations, Inuit or Métis)?

13%	Yes
87%	No

4. Describe your relationship with CRM archaeology:

47.1%	Employed in CRM as an archaeologist or related (GIS, lab tech)
9.1%	Employed by a First Nation organization as an archaeologist or related
3.4%	Employed by a First Nation administration (admin, politics, referrals officer etc)
2.4%	Employed by regulatory agency as an archaeologist or related
3.8%	Employed in another industry that interacts regularly with archaeology (e.g. engineering, forestry, utilities, municipal office)
4.8%	Employed in another cultural resource field (e.g. museum, art)
10.6%	Employed by a post-secondary institution
8.2%	Student of archaeology, anthropology, First Nations studies or related
4.3%	Not employed in archaeology
6.3%	Other

5. How long have you been in the CRM business (or interacting with it)?

27.5%	Less than 5 years
-------	-------------------

20.6%	6-10 years
32.4%	11-20 years
9.8%	20-30 years
9.8%	More than 30 years

6. How would you describe your position?

66%	Full time employee
8.8%	Part time employee
3.6%	Temporary employee
8.8%	Contract based (dependent contractor)
12.9%	Self-employed (business owner)

CRM Challenges

7. What do you think are the greatest challenges facing CRM archaeology in British Columbia? Check all that apply. (NOTE: percentages reflect the number of respondents who chose that option)

63.5%	Provincial regulatory system lacking resources to fulfill obligations
63.5%	Lack of understanding of archaeology and CRM by the public and industry
60.6%	Heritage Conservation Act not adequately enforced
50.5%	Insufficient respect and care for First Nations' cultural inheritance
48.6%	Insufficient role(s) for First Nations in regulatory systems
46.6%	Provincial regulatory system too focused on clearance of land for development purposes
41.3%	Heritage Conservation Act not adapted to contemporary rights and business environments
39.9%	Provincial regulatory system lacking a strong, transparent and publicly sanctioned mandate
38.9%	Lack of an accessible, central digital repository for archaeological data
32.7%	Lack of federal heritage legislation
14.4%	Other

8. Of the challenges you checked above, which is the ONE thing that would make the biggest difference for you if it was improved? Mark only one.

15.8%	Lack of understanding of archaeology and CRM by the public and industry Lack of federal heritage legislation
13.9%	Provincial regulatory system lacking resources to fulfill obligations
11.5%	Heritage Conservation Act not adequately enforced
11%	Insufficient role(s) for First Nations in regulatory systems
9.6%	Insufficient respect and care for First Nations' cultural inheritance
8.6%	Provincial regulatory system lacking a strong, transparent and publicly sanctioned mandate
7.7%	Heritage Conservation Act not adapted to contemporary rights and business environments
7.2%	Provincial regulatory system too focused on clearance of land for development purposes
7.2%	Lack of an accessible, central digital repository for archaeological data
5.3%	Other
2.4%	Lack of federal heritage legislation

Regulatory Matters

At the moment, responsibility for decisions relating to regulatory archaeology (that is, business-driven resource management) rests with the Archaeology Branch, Ministry of Forests, Lands, and Natural Resource Operations (MFLNRO), with some responsibility handled by the BC Oil and Gas Commission (OGC). These questions are about what archaeology's regulators are, and can be.

9. What do you think the primary role of the Archaeology Branch, MFLNRO, should be?

39.8%	Managing sites for preservation
27.2%	Managing site data and inventory
13.6%	Managing sites for cultural/scientific research
10.2%	Other
9.2%	Managing sites for development clearance

10. At the moment, is the Archaeology Branch effectively managing sites for preservation?

6.7%	Yes
69.7%	No
23.6%	Not sure

11. At the moment, is the Archaeology Branch effectively managing sites for development clearance?

41.1%	Yes
36.2%	No
22.7%	Not sure

12. At the moment, is the Archaeology Branch effectively managing sites for scientific/cultural research?

13.5%	Yes
64.4%	No
22.1%	Not sure

13. At the moment, is the Archaeology Branch effectively managing site data and inventory?

19.7%	Yes
62%	No
18.3%	Not sure

14. In the future, how you like to see regulatory archaeology managed?

42.4%	By a joint BC government-First Nations regulator
21.7%	By the Archaeology Branch, MFLNRO, in regional offices (e.g. Fort St John, Prince Rupert, Kamloops)
12.8%	By the Archaeology Branch, MFLNRO, in Victoria
9.9%	By regional First Nations regulators established for this express purpose
8.4%	Other
3.4%	By archaeology project officers working within relevant ministries or agencies (e.g. MoTI, OGC)
1.5%	By a First Nations regulator established for this purpose

In the past, a Professional Archaeology Act has been proposed to regulate archaeologists under an annual licensing system rather than permitting. This would entail a strictly enforced code of conduct and standards embodied in a professional act, including responsibilities for consultation with Aboriginal groups. It would eliminate individual location permits for inspections (AIAs) but would retain permitting and oversight for investigations (i.e. excavations or larger research projects). The resources of the

Archaeology Branch, MFLNRO, could be focused on inventory and data control, and compliance and enforcement of the HCA.

15. Would you support a licensing system under a Professional Archaeology Act?
- | | |
|-------|---|
| 12.4% | Yes |
| 49% | Yes, if the Act is developed cooperatively with the archaeology community and First Nations |
| 14.4% | Yes, with other conditions (please explain) |
| 14.9% | No (please explain) |

16. If you answered "Yes, with conditions" or "No" above, please explain:

[SEE PART 2 FOR ANSWERS](#)

The Heritage Conservation Act

17. What are your biggest concerns with the HCA? Check all that apply. (NOTE: percentages reflect the number of respondents who chose that option)

- | | |
|-------|---|
| 62.2% | Lack of protection for intangible cultural heritage |
| 59.7% | Lack of automatic protection for post-1846 heritage |
| 58.2% | Characterization of Indigenous burial places as archaeological sites (giving authority for their care to archaeologists rather than inheriting communities) |
| 53.7% | Lack of decision-making power to First Nation inheritor communities |
| 20.9% | Other |
| 12.4% | The Section 12 permitting system (please explain) |
| 11.4% | The Section 14 permitting system (please explain) |

18. Would you support redrafting of the HCA to address some of these issues?

- | | |
|-------|----------|
| 86.4% | Yes |
| 5.8% | No |
| 7.8% | Not sure |

19. Would you participate in community-wide consultation regarding redrafting of the HCA (e.g. forums, questionnaires, committee work)?

- | | |
|-------|----------|
| 84.1% | Yes |
| 2.9% | No |
| 13% | Not sure |

Money Matters

20. Who do you think should pay for archaeology, when research is the primary goal?

19.4%	Government
32%	Researcher, their institution or employer
26.7%	Academic research grants
1.5%	Private sector (corporate) funding
20.4%	Other

21. Who do you think should pay for archaeology, when development is the primary goal?

6.3%	Government
74.4%	Development proponent
0%	Academic research grants
10.6%	Private sector (corporate) funding
0%	Local First Nations community
8.7%	Other

22. Who do you think should pay for archaeology, when residential building is the primary goal?

23.6%	Government
55.3%	Development proponent (homebuilder)
0%	Academic research grants
1.4%	Private sector (corporate) funding
0%	Local First Nations community
19.7%	Other

23. The costs of archaeology should be subsidized for: (check all that apply).

80.7%	homeowners/homebuilders
43.7%	small business
10.2%	big business
73.1%	First Nations CRM on reserve
14.7%	Other

24. If you think the costs of archaeology should be subsidized, please briefly describe what a fair and sustainable funding source might be.

[SEE PART 2 FOR ANSWERS](#)

25. At the moment there are no fees for HCA permits in BC. Choose the answer below that best describes your position on this issue:

- 37.9% All permits should be free
- 21.2% All permits should cost money
- 26.8% CRM permits should cost money
- 1% Research permits should cost money
- 13.1% Other

26. At the moment there are no fines levied under the HCA for site damage without a conviction under statute. Some jurisdictions use fines ('provincial violation tickets') instead of criminal prosecution. Would you support fines rather than prosecution for unauthorized damages to sites?

- 52% Yes, if a company damages a site they should be fined
- 7.4% Yes, if an individual damages a site they should be fined
- 12.3% No, no one should be fined unless they are convicted of an offense
- 28.4% Other

At the moment, the Archaeology Branch, MFLNRO, accepts funding from Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI) for a dedicated project officer to manage files related to transportation. The following questions relate to this:

27. A funded position like MoTI's is fair and reasonable.

- 62.5% Yes
- 14.9% No
- 22.6% Not sure

28. The branch should allow other funded positions for industry-specific project officers (e.g. forestry, mining).

- 66.8% Agree
- 11.1% Disagree
- 22.1% Not sure

29. The branch should allow funded positions to manage or represent Aboriginal interests (e.g. through UBCIC or regional organizations like Coastal First Nations).

- 67.8% Agree
- 10.1% Disagree
- 22.1% Not sure

Aboriginal interests and consultation

Recent BC case law has created a new legal reality around consultation required for Aboriginal title lands (e.g. the Tsilhqot'in decision). Central to this is the notion of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) by First Nations for potential impacts to rights and title. At the moment, provincial consultation on matters related to archaeological management is the responsibility of the Archaeology Branch, MFLNRO. Archaeological consultants often engage with local First Nations but are not required to do so.

30. Describe your understanding of how free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) applies to CRM archaeology: Check all that apply. (NOTE: percentages reflect the number of respondents who chose that option)

61.9%	All parties have some responsibility for seeking FPIC
43.1%	The development proponent is responsible for seeking FPIC
37.1%	The Archaeology Branch is responsible for seeking FPIC
33.7%	The archaeological consultant is responsible for seeking FPIC
23.3%	First Nations are responsible for engaging in FPIC discussions
3%	There is no need to seek FPIC for CRM archaeology

31. In your experience, how effective is the Archaeology Branch at Aboriginal consultation?

2%	Very effective
62%	Somewhat effective
36%	Not at all effective

32. In your experience, how effective are consulting archaeologists at Aboriginal consultation?

14.3%	Very effective
75.9%	Somewhat effective
9.9%	Not at all effective

33. Who do you think should be responsible for consultation on archaeological projects?

16.9%	Archaeology Branch, MFLNRO
27.9%	The archaeological consultants doing the work
26.4%	The proponents driving the development or research
6.5%	Representatives of the Ministry of Aboriginal Relations and Reconciliation (MARR)
22.4%	Other

First Nations often find engagement with the Branch to be difficult due to restrictive timelines, costs of engagement, and differences in opinion regarding scope of projects. Respond to the following statements:

34. First Nations should be offered funding by the Archaeology Branch to engage on all applications/amendments.

42.1%	Agree
25.4%	Disagree
32.5%	Not sure

35. First Nations should be offered funding by the development proponents to engage on specific applications/amendments.

58.9%	Agree
15.8%	Disagree
25.4%	Not sure

36. The scope of consultation and funding expectations should be mutually negotiated with regulators and proponents, based on the kind of permit or project.

63.3%	Agree
13.5%	Disagree
23.2%	Not sure

37. Engagement could be improved by the addition of dedicated Aboriginal engagement staff within the Branch.

76.9%	Agree
8.7%	Disagree
14.4%	Not sure

The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) articulates peoples' rights to their cultural, historical and archaeological heritage and the need for consultation and reparations for damages. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) of Canada calls for action by governments and businesses to enact UNDRIP.

38. In terms of archaeology, whose responsibility is it to implement UNDRIP and the TRC calls to action? Check all that apply. (NOTE: percentages reflect the number of respondents who chose that option).

80.2%	Federal government
72%	Provincial government
59.4%	Regulators (Archaeology Branch, OGC)
52.7%	Municipal government

48.3%	First Nations
44%	Archaeological consulting companies
42%	Professional organization (BCAPA)
39.6%	Development proponents
12.1%	other
3.4%	No one, UNDRIP and TRC have little to do with archaeology

39. In terms of archaeology, what is the most important way that CRM can support the principles of UNDRIP and TRC calls to action?

[SEE PART 2 FOR ANSWERS](#)

Aboriginal participation in the heritage industry

40. How important is it to include First Nations field crews on projects?

2.4%	1 Not important at all
2.4%	2
10%	3 Somewhat important
19.6%	4
65.6%	5 Very important

41. What is the main reason to have First Nations crews on field projects? Check all that apply.
(NOTE: percentages reflect the number of respondents who chose that option).

87.5%	Representation from descendent communities
27.4%	Labour
88.9%	Local/traditional knowledge
39.9%	As a condition of proponent/community agreement
4.3%	Everyone does it
1.4%	None, there is no reason
14.4%	Other

42. How important is it to include First Nations administrators/politicians in decision-making for field projects?

2.4%	1 Not important at all
5.3%	2
22.1%	3 Somewhat important
19.2%	4

51% 5 Very important

43. What is the main reason to include First Nations administrators/politicians in decision- making for field projects? Check all that apply. Check all that apply. (NOTE: percentages reflect the number of respondents who chose that option).

- 83.7% Good heritage governance
- 53.4% Good business practice
- 50.5% It's a matter of courtesy
- 7% None, there is no reason
- 16.3% Other

Many First Nations organizations have developed heritage policies based on a combination of traditional and western legal concepts. The following questions relate to this.

44. When initiating work in a new territory, do you seek out Indigenous heritage policies that may apply to your work?

- 3.2% 1 Never
- 5.3% 2 Sometimes
- 19.7% 3 Often
- 71.8% 4 Always

45. When working in a territory where a First Nations heritage permit applies, how often would you say you obtain one?

- 2.8% 1 Never
- 4% 2 Sometimes
- 16.5% 3 Often
- 76.7% 4 Always

Many First Nations people make a living as archaeological field technicians. Often, the lack of documentation of experience, formal training, and continuity of employment prevents capable people from being recognized as heritage practitioners, and can stall career growth. These next questions apply to CRM archaeologists, managers, or First Nations fieldworkers. Please skip ahead if they do not apply to you.

46. If you are a CRM archaeologist, manager, or First Nations fieldworker, would you consider participating in an apprenticeship program that would lead to professional accreditation for archaeological technicians?

- 89.4% Yes
- 4.4% No
- 6.3% Not sure

47. If you are a CRM archaeologist or manager, or First Nations administrator, would you consider supporting an accredited technician apprenticeship program by participating in documentation, on-the-job-training, and/or mentorship roles?

92.5%	Yes
2.5%	No
5.0%	Not sure

Heritage Policy

Thinking about provincial heritage policy and Indigenous heritage policies you may have encountered, answer the following questions about policy outcomes.

48. In your experience, does following Indigenous policy ever compromise the scientific standards of your work?

41.7%	1 Never
33.2%	2 Sometimes
23.5%	3 Often
1.6%	4 Always

49. In your experience, does following Indigenous policy ever compromise your ethical standards (or those of professional organizations of which you are a member)?

55.6%	1 Never
27.3%	2 Sometimes
15%	3 Often
2.1%	4 Always

50. In your experience, does following Indigenous policy ever conflict with the wishes of neighbouring First Nations?

11.7%	1 Never
50.8%	2 Sometimes
34.1%	3 Often
3.4%	4 Always

51. In your experience, does following BC Archaeology Branch policy ever compromise the scientific standards of your work?

26.9%	1 Never
35.7%	2 Sometimes
32.4%	3 Often

4.9% 4 Always

52. In your experience, does following BC Archaeology Branch policy ever compromise your ethical standards (or those of professional organizations of which you are a member)?

25.8% 1 Never

40.7% 2 Sometimes

26.9% 3 Often

6.6% 4 Always

53. In your experience, does following BC Archaeology Branch policy ever conflict with the wishes of First Nations?

2.1% 1 Never

26.7% 2 Sometimes

62% 3 Often

9.1% 4 Always

Public outreach and education

54. How important do you think it is that the public understands about archaeology in BC?

0.5% 1 Not important at all

1.4% 2

6.2% 3 Somewhat important

15.3% 4

76.6% 5 Very important

55. How often do you participate in public outreach about archaeology (including media, on your own or through your job)?

9.8% 1 Never

19.1% 2

29.4% 3 Sometimes

18.1% 4

23.5% 5 Often (at least once every month or two)

56. What is the most important thing you think the public should know BC archaeology?

[SEE PART 2 FOR ANSWERS](#)

57. One last chance: is there anything you'd like to say about BC CRM?

[SEE PART 2 FOR ANSWERS](#)

2. Long-answer questions

The answers in this section are presented as submitted, I have not edited except to remove overtly personal information, and I am definitely not responsible for grammar and typos.

16. Would you support a licensing system under a Professional Archaeology Act? If you answered "Yes, with conditions" or "No" above, please explain:

- it is inappropriate for anyone but a designated government agent to consult with First Nations, and the onus should not be put on the archaeologist. Collaboration with First Nations is a different and effective approach, but consultation by a proponent or professional is simply unacceptable.
- If it could be set up for success it is a great idea. If it is just put over to the professional association, same issues will persist, which are issues of under-resourcing. Who will police if someone doesn't send out their 30 day notification (as required), and what will be the recourse?
- If the Act is developed with First Nations input
- At present BC Archaeologists have no understanding of what a professional status is and the legal obligations of that status. Also at present the branch does not maintain objectivity (I have seen permit holders approved with less than two weeks experience in BC because they have friends in the branch and seen other people with 5 years experience get rejected because they were not favoured by the project officer, despite having the requirements). While neither approval is incorrect in must be consistent.
- Yes, a thousand times Yes.....just like every other professional obligation like engineers and biologists. If we can trust people to keep bridges standing up, I'm sure we'll find a way for professional archaeologists to do there job
- Stricter membership criteria, more sophisticated administration of the professional association, and more accountability for professionals to each other, indigenous peoples, clients, and the public are needed. The current CRM community is woefully underprepared for the level of self-regulation needed to make a licensing system work.
- Who would regulate the annual licensing? How do you propose to police that the code is enforced? I do like the idea of MFLNRO having more time to focus on inventory/data and HCA enforcement, but the annual licensing sounds like a nightmare. (Also - Who isn't already consulting with FN?)
- Archaeologists should be permitted to work in their own area of interest, where they can develop a speciality for a certain region over time. Having archaeologists jumping all over the province under blanket permits (MOTI) does not work for proper archaeology to be done. When an archaeologist is doing work in an area they have never been and may not return, some details and background knowledge is lost and certain details or information is lost, sometimes forever.
- If the licensing system were developed with the archaeological community and enforced/administered by an independent professional association (e.g. a college of professional archaeologists).
- also need First Nations participation
- Emphatically, yes! Professionals should be held against professional standards and it's been a long term goal of the BCAPA to implement a system like this.
- The bureaucratic potential of this is overwhelming. Creation of licensing standards marginalizes too many people who want or should be involved. It creates an elite group (see BCAPA) which marginalizes others.
- The people of the nation that resource belongs to should have a say as to who is working /managing their resources they are inherently responsible for.
- All FN do not have capacity and specific education to regulate archaeologists.
- I agree that the Act should be developed in conjunction with the Archaeology Community and First Nations. In addition, I firmly disagree with any notion that existing "Permit Holder" and "Field Directors" should be somehow grandfathered in to any new Act. An objective set of minimum requirements for holding a licence

must developed cooperatively with the Archaeology Branch, First Nations, and the archaeology community, and once those requirements have been established individual archaeologists can apply for a licence.

- Self regulating agencies can be difficult for outside parties to file complaints and have issues addressed.
- Yes, with very strict professional qualifications
- This would essentially negate the ability of the Archaeology Branch to manage archaeological resources either by preservation or by record. Allowing consultants whose income relies on the alteration of sites in some way, shape or form seems like an inherent conflict of interest.
- Local First Nations are less likely to be adequately engaged.
- Only if the competence of the archaeologists is vastly improved by better education and collaboration with First Nations
- developed cooperatively with First Nations, not necessarily archaeologists because they are often divided and sometimes don't have the best interest of the profession or site at heart. Additionally, I'm concerned that by eliminating individual location permits it wouldn't be possible to know what work was happening where, what reports were due when, etc. I expect the Archaeology Branch will have track the work and it will have to be reported on so am not sure how this helps with data or workload management. Instead, this seems like a way to stop "bad actors" from continuing to work (which doesn't bother me).
- I'd be very concerned about the small size of the community and how a "College of Archaeologists" would self regulate given it is somewhat incestuous, so to speak. With, say, Nurses or Engineers there are thousands of practitioners and arms length discipline and regulation is possible. No doubt the permitting process could be streamlined and the "small works" thing could be a good idea but I don't trust a small community who drink together and went to school together and so on to regulate each other. Mind you, the branch has been ineffective at keeping out incompetent practitioners as well.
- Academic and non-development related applied archaeology needs to be given weight under such a scheme, not just crm archaeology
- I have concerns about adequate first nations consultation if individual location permits for AIAs were eliminated, and also concerns about self-regulation.
- A rigorous system would need to be developed to keep track on what was done, were artifacts have been deposited etc... There are problems as it is with tracking some of this and that could get worse with a licensing system.
- In support of a licensing system, provided that the individuals within the overseeing body (BCAPA?) are not bias to colleagues, classmates or friends.
- Only if there is a real review of applicants and consequences. There is a lot of bad work being done by fringe consultants and it makes the industry look bad.
- The crux will be defining and enforcing the code of conduct. Generally, CRM archaeologists in BC are entrusted with too much responsibility too soon considering the relative levels of education, training, and internship, compared to other parts of the world (e.g., the UK).
- A worry would be the regulations of methodology and personnel under a new act.
- We have seen numerous problems in the consulting community with archaeologists from other areas parachuting in without the specific regional knowledge necessary to do a good job. This also sounds like it might lead to a two-tiered kind of hierarchy that could stall people's careers.
- Licensing lends to cookie cutter approaches to archaeology and reduce the ability to develop innovative solutions to complex problems.
- How is this ever going to work for a non-renewable resource in an industry with limited oversight and bid-tender system that encourages reduced costs and works loads. (Unlike medical doctors, archaeologists will never hear their patients scream.)
- The act must be developed only by professional practioners
- Only if Archaeology Branch and First Nations have capacity to review and respond to the results of the work prior to development.
- A similar style has been proposed in many other provinces and jurisdictions without success. I like the idea, but I don't believe it's achievable or realistic. I think a system like this works for engineers as they are a huge group that can be nationally regulated and monitored. I don't think it would work for a small group of BC CRM archaeologists.
- Give more money to the branch, make regional offices so each permit gets an actual look at.

- If it is developed with input from professional archaeologists actively working in CRM, AND does not risk creating the problems Ontario has encountered with their version of this system. In Ontario, companies have overloaded people with licenses, and then terminated their employment without giving them the ability to complete the licensing requirements. Such people can no longer apply for licenses and therefore cannot work as archaeologists. If BC moves to a licensing system, it needs to be linked to the company, as well as the individual, so that the company cannot overload individuals and itself would be sanctioned if it did.
- It is common for Branch review of AIAs to identify fieldwork shortfalls that lead to discovery of extant new sites. Archaeologists are regularly pressured by clients to do minimal (sometimes insufficient) work during AIAs, but Branch can insist on appropriate and statistically relevant levels of pedestrian survey, testing, analysis and reporting.
- I believe permit-holding status archaeologists need to hold a Master's degree with relevant experience to gain their status. The scale of the permits held over time will increase in complexity... i.e. a first time permit holder wouldn't be approved for a very large industrial project, such as a major pipeline. I do believe we need a stronger professional organization than our current one-. However, I don't think new legislation to issue licenses is appropriate--particularly as an alternate to the current permitting legislation. I see these as separate issues.
- Licensing would not provide enough regulatory oversight.
- Community is too small to effectively self-police
- it would be difficult/impossible to enforce; (2) BC is large and diverse; archaeologist should have experience/knowledge of the region, not only AIAs in general; (3) thin edge of the wedge: very quickly we would see firms/companies being granted a blanket license-- and there would be no way to control quality of their work;
- I've worked under such systems in Europe and did not find them to be effective.
- Needs to partner with RPA for more universal standards
- Developed in free, prior and informed consent with First Nations and a strict adherence to a professional code of ethics.
- Certifying individuals as opposed to reviewing projects would have the effect of making projects more difficult to track and control.
- Consequences for breach of standards were significant to deter complacency and to ensure high standards.
- Public input needed as well
- Archeologists would be hired by RFP
- Ontario operates under a legislated licensing system similar to the one envisioned above. Despite having such a program the province has still needed to maintain a "location-based" system with respect to individual projects. Although not called a permitting system, these Project Information Forms are still subject to approval by the ministry in much the same way permits are subject to approval by the Arch Branch in BC. The license terms and conditions are still administered by the Province as no arms-length professional body has the resources to manage this program. Essentially, Ontario maintains both permits and licenses and is responsible for both. If a licensing system were to be introduced in BC it would still require enforcement of "conducts and standards".
- A key factor will remain enforcement of the terms of licensing and breaches thereto. Who will enforce? What are the penalties and under which jurisdiction can they be prosecuted? No question has been raised of alternate forms of resources such as like the carbon tax we employ at the provincial level a crm tax to go to a trust to manage funding of pfrs, aias, et al.
- Develop cooperatively with Indigenous groups and archaeology committee, would want to ensure strong enforcement of standards if there is no permitting for inspections. Where would resources to oversee the Professional archaeologists come from ? If professional body similar to RPF, it would have to be funded somehow.
- I don't think this works effectively in Ontario, don't want to see BC adopt it
- Provisional on passing an exam. Republic of Ireland has such a system.
- Licensing hasn't enhanced resource protection in other jurisdictions.
- The AIA is self regulating adequately
- Has been a failure in other provinces. Entails a lot of pitfalls like repository, regulation, standards maintenance, etc. BCAPA too small to self regulate, self regulation in other sectors by and large a failure in

BC. Better to get the Branch on its feet financially and professionally than trying to create something new out of very thin air.

- Ontario has a licensing system that requires project specific information forms to be submitted for regulatory purposes. I think it works better than BCs current system.
- The current system works fine although there could be greater coordination between BCAPA and the Branch.
- The problem of doing away with permits (onerous though they most definitely are) is the obligation to complete and properly report any projects. Even with the permit system, there are numerous permit obligations unfulfilled. I believe this is because: 1) there is no political will to chase anyone down due to cost and accusations of impacting people's livelihood; 2) the Arch Branch doesn't have the funding to consistently chase down permit infractions; 3) FLNRO Compliance and Enforcement and the RCMP don't know what they're doing when it comes to cultural heritage, and they always think there's something more important to deal with (which would be less of a problem if there was public pressure). I think permits are important because it provides a way to track the obligations of an individual archaeologist. I can't give a solid answer to this question without asking who would police the licensees?
- I have 22 years of experience, and much of that was obtained when I worked for a FN govt. At the time when I obtained a large portion of my experience (1995-2005), the Province and Industry and the FN I worked for had a 'deal' in place of some sort (I do not know all of the details), however, within that milieu, our work was done under the guidance and direction of the FN, with input from some Professional archaeologists, as well as foresters. We worked within the provincial system to a degree, but the FN guidelines came first. My role as the head archaeologist and manager was to ensure that the directives of my employer were followed, along with addressing the needs of AIA style reports. In addition, I was required to deal with industry, who wanted the bare minimum of reporting, and as my employer agreed to this, this is what we did. Our work was ground breaking, and I have deep expertise in working within that region in terms of archaeology, FN liaison with regards to field methods development to identify cultural/archaeological sites and their interrelationship (medicinal plant communities hunting, fishing areas in relationship to archaeological sites as defined by BC and as defined by the FNs). With all of this, I have not been able to field direct in BC - not on the islands or anywhere else in the province. I have tried on two occasions, and even made a complaint to the BC Ombudsman, but it fell on def ears. The Branch is so concerned with reflecting the values of a small group of BCAPA archs , as well as the consulting firms themselves, who want to hold their position that they do not really look at the real breadth of the credentials that one brings to these positions. After having raised my two children and taken a MA, I am in a good position to take a management position again, and especially with my professional background as well, in this current political / developmental climate, however, the Branch will not move, and continue to simply say I do not meet their guidelines. This is deeply wrong, and degrades my work, research, and overall 'value' as a professional archaeologist, surveyor, and cultural liaison. The application to hold a permit or be a field director must be more flexible to accommodate a variety of experience that is important to the discipline - which is being re-defined by deeper connections to FN cultures. Whoever is making those decisions needs to be more flexible, and much better work will come out of a system that recognizes real expertise in a broader range than merely how many hours you have spent digging into a site that should not be dug into in the first place, for example. If we need someone with specific experience, we write this into applications, and we bring that person in. Saying that one cannot hold a permit or field direct due to the parameters currently in place degrades the profession, and does not let it evolve as it should in these times.
- Rather than a full permit, perhaps an alternative is a restructure to the extent of the permit application - a smaller scale permit application for inspections rather than eliminating it entirely to reduce paperwork but still work to protect the landscape before work is done (although my overall experience with this area is limited). Although I agree that a simpler system is necessary.
- "There needs to be a body responsible for quality control to ensure that proper science is being undertaken and all information from sites are being documented and secured in a digital and physical form. This would involve the establishment of regional repositories that are subject to inspection under well defined guidelines. Archaeologists need to be asking the right questions and collecting leading edge data. This is often not done.

24. If you think the costs of archaeology should be subsidized, please briefly describe what a fair and sustainable funding source might be.

- Apply through the provincial and possibly federal government.
- "Federally funded through INAC, annual contributions that are invested in a fund that has the opportunity to grow (like a scholarship or bursary); and a board made up of regional folks from the archaeology community who look at proposals to support. NOT available for corporations and developers.
- Alternatively or additionally, if a grant was available to every private property owner; it could be scaled to property size and archaeological potential, expected site type etc..
- Also, having archaeological work as a corporate or personal tax write off would provide an incentive to undertake/contribute funds to the work."
- Government, or maybe some research-funding agencies (granted there is some participation of university sector perhaps)
- permit fees for big business
- Provincial (ministry) and federal (heritage) grants
- Proceeds of tariffs levied against violators of the HCA, combined with provincial tax dollars. If archaeological sites are truly a public resource worthy of protection (regardless of individuals' feelings towards it), the public should be funding that protection.
- It is not unreasonable to charge a fee for the permit. To make this permit fee fair it would be expected the Archaeology Branch to have quicker turn around time. Fee could be between 200-500 depending on the size.
- municipal taxes, provincial royalties.
- Municipal taxes
- Proceeds from tariffs levied for contravention of the HCA and tax dollars pertaining to the managing and maintenance of public resources.
- Seeing as the archaeology sector is primarily driven by industry (forestry, transportation) they should be contributing a percentage to help with the preservation of BC's Heritage as a whole, not just their area of intent. Currently only the areas that are intended to be disturbed are investigated, and the picture as a whole is getting left out, so we are getting bits and pieces of the whole cultural heritage management picture across the province.
- I'm honestly not certain, but maybe there could be tax credits/breaks/incentives or something along those lines
- The Federal and Provincial governments should provide CRM funding to First Nations
- Taxes on big incomes
- It would be great to see some governmental funding pool to apply for so that further aspects of research could be applied for your particular HRM project. This wouldn't be like (we will subsidize the costs of everyone of your projects); however, if firms or sole proprietors could apply for a research fund of say \$10,000 or \$25,000 to contribute something scholarly out of their datasets they recover I think it would go a long way to build that bridge between academia and professional archaeology.
- Taxation to create a trust fund!
- 25%First nations, 25% provincial gov,25% federal government 25% developer/researcher.
- I'm not entirely sure. I think the most fair way would be from a research grant and engage professional archaeologists to do something with the results besides letting the data sit in CRM reports
- The regional government. On reserve could be first nations bands and off reserve, provincial govt.
- Permitting could be a revenue generating item like they do in Alberta. only issue would be blanket permits but a per project fee could be done as part of the application process with regulatory (ie oil and gas)
- INAC should fund FN CRM on reserve. Federal taxes should be the main source.
- A government tax as part of mitigation process on large scale developments. First Nations must also start committing and budgeting for archaeology if the bands are serious about protecting these culturally significant resources.

- First and foremost, enforcement of the HCA should result in the imposition of fines for non-compliance. These fines should be pooled into a fund for subsidizing the costs of archaeology. In addition, HCA permits for CRM work should have a fee attached, and this money should also be added to the pool.
- Property taxes are collected by all municipalities and a portion of those funds could be allocated to heritage. Set rates for consultants and workers could be established so costs do not run high and the work goes to the lowest bidder.
- credit to royalties / stumpage, recognized in appraisals
- Province of BC Lottery revenues
- "in my opinion, there should be two streams of revenue to support this funding. 1) When a large scale private or industrial development requires significant alteration of a site or sites, in addition to the concurrent studies conducted under permit, a percentage of the profit could also be included (a development tax).
- 2) Consultants that conduct this work (concurrent studies under alteration permits) could also contribute a percentage of their profit margin. "
- Federal government to provide funding for on reserve arch
- given that archaeology is typically in conflict with land and resource development but can benefit these same agencies if conducted intelligently (ie not just to get the artifacts out of the way), they are logical funding sources. If archaeological heritage was better promoted to society at large, it is also a logical funding source, being the commons
- taxes. We all benefit from archaeology, we all should share the costs when they are too much for one individual (not business projects / developments, but to help homeowners and encourage reporting)
- Development costs
- Tax of e.g. 1/2% on all development and use of same to resolve archaeological conflicts without penalizing any one "client" or developer.
- Split 75/25 with the developer paying the majority share. Government funding could be generated by enforcing the HCA's fine structure.
- Corporate taxation; income tax
- Taxation dollars specific to archaeology and/or a sliding scale based on income or profits of business or FN
- If a proponent wants to work in such areas they must have to pay accordingly, in a phased process.
- tax on development, also partly through HCA permits per the following....
- This should be an area in which provincial and federal funding is made available as part of economic budgeting.
- BC gaming income
- general tax. This is a non renewable resource.
- Should be set up as a tax credit were the more you earn, the less you would receive back. People whose incomes place them under the poverty line should receive 100%
- Smaller fees paid by all developers via building permit system or similar.
- Unknown at this time.
- If large companies (ie mining, forestry, etc) had to pay a small fee with every archaeological project they had to undertake for their industry, this fee could be compiled and used to subsidize smaller projects for individuals, First Nations, and small business owners who didn't know what they were getting in to.
- HCA enforcement Fines (ha)
- Additional tax assessed on all property purchases province-wide, which contribute to a pool of funds that regional offices can administer to accredited and approved CRM experts who have the appropriate level of education, and regional-specific supervised and evaluated experience.
- Caveats should be made for small scale stakeholders (ie, home/property owners) when archaeological resources are determined to be under threat. Rising costs in resource mitigation is largely outside the purview of individual home/property owners, as opposed to big business.
- Federal Gov; INAC
- BC Lottery, tourism grants, parks and recreation federal funding
- I think that municipal taxes should be used to subsidize CRM for homeowners who are building on or subdividing their own property. ie: no subsidies for professional property developers.
- "Realty tax (a pool to cover unexpected heritage costs for homeowners)

- INAC funding to be used by each band to fund various projects beyond the 'minimum' required - to be decided upon by each involved FN.
- Government/museum funding to be used for archaeology - both research and development driven projects.
- In the UK, archaeology is NOT the financial responsibility of the property owner, and people are far more likely to report finds, support excavations, and generally be much more accommodating - In Canada I see that the financial burden creates problems including (but not limited to): not reporting sites, outright racism, financial problems. etc.
- In Germany, homeowners/developers are expected to pay 10% of the archaeological bill. Local government pays the rest."
- Heritage tax incorporated into (already very low) corporate tax schedule; big business could also receive some funding for large mitigation projects.
- Provincial and Federal Government agencies.
- A percentage of export oil/potash/lumber...
- Taxes.
- A CRM tax perhaps, provincial budget set aside for cultural resources.
- Award grants from a fund financed by private and government sources
- In the form of tax rebates,
- Pro-bono work should occur more regularly among more consulting firms.
- Tax revenue
- A tax from home purchases or as part of a small business tax to subsidize costs for small business.
- On reserve projects should be covered by the Federal government
- Make it a tax write off for large developments.
- Taxes - corporate and private. Or target tax, but this doesn't really happen does it? See how gas/transport taxes are shuffled into general revenue by gov't
- Home owners could apply for grants to help
- I favour a consumption tax - a 1/4 cent per litre of gas, or something similar. And/or something development-specific, like a small tax on development permits - building permits, cutting permits, exploration permits. We need to develop and maintain a fairly significant pool of money that can be used to subsidize archaeological work in certain circumstances and also contribute to public education efforts, data gap analysis and data related data collection. And better enforcement could yield fines which could also go into this fund.
- I don't believe construction companies, who build the vast majority of homes in BC, should be subsidized, but perhaps a private home-owner could be. Business should also not be subsidized (not even small ones, many of whom deliberately retain their "small business" label to avoid a higher tax bracket.
- Federal archaeological legislation/programs.
- The federal government should cover costs on reserve.
- Contributions from Prov, Feds, FNs into a pot supplemented with a portion of land transfer fees
- A percentage of archaeology costs on reserves to be covered by government.
- Real estate sales tax, property tax, proposed permit fees
- Provincial government
- large developers
- A small fee on any building permits should be levied to provide to fund subsidies.
- Monies coming from taxes that would normally be granted to the local First Nations Communities
- Tax on large development projects, paid into Govt trust fund.
- My first thought for a subsidy would be through a property transaction tax that is levied during property transfers. As I am not a policy person, I am not sure if this should be a flat rate, pro-rated for the value of a transfer, be a 100% user pay in/pay out, have a cap on how much work is paid for etc.
- government --- provincial or federal depending on jurisdiction
- A dedicated government funding pot, it's our job as tax payers to protect our cultural heritage
- I feel the cost for a minimum assessment should be cover (basic desktop review or in-field meeting/opinion letter by a professional archaeologist) for small sized developments. Not an aoa or AIA but a general idea of what could be coming down the pipe. This would introduce heritage to the preliminary design phase and

could add to the potential models. Tack on accessibility of that data and you add to the overall picture of BC archaeology. Possible source of funding could be from a percentage based permitting fee system ?? Fines for infractions ?? Rich uncle?? I don't have a solution for \$

- government and business
- This would have to, by default , come from the Province or the federal government.
- ideally somewhat government.
- A percentage of revenue from resource exploitation on or near first nations lands could be a start
- Research grants
- pay for HIP or SAP permits, actually enforce the HCA and fine people who are in contravention of it
- A heritage tax built into all building permits
- Full support
- general development tax for all development projects
- There should be a fee structure whereby proceeds from the fees go, in part, toward subsidies supplemented by crown funds.
- fees for permits could cover some of the costs
- Income tax break
- A flat rate (possibly standardized or with cost-effective research to determine appropriate cost of project) subsidized by the provincial government.
- lottery
- There is no clear explanation of what the actual costs of archeology are, do these costs also include recovery of annual professional fees, market share of available research?
- An allocation of both government and private sector (proponent-sourced) capital into a government administered fund based on a schedule of fees or penalties attached to CRM -premised work and infringements (mitigation/destruction of heritage sites resulting in higher fees).
- surcharge to property taxes
- A portion from municipal, private donations, provincial and federal funding could be pooled and provided as a grant based on a needs assessment.
- Permit application fees collected by: regional municipal districts, provincial and federal government
- restructuring of the already available money in the system
- "Government of Canada for Archaeology costs on Federal Indian Reserves.
- Government grants (provincial), distributed according to archaeologist's application recommending high provincial heritage value of the property
- Funds from the lotto program
- A grant system administered by local government as well as federal funding.
- Aboriginal affairs branch
- For CRM on reserve, federal funding through general revenue (e.g. federal income tax). For homeowners/homebuilders, provincial taxation on
- "Fund established with seed money from Province (taxpayers) and then maintained by a small fee on on all ground disturbing developments in the province, whether they impact a site or not.
- Individuals and small companies should have to meet basic criteria. They should have to provide detailed budget and \$ request for funding and also feedback on how the process worked for them.
- Not sure, but I think the current system is inherently flawed and all forms of alternate funding models should be considered.
- Infractions to the HCA should actually be fined (as they can be under the existing act) and that money should be kept aside and put towards those cases where people really need assistance and a site is in danger.
- Provincial taxation and Developer / development-based taxation
- Grants, tax cuts, government funding
- An annual budget from a government department to pay for all residential development and provide funding to larger urban centres to hire city archaeologists.
- Government subsidy for those with actual need. HCA violations should be fined and monies collected can be redistributed to subsidize those who apply for it and can demonstrate needed assistance.

- Carbon tax
- provincial and federal government - tax revenue
- a tax credit might work. For homeowners, property value could be affected by the discovery of an archaeological site and some way to offset that might help to discourage unauthorized impacts to sites.

39. In terms of archaeology, what is the most important way that CRM can support the principles of UNDRIP and TRC calls to action?

- Unbiased research and interpretations
- CRM can have higher standards of conduct within the BCAPA; and adopt the UNDRIP by adding provisions of practice; this can further be enacted through mandatory workshops undertaken by professionals required to maintain their professional designation. Professional members should further be required to demonstrate their proficiency in collaborative practice upholding the UNDRIP. Hold the federal, provincial, regional and municipal governments accountable. They are the regulatory agencies for which the developers have to operate under, and will only implement if forced. The HCA is regularly skirted, and developers willfully remain ignorant unless it is formally adopted into their practices (eg. forestry; even provides for the intangible sites). BCAPA members who demonstrate a willingness to manipulate the system to avoid principals of UNDRIP should lose their professional designation for 1 to 5 years depending on the offense(s) and be required to take cultural awareness workshops where able to with local/regional communities that provide them, and undertake certain amounts of archaeological volunteer time within FN communities followed up by providing joint awareness programs (technical and cultural) to proponents or community groups (the public) with a local first nations to be able to earn back their professional standing.
- Consultation, and appropriate long-term repository/repatriation protocols PRIOR to archaeological work
- professional code of conduct to not engage in projects which lack FPIC
- codify it in professional code of ethics
- Including First Nations in all aspects of CRM is imperative
- CRM archaeologists can work with affected First Nations and individuals on projects of their choosing, which will help to restore their connection to the lands and to the archaeology, funded by whichever government agency is ultimately deemed fiscally responsible for implementing UNDRIP and the TRC.
- Professional Organizations should be in support of it.
- By not taking on projects or holding permits for projects that First Nations have objected to; ideally, by only taking on projects when meaningful consultation with and involvement of First Nations takes place.
- Archaeologists collect data that can be used in the implementation of the policies mentioned above.
- View CRM as protecting the heritage of BC, not driven by industry who build profit from disturbing the land. The industry is driven by development, and therefore the only documentation and protection (or lack thereof) is done when a proponent wishes to disturb a land base. Allowing First Nations to take the lead and properly document sites, will ensure proper management prior to any disturbance plans take place. Should be a forethought, not an afterthought.
- Educate people and spread the word. Most have not heard of it.
- Consultation with/Involvement of First Nations more often than what we already do
- By clearly articulating the requirements for consultation to proponents early on, which would require a clear directive from the Provincial government and Arch Branch that consultation is a requirement and well-defined parameters of the level of consultation required.
- By consulting with adequate notice, and with transparency in regards to development plans, archaeological methods, results etc.
- Insisting upon FPIC as ethical mandate and refusing to work otherwise
- Having read through both the principles of UNDRIP and TRC calls to action, the most effective way in my opinion is to structure these items into federal and provincial legislation over heritage regulation. Applying UNDRIP and the TRC to an overhauled HCA could resolve many of the issues that we are currently not addressing.
- True collaboration with First Nations.

- Better initial engagement with communities prior to development. This can include discussing the HCA permit with communities while writing the permit before submission to the Archaeology Branch
- Accurate, quality driven fieldwork and reporting
- Respecting the nations and the people of which the resource belongs to
- Understand that the past is mixed with the present. The native knowledge holders need to be treated as experts on their own culture and stories. When discovering new digs, welcome interpretation from those in the region.
- By respectfully engaging First Nations with regards to sites and mitigation.
- Increase FN capacity through funding and training.
- By working closely with First Nations communities and keeping all parties involved informed of all actions within a project.
- Meaningful engagement on the scope and scale of CRM projects rather than the current regulatory status quo, which mandates notification only, with the Province having responsibility for consultation. Participation of First Nations communities in developing work plans, field work, analysis and reporting, and review and approval of archaeological reports. CRM companies should contract First Nations communities to produce sections of archaeological reports pertaining to cultural background (ethnography).
- consultation with local First Nations
- Increased consultation and giving First Nations legislative power around the protection of their heritage
- Arch Branch needs to engage in development of a new consultation process that includes time, training and funding for First Nations
- by understanding that archaeology is about evidence that leads to improved understanding, that it's not a gig and not about nice artifacts
- support regulatory requirement for engagement. If we don't support this, there will be some who don't do it and we need level playing fields. Additionally, by providing resources and training to First Nations as desired we can support First Nations in having meaningful consultation.
- There has to be clear communication of goals and results of projects, and there should be much more interpretive work done at a human scale e.g. "What this Awl Means" etc. A more humanistic approach vs ecological.
- By not engaging in any ground disturbing activities until the respective FNs are able to provide some sort of consent.
- Keeping high standards in regards to the accurate documentation of info from arch sites. Rights cannot be exercised without basic information related to the sites in question. This means appropriate field methodology, transparent reporting, and adequate documentation and recording of sites.
- meaningful consultation and equitable participation at all levels of a project, from proposal to repository (i.e. FPIC), using archaeology to incorporate indigenous language into reports and into geography (place names), by working for and in the best interests of FN, by abiding by FN policies, acknowledge the unceded traditional territory everywhere you work and repeat it in reports, use of indigenous repositories, educate everyone on the "real" history (residential schools, colonialism) including in reporting as well as public education.
- By being transparent and joint decision making.
- Move from simple consultation to engagement and First Nations control/say over the damage to/excavations concerning their own heritage.
- Open communication with descendent communities and adherence to our higher ethical standards.
- Active meaningful consultation collaboration and profit sharing
- With the creation of federal legislation. Province by province regulation has failed everyone.
- By documenting archaeological resources and contributing to the provincial database/inventory. 2) Encouraging the preservation of archaeological resources when/where applicable with non-essential development is proposed.
- Involvement of interested First Nations and building of capacity within them to evaluate and be involved in land development and use permitting.
- By making sure that we respect First Nations ideas and concerns about the use of their land
- by including First Nations in assessments (early) and incorporating their views into recommendations, interpretation and management approaches

- Indigenous representation and more thorough consultation in CRM: building capacity so Indigenous peoples can manage, protect and preserve their own heritage as CRM professionals.
- Incorporating UNDRIP and TRC recommendations into meaningful consultation, and acting on the results of consultation. Indigenizing archaeology to consider a more diverse recognition of what is a heritage site (e.g., blue camas gardens, culturally modified forests, etc.). Working with proponents to help navigate their responsibilities as colonizers.
- Engagement in consultation, and education in regulation, process and resource management. Raising awareness of the resource management process is key to any future growth of the CRM industry.
- Including First Nation communities in the dialogue surrounding CRM methodologies for proposed development projects in their territory at the planning stage, not just the execution phase.
- Education!
- Local collaboration combined with federal and provincial buy-in.
- Communication and consultation with First Nations.
- supporting FN repositories.
- Finding ways to integrate First Nations in project planning and the regulatory process.
- Not sure they can.
- I am opposed to implementing the above.
- Lobby governments, including First Nations, to talk and establish standards. Consultants do not have any power to regulate archaeological work, all they can do is advise and recommend where other parties are willing to listen.
- Supporting First Nations recommendations regarding their heritage, and refusing to participate without the support of the stakeholder Nations.
- Partner up with relevant First Nations on proposed developments from start to finish, listen - really listen - to their concerns regarding archaeological research and collaborate to address them, develop MOUs with First Nations communities to work collaboratively with communities over the long term (fill the regulatory void between what Nations require and what the Branch requires).
- By following guidelines established by government
- Include First Nations perspectives on heritage management protocols designed for archaeology and other cultural resources. Right now, in BC, we are really archaeological resource managers, not cultural resource managers, but I feel the HCA should extend to cultural heritage landscapes, etc.
- Support stronger and clearer heritage laws
- incorporate in a code of ethics and mandate a professional registry
- First nations should have involvement in the issuing of permits
- By agitating for change that sees these calls to action addressed in a manner that is not unduly punitive of business
- To follow the principles which will ultimately be crafted by government and industry. I don't believe CRM in BC can, or should, lead the way on this.
- Engage and invite participation - fund participation for field work.
- To reiterate ensure, preserve, and properly document Indigenous histories.
- Increased, more effective communication/consultation between all stakeholders, especially Branch-FNs- Archaeologists, along with Provincial will to prosecute contraventions of HCA.
- consultation
- Through professional code of conduct and bylaws
- Reading the reports and calls to action and making plans to discuss and implement with nations. Additionally, make this clear to proponents that this is how we do modern archaeology
- honest communication
- Meaningful First Nations involvement and regulatory oversight.
- CRM consultants are often at the forefront of the archaeology process and, as such, are in a position where they can be more up to date on the needs, requirements and expectations for meaningful engagement with First Nations. I would see that CRM would most effectively fit within a robust interconnected system to support these processes.
- recognition and respect; and capacity building through meaningful participation

- Making sure archaeology done FOR development isn't against FN wishes, and can also be used to further previously articulated and agreed upon FN goals for each band.
- Transparency and definition of roles
- education of consultants
- There has to be uniform political support for UNDRIP in Canada. I.e. at this point, not all premiers have agreed to adopt/support UNDRIP and are hmmm:ing about doing so. Until they do, nothing can move ahead. I also feel that education, education, education would help us greatly. Although some archaeologists and some First Nations members know what UNDRIP is, and have an opinion on how it can/should work, most of us don't. We need to learn more about it. In the past the UN has actually come out to run workshops about similar incentives and programs. That would help, I think. Heritage BC and BCMA need to run workshops. And include all of "us", not just the managers, but the GIS folks, the field techs, the students, the conservators and people like me, in these educational efforts.
- By making sure indigenous heritage is preserved to the highest extent possible. Ensuring all information gathered from any mitigation is shared, protected and preserved.
- Make clients and First Nations aware of these requirements
- Consultants need to engage in meaningful dialogue with First Nations with regards to respecting Aboriginal Rights and Title and perform their duties ethically without corporate and political mandates.
- walk the talk. decline projects that don't take First Nations into account, decline projects that run through a First Nations cemetery, remember that cultural heritage is finite and once it's gone, it's gone. No road or house development or sewer line is more important than cultural heritage.
- Amend the HCA in partnership with FNs
- Having provisions that require consultation with First Nations groups.
- helping enable capacity of First Nations to respond to development. This can be through funding and streamlining services and access to services for bands paid for by the government
- Adopt the relevant stipulations as part of the regulatory process.
- discussions with First Nations
- Include First Nations
- protection and preservation of cultural inheritance
- by doing unbiased work
- Respect the wishes of the native communities
- Support and advise initiatives at all levels of government. Even if not required to do so, archaeologists should attempt to incorporate these principles into their best practices and better communicate to clients the benefits of doing so.
- Ensure local indigenous consultation is taking place or heading toward impact and benefit agreements and then engaging local First Nation in the crm process, RISC training, fieldwork, GIS and report writing.
- Update HCA
- The crown must meaningfully engagement with Indigenous governments on changing legislation, policy and procedure.
- the only way to establish certainty is to obtain FPIC
- allowing First Nations people to manage their own heritage and supporting those decisions...also creating new understanding between communities and First nations people
- " ""It is an expression of the fundamental rights of Indigenous peoples around the world. It sets out the principles of partnership and mutual respect that should guide the relationship between states and Indigenous peoples. It provides ways to measure and assess the way states are respecting and implementing the rights of Indigenous peoples. "" (Assembly of First Nations)
- CRM can support the principles of UNDRIP and the TRC by aligning policy with these two affirmations. UNDRIP and the TRC can inform new/or amended CRM policy. "
- make aboriginal consultation an essential stage of our workflow
- Ensure automatic inclusion in the process and decision-making input
- Interpret FPIC as a right to a final veto
- Alerts with time limits through permitting

- Develop a more rigorous and formalized consultation process with First Nations prior to the commencement of field projects and provide updates on any significant results in a timely fashion prior to final reporting so that all parties have knowledge of any archaeological heritage and can provide input and direction before the project is complete.
- \$\$ will get in the way of doing this, just as they do now with CRM in general. Therefore, one important way is keeping costs down - rapidly escalating costs of archaeology are alienating developers who skirt the rules, and will also make it impossible for the province to make meaningful contributions to costs.
- Effective and extensive consultation for each and every project.
- All parties working (CRM, FN, Gov't, developers) collaboratively, doing the best job they possibly can.
- Archaeology must be more open and public. There needs to be much more information available to the public on what is being found and recorded with public tax dollars. When people ask me what I am doing, I tell them, but how many people know an archaeologist?
- Taking it seriously within their work, even if it 'slows down' or creates another 'loophole' to getting the work done - make sure economics and personal agendas do not override morals and human needs. Also working to build capacity and opportunity within First Nation communities, and CRM companies working to establish genuine and meaningful relationships with surrounding First Nations communities.
- Hire specialists in the Archaeology Branch to spearhead implementation
- Speak to the nation's whose land is involved in the action. Actually speak with them, engage with them.
- Documenting trad territory and demonstrating full extent of traditional use and patrimony
- Consult with involved FNs at the very beginning of a Project; develop project methods collaboratively with FNs; incorporate and follow FN heritage policies throughout project lifecycle; ensure FN participation at all stages from planning, fieldwork, and final reporting.
- By educating our clients and encouraging them to provide the funding, timelines and other support that would allow for meaningful consultation, engagement, assessment and mitigation efforts.

56. What is the most important thing you think the public should know BC archaeology?

- That is right here in BC.
- That it's not OK to destroy it through ignorance.
- That it's very closely intertwined with the places we live today - people aren't always aware that there has been human occupation for thousands of years before settlers arrived
- That it is a rich and diverse field of study
- That it is here and it is interesting and worth valuing.
- That it is illegal to collect archaeological artifacts and that indigenous cultural heritage is important to all Canadian communities
- BC Archaeology is not (only) about FN land claims or only the concern of First Nations, but is part of our shared cultural heritage. Unfortunately the current legislative environment encourages ignorance of archaeology through muddled policies and inappropriate screening tools, and those who wade through that quagmire are often thanked with extremely hefty bills. Given that there are no consequences to violations of the HCA, the system is silently encouraging developers and individuals to "make it go away".
- That it is a part of what makes us and it is not a renewable resource. That both First Nation and European archaeology is important.
- That archaeological sites exist in BC
- People need to understand the context of results. Someone needs to create a connection between material evidence found and the story of how they came to be there. Connect people now with people in the past. Show them the human element that is the reality of a "bunch of rocks"
- That it exists - and so does the HCA.
- The vastness of the distribution of mobile and semi-sedentary groups across the province and country and the great time-depth of occupation (in Canada and in BC).
- That BC has history (First Nations history), not just a colonial "recent" history
- It is protected

- That they have a responsibility for protecting and documenting archaeology in this province, whether they are business or private land owners. And ensuring they have the proper tools and knowledge to move forward with their plans in the very beginning stages of their work, not when they are submitting for various permits and the process has begun.
- The time depth and breadth of First Nations occupation of the province and, by extension, the degree to which our contemporary activities (including development) are always an imposition on that history.
- That archaeology isn't the bogie man show stopper. It's a great way to connect developments with local communities. If done correctly, it can great a large amount of goodwill toward a project.
- That we're not here to stop development, we want to support development! But we also want to make sure we're protecting and respecting BC's heritage
- Equally important: 1) that it exists, and 2) that there is legislation protecting it.
- Of it's existence... it's legal protection, it's importance in all our history, of why we have a 'user pay' model, it's living descendent.
- It is, like the rest of the province, co-owned with First Nations
- The role of professional archaeologists versus archaeological regulators and the reasons why archaeology is important. We are not here to take your fucking land - it's 2016, we need to be able to convey this properly.
- It is there, everywhere, often unseen, mostly unheralded & minus a champion.
- The value of studying the past.
- What we do benefit not just First Nations communities, but the province as a whole.
- That is actively on going
- Respecting the nations of which the resource belongs to.
- We're not looking for dinosaurs
- We live in a symposium of cultural integrity. We just need to remember that.
- That First Nations history is our collective history. the more people know about it the more they are invested in protection. Grass roots archaeology and public engagement only strengthens BC Archaeology.
- CRM supports development while looking to manage archaeological sites.
- That it is a vital, integral part of First Nations mitigation. Archaeology should be seen as a part of the environmental assessment that the general public agree should be conducted before developing. The true costs involved in archaeology and where that money is coming from. Consequences in violation of the HCA that are swift and absolute.
- Archaeological sites are protected by law, and collecting artifacts is illegal
- Archaeology and heritage should be protected because knowing the past can provide a strong foundation for healing and reconciliation.
- That most of the sites have already been destroyed and therefore what is left is extremely valuable. (arch consultants should know this as well. I don't think they all do.)
- that it is science not treasure hunting
- The public should be made aware of the antiquity of human occupation in the province and the locations of site should be made public
- That Heritage Resources are protected by law.
- The depth, diversity and interesting Indigenous history of BC
- the archaeological record
- it's exciting and doesn't belong to anyone person so let's all work together to protect it
- They need to know it is present and be aware to look for it. People should be aware of the different qualities of the archaeological finds they encounter.
- The importance of protecting cultural heritage.
- Why it is important
- That it is everywhere, that it is protected and that it can be framed as a good thing, or it could be, provided some basic sharing of the burden is taken by government vs piling up heavily on some people/developers and not piling at all on others.
- What is it

- That archaeological materials and features, whether recorded or not, are protected by provincial legislation, and that they should never be handled, altered or removed from where they are observed.
- We have over 10,000 years of history here. The actions and decisions of indigenous people in the past are fundamental to understanding BC today, including the basis of our wealth.
- the "real" history! plus some of the cool stuff that they like such as pretty objects with culturally appropriate interpretation
- How underfunded and understaffed the arc branch in Victoria is.
- Archaeological evidence is more important here because of the lack of treaty context, and it comprises their evidence of long-term occupation of their lands. Erasure of that is not simply following or meeting minimal regulatory requirements but participates in ongoing colonial practices to minimize First Nations presence and/or control of their lands. Archaeology also can serve their needs in the documentation of long-term heritage sites, and the presentation of that ancient heritage as such (rather than the governmental presentation of the Glenrose Cannery site as simply a "resource processing area").
- That the depth of the diversity of the history in this region is stunning.
- Important part of Canadian history huge timespan ubiquity of archaeological material. Also HCA when buying a property
- It is unique, fragile and protected. As citizen, we have an obligation to preserve it for future generations.
- That it is non-renewable. That development destroys sites forever and as we can't document every tiny aspect of every site any more than we can avoid developing our lands, we need to find a better standard. But to be honest, until we have over-come our colonial, racist views of First Nations, I really don't have much hope that people will see archaeology as anything more than a waste of time and money.
- Evidence of indigenous occupation in the province is literally everywhere and rumours/hearsay/modern myths of 'Indians' not being here or actively avoiding areas (e.g. the proponent's land/project area) is incorrect. Archaeological resources are often in our backyards and knowledge/acceptance of this needs to be more wide spread
- How it relates to current day policy and communities.
- That there is a lot of indigenous and historical archaeology all over our province, and that is an important part of everyone's heritage, and should not be collected for personal collections but allowed to stay where it is, or made accessible to everyone if it is not culturally insensitive to do so.
- protection status and why the preservation is important to all of BC
- The breadth and depth and diversity of the arch record in BC, and the state of the HCA
- The effect it might have on their proposed development
- Value and significance to Indigenous groups and the broader public.
- That indigenous history is an integral part of First Nations identity and a sense of community well-being. This is a shared responsibility, which doesn't diminish private property rights, but does require that we acknowledge the perpetuation of colonial legacy by the way we prioritize aspects of archaeology and diminish others—in particular human burials and cemeteries.
- Resource management is intrinsically complex, but the key component is recording and preservation of the resource to the best of our current ability (defined by HCA, current methodology and standard practices), in order to protect scientific understanding of our shared history; and should not be viewed as either a hinder to development; or as a political tool in modern agendas.
- The value of heritage information to First Nation communities and the scientific community. The system in place for mitigating damage to archaeological sites, how to identify sites and what to do once found.
- That is DOES APPLY TO YOU!
- That it's a non-renewable resource that will not automatically bankrupt your reno or stall your project.
- It is our history, both First Nations and original pioneers. More knowledge we have about our past is very valuable in our lives today.
- its everywhere.
- Archaeology is not all about Treaty Rights and First Nations peoples land title claims. It is about preserving the pre-history of British Columbia that remains in the landscape all around us. We are not the only province or country with archaeological standards to follow.
- People were EVERYWHERE before European contact and those traces are protected.

- It is important that they know that much of the past record has been destroyed and it is critical that what remains is preserved or rescued.
- Archaeology is not a show stopper. Archaeology is one way to address heritage resources that are protected under the HCA and to facilitate recommendations and requirements proposed by the archaeologist.
- Speaking with primary school students, high school students, and the public in general on a regular basis.
- What we do, why we do it, what the public gains from the work we do
- That it exists would be a good start.
- What it is, how it works, and how it benefits the public.
- Heritage sites are non-renewable
- It exists and archaeologists need to eat too.
- that the past may often be the key to our future - and also teach respect for cultural differences among Aboriginals and 'newcomers' - of whatever time period
- Importance of conservation
- The scale of the issue
- Aside from oral history, it is the only record of First Nations pre history
- It's relevant, topical, and records over 10,000 years of history. Many large, important sites are destroyed, simply because they are Aboriginal in origin, while minor sites from the recent wave of European immigrants are protected and even celebrated.
- value of history on the present
- The presence and complexity of indigenous history.
- That is important to everyone, not just FNs and scientists.
- That it is everywhere and that there are laws about it!
- That BC has a great deal of diverse archaeological history in the province.
- It is protected by law
- Heritage is alive and ongoing. BC was never ceded to the colonizer, so we must respect Indigenous ownership and control over their lands and heritage
- it's important to preserve the past, or at least an interpretation of it
- That there is a deep and rich archaeological record in BC predating European contact.
- What it is and the significance to telling the history of BC
- That archaeological knowledge and knowledge of the past is critical for everyone (not just "them Natives"), and for our collective future.
- That it is a shared heritage that we all have a responsibility for.
- It's super interesting. And it doesn't have to be an expensive impediment to development if you plan ahead. News stories focusing on costly CRM projects for "the poor homeowner" usually turn out to be the result of some poor decisions made early on.
- Understanding WHY it is important to leave (or report to an arch) artifacts that have been found, and to know that collection of all artifacts (known and unknown sites), or developing in a known site without a permit is illegal. These are the most common statements that I tell people, because they have absolutely no idea!!!
- Knowledge of the past informs current decisions and policies for the future
- First Nation peoples have been here for over 10 000 yrs, reparations are due!
- I want them to know big projects we are doing, and to see the unique relationship BC archs have with FN communities
- Archaeology and a development can co-exist and does not have to bankrupt you. It can be done in a cost effective and respectful manner as long as every keeps an open mind and works in some flexibility
- ?? transparency without secrecy
- I get asked where to go if you find an artifact on your property all the time! People have some really weird ideas about indigenous rights vs. archaeology, along the lines of "they have all the rights, we have none", likely stemming from Kennewick or some such case, and they think that if they find an arrowhead in their back 40 they should hide it because if FNs find out, they will stake a claim to the land and the owner will lose their home... They just need to be educated what archaeology is, and some of the basic

terminology (in order to prevent pit house foundations from being used as BBQ pits...yes, true story) and what the archaeology of the local area actually looks like.

- That it's not about pot-hunting!
- That it exists and is important to everyone, not just First Nations and archaeologists
- respect and no looting
- That cultural heritage resources allow Aboriginal people to honour their ancestors, remember their history, maintain traditional practices, transmit cultural to their youth and prove their Aboriginal Rights and Title.
- that it exists, that it's old (many people can't believe that there is heritage here older than the roman coliseum), that it can tell us about past Canadian and First Nations history, that it is important and worth preserving.
- It is not "the dead past," but an important foundation upon which to build the future of our province. It's important to understand the pre-history and history of BC in order to understand First Nations-colonial relations, and to move forward.
- Its importance to descendant communities
- That there is a rich cultural past in BC that stretches far beyond 1846 (people assume there is nothing?? wtf!?) Better education.
- It is all around us
- The value of it and who is paying for the work to be done and that the HCA exists.
- learn about it in a way that is decolonizing - learn about it young, as kids in schools; that it is a finite resource and extremely valuable for the deep history due to the legacy of colonization and loss of oral traditions
- Don't dig
- BC heritage is human heritage and just as important as heritage anywhere else in the world.
- that it exists AT ALL and that ordinary citizens have a role for participating
- The HCA laws and act
- The continuity of Indigenous rights and title to lands and resources in relation to archaeological projects and the preservation of artifact context through the HCA
- its purpose
- It is the history of indigenous people as discovered by Europeans
- It is legally supported.
- That First Nations heritage is not a threat to livelihoods and private property.
- Three things: cultural heritage in the hands of industry that wants to get to the bottom line as fast as possible; colonial hegemony clouds perspectives on indigenous people and the legacy of their heritage; no one wants to pay for the preserving the past unless one has to.
- That BC archaeology is the heritage of living populations and is as important to them as your own heritage is to you. Archaeology can also be seen as something that is important to the general public, as a legacy of human kind. We should all desire to protect that legacy.
- that it is everyone's history
- that by understanding the past, we are able to better understand our current social conditions, potentially alleviating stereotypes or negative impressions of Indigenous peoples. Also, that the current structure of archaeology is not allowing the discipline to reach its full potential and is instead working as a tool of the government and developers - that change needs to happen
- The extent to which CRM work is going on, has been part of the assessment process for large projects
- That the past lives on under our feet and foundations.
- That heritage is protected to a reasonable degree.
- The large variety of cultural materials and ages of sites in the province, i.e., it is not just "arrowheads". From this point it hopefully becomes more clear the importance of archaeological sites.
- Importance of the Past and our shared Historical Heritage
- That FN's archaeological heritage is the vast and important part of BC's heritage. BC citizens, and especially those that come in contact with archaeology, must value the heritage as part of their own. Without that value, there will continue to be resistance and respect and engagement - developers will continue to complain about costs, blame the FNs for the costs, demand someone else pay for it, and so on. If you look at European countries, developers spend much less time complaining about doing the work or the value of

doing it (since they consider it their heritage, and they have learned to value it as such in school). This means that it is also incumbent on FNs to choose strategies that don't have a long term effect of alienating BCers from valuing the heritage as if their own. Some FNs approach archaeology as "It's ours, not yours, get your mitts off it" for which there are some short term reasons, but with long term probably damaging consequences.

- Ongoing projects in their community and how they can get involved.
- That evidence of the past is so powerful, and deserves respect and protection. (Short answer, because I don't have time to write the three volumes about what the public should know ;)
- There is so much info missing about the late precontact period. We need to focus on this period in our research works, while documenting all archaeological / cultural sites, whether they are pre or post contact. This is where we can understand ourselves better as Canadians as a whole which for me includes everyone and is not really a political term, but a term based on over riding ability to make policies that can be enforced. In the late precontact to contact periodo we have very interesting stories to tell, as I have done to a degree in my research. And this needs to be looked at everywhere and the lookers do not need to be PhDs. We need writers who can write for the broader public - to bring them in where they actually want to be- the knowledge holders as well. Because everyone I talk to is interested - and I mean all. For example, recent immigrants are interested because development is also affecting cultural sites and traditional/ancient cultures in their regions, where there is also conflict sometimes. I believe that archaeo-cultural, in conjunction with the environments or landscapes of the late pre-contact are the most compelling stories we have to tell right now, and we need to be telling them.
- That it exists! When talking to a person about having studied archaeology I'm often asked (has happened twice in the last 6 months) "where are you going to go to dig/practice your trade?" and are surprised that I'm not planning on going overseas. I think there is a huge gap in knowledge about how extensive history is in BC and Canada.
- It is important for both the identity of First Nations and our understanding of human nature.
- That it exists and that it is worth supporting
- That it exists and that it is important and that the public has a voice in how we deal with archaeology as well
- Everywhere is a site
- What it is and why it's important
- That artifacts are protected and not to alter a site or the provenience of artifacts.
- Its everywhere (where you want to build that pool...or have your waterfront condo), and provides not only an understanding of First Nations culture history but contributes to our collective global knowledge of human history and diversity. BC Archaeology should be celebrated and treated with respect.

57. One last chance: is there anything you'd like to say about BC CRM?

- "Thanks for putting this survey together, it reminded me of a lot of things I am frustrated with in practicing BC archaeology and gave me an opportunity to have a voice.
- I think burials need special attention, and when disturbed or 'managed' by the Province or a private property owner or a proponent cause the communities incredible distress and harm. While it is common for the Branch to differ to the local community, and at times many communities may collaborate on a process, the process itself is often beyond inefficient and hampered by negligent communications and delays. With approval from a 'lead' community or several, and all the provincial consultative areas database FN's consent or non-objection acquired, the lead community should be able to undertake the work in collaboration with a qualified archaeologist in an expedited form without the current HCA permit obligations. The FN should have the ability, the authority and the access to funds to approach and resolve a disturbed burial on their cultural and technical terms in an efficient and timely manner as their protocols dictate NOT the HCA. I'm not opposed to the HCA standards for technical work, I'm opposed to the process that perpetuates an ineffective process leaving communities in distressful situations for extended periods of time. "
- Only that CRM archaeologists are driving really neat policy and practice changes, which the government should support if it is truly serious about reconciliation and building a future with First Nations as full partners

- This survey is an important first step to the government understanding the extreme complexity of the situations of those affected by archaeological management, and hopefully some appropriate, efficient, and clear changes can be made to the legislation and its application. While the Arch Branch is full of exceptionally patient and knowledgeable people, they are completely overwhelmed and under-funded, and need additional Government funding in order to appropriately deal with their current workload, in addition to taking back the responsibility of Consultation that has been disbursed to proponents and consultants. Regional Arch Branch offices would be an excellent first step to improving on engagement with consultants, proponents, and local First Nations.
- I have worked most of my career in BC. However I am a permit holder in BC, Alberta, Yukon, NWT and have been in CRM in U.K., Ireland and Australia. Out of all this experience I find that BC is too insulated. Instead of working with other provinces legislation BC appears to have strong opinions on other provinces legislation despite most of the community in BC having no experience in it. BC should be working with Alberta, Sask, Yukon and NWT to continuously improve the legislation and the management of the archaeological resource. I find the BC Archaeology Branch has no knowledge of other legislation and often has no experience but in BC. However to quote the Branch 'The rest of Canada looks to us for their legislation'. How do they know this? Infact all other provinces actually reference BC as an example of poor management and weak legislation. Often citing that BC has a lack of meaningful First Nation consultation, no protection for post-1846 archaeology sites, poor turn around times with reviews and a very poor success rate when litigation of bought against them.
- We need to think about how we can disentangle CRM from reliance on destructive resource practices and large corporate clients. The work we do rarely leads to actual protection of sites and often does not involve real research or analysis. How can we better live up to our professional ethics as archaeologists and obligations to descendant communities ?
- Make this a professional reliance system. Define what it means to be a "professional permit holder" and set the bar high.....but enough with the daycare style, desk jockey oversight.
- Due to an ongoing and flagrant lack of communication between the government and the First Nations, and a quasi-complete (if feigned at times...) ignorance of the legislation and permitting process by the business community and the general public - as well as a generalized refusal to recognize the cruelty and dishonesty of the colonial process and the horrifying conditions for First Nations communities resulting from that paradigm - consulting archaeologists are now caught in a political no-mans-land where, no matter what efforts are made to consult with different Nations and the provincial governing body, they are forced to recognize that most, if not all, decisions regarding the preservation or destruction of archaeological sites are based in large part on purely economic criteria, and not in any way on cultural or scientific values. The 'consultation' process has been offloaded to the CRM community in such a half-arsed manner (e.g. there is no clear framework to work within and there is absolutely no guidance from any party to facilitate discussion) that none of the parties involved can even hope to glean any meaningful communication from it, and seeing as the consultants are often forced to play middle-man for both the proponents and the government in organizing First Nations involvement in CRM projects, they are consistently held responsible (by all parties) for any and all negative outcomes or breaches of communication that can, and very often do, occur.
- The First Nations of the province are who's heritage that is being protected, they have a RIGHT to participate on how it is managed in their respective territories. To date it is simply a check box for developers/industry to check, to consult and it is not taken seriously. It is rather offensive to have a concern with a project, and it is disregarded and given permission to move ahead anyway.
- I believe our industry needs to step back and look at the way we do our studies. More time and budget needs to go to community consultation (FN and others) prior to starting the fieldwork. We also need to put more effort into capacity building in FN communities. I find that some of my colleagues still have an antiquated 'us vs them' attitude, while others are shifting to much more collaborative process. Let's hope that's the direction we end up moving.
- There is a lot of anger and resentment towards the Archaeology Branch from both the archaeological community and First Nations. While I find this somewhat understandable, I often fail to see how railing against the Branch will achieve any positive change in the industry. I often hear the opinion that the Branch doesn't do enough to protect archaeology or engage with First Nations; however, I don't see this as being within the mandate of the Branch. Their mandate is to enforce the HCA (as written), to oversee the

permitting process, and to maintain site inventory. While there are problems with the Branch's ability to do these things (lack of funding being the main issue), many of the things we chastise the Branch for (lack of First Nations engagement, being overly pro-development at the expense of the archaeological record, etc) should be taken to MFLNRO itself and higher. The current provincial government is blatantly pro-development and anti-First Nations, until change happens at that level, the Branch will remain underfunded and ineffective.

- We are miles ahead of other provinces, territories or states; however, we have a long way to go. This survey is fantastic start to gauging where we all feel like we stand. Great job, with all of this. Really looking forward to seeing the fruits of your labour.
- It hogs the limelight!
- We do not own anything. If you want to do good work, take time to conceptualize Indigenous worldviews on connection.
- In order to move forward in this industry, I would like to see First Nations create departments for archaeology and the protection of cultural materials. First Nations should be the primary governing body over cultural heritage. In educating the public the hardest topic is that of the legitimacy of First Nations interest in archaeological heritage. Most people I have encountered believe that First Nations only show interest to get their cut from a western established industry that makes profit from past indigenous populations.
- We to work together to mentor and provide training opportunities for people interested in archaeology and heritage. Large consulting companies could offer internships in small communities for youth and elders to participate in archaeology projects. Change the focus away from archaeology as a business to archaeology as a tool for cultural awareness.
- The inventory, assessment, and evaluation of sites on a development-by development piecemeal basis is an extremely ineffective way to manage heritage resources. The Archaeology Branch should be responsible for taking a regional approach to site assessment and management (with regional 'experts') taking into account how each site contributes to our understanding of the region in which it is located.
- A highly qualified professional archaeologist is needed as director of the Archaeology Branch
- CRM should be controlled by the Provincial government and BC First Nations. It has failed as a private practice
- The fact that the involvement of post secondary institutions isn't mentioned is very telling. Besides their glaring lack of involvement in stewarding the information obtained via CRM (which is most archaeological data obtained in BC), most BC archaeologists do not seem to be very well educated about what they are supposed to be doing, both in terms of scientific methodology and in terms of the broader ethical and societal implications of the information they are entrusted with stewarding
- It seems designed to keep workers down / limit the number of permit holders in the province. Field directors are kept from gaining the necessary experience writing or performing other duties required before qualifying for permit status. These are issues internal to CRM firms, but the Arch Branch should review the necessary qualifications to help experienced people make a living in their field.
- There should be weighting on the quality of archaeological finds. Lithic scatter and a burial site should be treated differently and be protected differently under the HCA
- I think there's a structural problem that produces at least the appearance of conflict of interest in that the government issues permits but the developer pays the bills, so the archaeologist is beholden to both. Also I think that there is very little knowledge value gained through the CRM process. Data points are gathered, often haphazardly, true analysis is minimal, true collaboration in interpretation (not just fieldwork) is minimal with FN, and for the 50 million or whatever it may be per year in BC that gets spent there is very little bang for the buck. This matters not in an academic sense but in a practical sense because without high quality archaeology then the basis for making judgments about CRM needs is lacking. Fundamentally, the overall standard of CRM is fairly low, mainly because the AB doesn't require it to be higher. FN could take a lead here in requiring higher standards but of course they are swamped. I'd like to see some sort of oversight or steering committee control the AB and not a career lawyer, the politicization of the HCA & AB is at the root of many of these problems.
- There is no management. It is policy driven and the regulators do not understand the meaning of management

- We are in a unique position in BC with regards to the development of new professional standards. I believe we need to reconcile the old, strictly empirical standards with newer standards regarding indigenous beliefs. Not be abandoning high standards with regards to evidence, but by being open to different types of evidence and interpretation.
- Things gotta change! Thanks for putting this together Joanne :)
- "I am not in favour of blanket permits. This needs some attention.
- All permits and final reports should flow through F.N.."
- The allocation of funds directed towards archaeology does not prioritize public presentation of knowledge gained from excavations in BC. This is on part of the Branch but also archaeologists. Extremely interesting history, especially to locals, is continually found, and yet the info is predominantly made apparent to other archaeologists (and sometimes not), leaving it to digital archives or rarely read master's theses. The underlying justification of the heritage act and thus the CRM industry itself is to serve a public interest, therefore that needs to be justified. If not, archaeology will continue to make news as costly projects about things the public knows nothing about, and wonder why it's done, questioning its cost and relevance. There is no system in the Branch to give priority to, or to encourage further funding towards projects that can further our understanding of the past. Hence, projects can cost hundreds of thousands with a smattering of sites, or even negative surveys, or concerning reservoir drawdowns about nearly entirely damaged sites; meanwhile, excavations at important sites can seem minimized in comparison, instead of being seen as opportunities to create public awareness and knowledge about local history. It's almost as if they don't even want the public to know that excavations are occurring. Public visitation to excavations should be encouraged, and this is on part of CRM and the Branch to do so; of course, local First Nations input is important and can be part of showcasing that history and heritage. This may seem above and beyond archaeological intentions, but really it's about again the underlying justification, and hence is in the interest of the archaeological industry in the long term.
- I believe that a lot of CRM in BC needs to improve upon their collections management and cataloguing systems to ensure that artifacts are not lost or overlooked for years at a time.
- when discussing redrafting the HCA, I would only be supportive if it included First Nations and the intent and sections for redrafting were clear and understood by all parties prior to commencing.
- Thank You for this.
- We have a long way to go, but indigenizing the process is key.
- The future of CRM and the status of the archaeological resource will be defined by the actions of our present. Protecting and preserving the resource from potential impact of the present is as important a concern as managing the process for the next 20-30 years. This includes, both the resource, but also and perhaps as importantly the personnel involved in all aspects of resource management, present and future.
- Don't give up, this issue has been an ongoing complaint for 35 years or more and hopefully with new technology of involving people globally and perseverance that some good good will come out of this! I strongly recommend a FN Advisory Group that can oversee and advise on many of these matters. I understand there was one back in the 1960s/70s and it worked quite well, but funding got cut, so this needs to be revisited!
- Thank you for putting this survey together!
- its awkward.
- The permitting system may be cumbersome, but it allows for thought and innovation in our discipline.
- It should be based primarily on scientific methods because the political agendas of FNs. Activists and govt are compromising archaeological-human history research and its record in the present and on going situation.
- Archaeology is not strictly CRM. CRM is a holistic management approach to what has cultural/heritage value to a community/society. This value can be seen as economic value, spiritual value, well being value etc. Archaeologist should have a fundamental understanding as to what CRM is really about. Management is not always about making the right decision but the best decision.
- BC and Alberta should compare notes more often and learn from each other. Some of the current issues in BC CRM are non-issues in Alberta because of the regulatory system in place and the way the legislation is written. The opposite is true as well though I won't elaborate on Alberta's issues here.

- The survey seems to force respondents to agree that there are major issues in BC CRM and that major changes are needed. I would agree that some changes would be very beneficial, but I don't think it needs to be completely redone. Guidance and oversight from the Arch Branch is definitely lacking. Generally I would say that the CRM industry consists of professionals that want to do what is best and want to do it well.
- BC archaeology should expand into true cultural resource management and push for updated protection and management policies for cultural properties and landscapes.
- What the hell is happening with all the CMT data?
- Contractors who default on payment are difficult to chase legally. How about a legal advocate either in the BCAPA or provincial gov't to help deal with such deadbeats?
- Paula and some other staff are not suitable for their roles.
- It's hardly the devil many professors at university make it out to be. Why is it that, if you work for a CRM firm, you are perceived to have sold your soul, but if you do CRM work for a Nation, you're on the side of angels?
- we must strive to find a balance and work in collaboration - this means everyone
- It requires a stronger ethical code. Current ethics statements are lacking.
- We archaeologists aren't perfect by a long shot, but most of us try hard to do what is ethical and we'll as scientifically valid. The Branch is massively understaffed and underfunded, which makes it impossible to do their job as thoroughly as they need. BC needs to enforce the HCA because as it stands, appropriate archaeological work is far more expensive than ignoring the legislation.
- The current accreditation program (field supervisor, field director, permit holder, etc.) is heavily flawed and should be revamped to more accurately reflect individual skills and experience, not regional availability of personnel.
- The lack of standards for the identification, recovery, analysis, curation and repatriation of archaeological human remains is unconscionable; too few qualified investigators are conducting these analyses with no oversight, introducing flawed data into the record and misinforming First Nations about critical information (such as MNI for reburial ceremonies).
- Not enough of the interesting research that is being done is made available in a format suited for the general public.
- In my opinion, it was a mistake to separate permits for AIAs and Investigations-- the latter have fewer regulations and requirements regardless of whether a site is being destroyed, whereas for AIA permits the quality of the archaeology is of less concern to the Arch Branch than adherence to the regulations
- It's run better than in other provinces (ex. Ontario) and I appreciate the regulations but I want more focus on the archaeology and the FN and less on getting things done quickly (and sloppily) just to satisfy O&G or development
- Archaeology is a sub set of Cultural Resources and CRM is about First Nations Culture not Western Sciences take on the relevance of stones and bones. It is past time to quit confusing archaeology with Cultural Resource management.
- CRM has to get up to speed culturally. Govt must be less secretive. Public should take responsibility and "ownership" for heritage resources maybe at local govt level
- Most European countries have made archaeology more inclusive, supportive of "public archaeology" and have tried to decentralize it. I feel like we are going the opposite way. we hide where we are excavating for fear of looting and vandalism. We don't publicize where are archaeological sites are. That way the general public don't know what "that depression over there" is, and they can't take pride in the fact that their local area sports important archaeological features. I'd like to open it up more, so that the general public knows what we're doing.
- It is very Balkanized, and needs to be more encompassing. Having a professional association more concerned with ethics and credentials than with keeping out "outsiders" would be a major step forward.
- I worked in the field for my band for 15 years, I have post secondary education in archaeology, I have trained FN techs in the field. Their training is inadequate; there are currently programs available people can be taking advantage of. Bands need to support them with training. It shouldn't be entirely up to the proponent or the government to cover these costs, it is our cultural heritage and we should be training our own people to protect it.

- It is an industry that is ethically flawed. Cultural Heritage is not a "resource" it is an essential part of persevering, promoting and revitalizing the culture of a living people.
- we need big changes in BC CRM and I'm excited that it slowly seems to be coming about.
- Corporations are driven by their shareholders and clients. They neglect their responsibilities to the archaeological record. I feel very strongly that archaeologists must be advocates for the record and when asked to be, advocates for descendant communities. The current pro development climate (supported and enforced by the archaeology branch through the granting of permits to corporations to non archaeologists and many, many poor decisions) propels development forward and continually places the archaeological record at great risk in exchange for profit. If this does not change, the archaeological record in BC will be destroyed so developers and government can fill their pockets at irreparable cost to the marginalized first nation communities.
- Fieldwork business models are exploitative to field assistants!
- As a Professional CRM Archaeologist, I feel that a great deal of time is wasted meeting meaningless Provincial Gov standards.
- The Archaeology Branch is the regulator, but they have little to no interaction with the greater community and those practicing archaeology in the province in terms of knowledge sharing. No one working at the Branch is undertaking research projects that better the knowledge and understanding of BC prehistory. The Branch is understaffed, inaccessible, and in my last few experiences, supportive of development at the expense of the archaeological record.
- it's a racket. It panders to development and on the technicalities of bureaucratic box-ticking. It provides lip service to First Nation concerns and scientific research. Long-term relationship-building with FN communities and long term work in a specific area are the best aspects of good archaeology. When multiple companies disturb small patches of an archaeological site, it builds little continuity while destroying the site and is not empowering for the First Nation community. More work effort should be put into developing continuity of research. CRM is poor science because it rarely looks at a site as a whole, but rather each development project and much less information is gained from the piece-meal approach. Which is unnecessary. If the government were to fund research archaeology to do a comprehensive study in advance of a development project of high significance, rather than invest so much into multiple smaller AIAs, more resources could be balanced in favor of research over paperwork. The results of that research can then be put back into education for communities - FN and general alike.
- Public must be more included in CRM
- For CRM to have public support context and relevance need to be showcased.
- Restrict the total number of graduates to reflect the employment opportunities and allow what you would call apprentices to begin the process of understanding that the European community has learned to do in the profession they call archeology.
- Better than Alberta!
- BC CRM is increasingly subject to ongoing treaty settlements and other agreements. As much as there may be a need now for centralized practices and controls of CRM, as these treaties continue to be finalized these controls and practices will be increasingly defined by regional Indigenous governments and not in Victoria.
- I have much to say and share. First thing is to update RISC training. Second is better liaising between BCAPA, BC Arch Branch and other related associations.
- HCA should be completely rewritten in light of the Grace Islet fiasco. FN burial grounds and places of human remains should receive the same protection and respect as cemeteries. They are cemeteries and not collections of artifacts. BC FNs should have complete authority and control over any projects, including archaeological investigations, proposed for their land.
- Process to be fast and cost reasonable
- "I believe there is a great deal of misunderstanding about what the branch does, what it can do under statutory and other legal constraints, and what it should do as a small part of the provincial government.
- Some of the ideas floated here used to be the case (ASAB and HAB had FNs members, voicing input to permit approval into the 80s. The Heritage Trust contributed funds to research, and sometimes peripherally to CRM into the early 2000s. There used to be an Aboriginal Liaison section in the branch into the early 2000s. The branch has employed FNs staff over the years, but they left and have been hard to replace in non-dedicated positions. The Branch has ""allowed""funding from various agencies, not just MoTI. MoTI has

provided funding to branch, with a decade long interruption, most of the time since the 70s. BCHydro/Site C funded a position in the branch. The Oil and Gas sector (OGC or MEM??) funded or still fund a position in the branch related to the recent boom in gas line assessments. Ideally, it would be better if the branch had enough of its own money to hire all the staff it needs, but if other agencies are willing to get dedicated service by contributing to the costs, then that is fine. The branch works independently of those agencies when making decisions in just the same way as other agencies not contributing except with the opportunity for a lot more discussion/consultation with the agencies along the way.

- It seems impractical to place branch staff regionally - there are too few of them as it is, the costs would be high internally, though there would be considerable gains. However, in the 70s the branch placed staff in the regions during the summer months to supervise branch field crews - the year after I started in archaeology the branch hired 135 summer students. Those regional supervisors did have an important role to play in building local relations that were then useful in the winter.
- Consideration should be given to a modernized "Warden" system - it was a good idea that worked very well up to its demise in 1981 or so. It was a network of community based volunteers that had an interest or background in archaeology who kept an eye on local goings on, and could serve as local contacts and information centers. Some of the wardens were FN individuals if I remember correctly. The branch contribution was a full time staff member (Brian Seymour, now at RBCM) to coordinate and the costs of an annual meeting, including travel and accommodation, for the wardens. With the right people involved and a more modern mandate this could be made to work again
- Some other government agencies should have their own archaeologists. Forest Districts in particular. Look at the PNW Forest region for the US Forest Service that has, or tries to have, an archaeologist in each Forest (equivalent, but smaller, to a Forest District). This would place archaeologists such that they could build local relations with FNs and settler communities, could be involved in audits and enforcement, could administer contracts for things like blanket permits, and so on. They could also take a hand in developing local goals for research such as gap filling in inventory, ensuring good modelling of high potential, and good ground truthing of the models, and so on. For starters, it would be good to see an archaeologist in each Forest Region office. Some other agencies don't need as intensive staffing, but would greatly benefit from a few archaeologists on staff - MEM for instance, in regional offices. MOTI are probably not adequately served by one less than full time position in the Branch, and so on. OGC has need of coastal experience and knowledge.
- However, the placement of staff in other ministries comes, or might come, with thorny issues like those that arise with the OGC. OGC has sole authority to issue all s12 permits for O&G in BC (Branch can't issue those ones), even when they have not been involved with earlier s14 work. OGC also has a very different way of doing things, though they seem to run a tighter ship when it comes to archaeological standards and auditing. Not sure how they get around the consultation and other "duties to give a hearing to interested parties" (arises from Craig Bay court case) the branch is obliged to deal with. "
- I am a recent archaeological transplant, and have had a lot of difficulty making connections and finding my way in the BC archaeological community. Sadly my extensive education, experience and specialist skills are constantly overlooked as I am viewed as an outsider. This is no way to welcome a fellow Canadian trained archaeologist. I am also tired of being put through the paces by the large corporation I work for. I am being denied a promotion until I get permit holder status. This is difficult to do when I am managing collections, analysis and project reporting in the office/lab and don't get an opportunity to do field work. I also don't think the BCAPA is effective as currently run and am tired of having it rammed down my throat. The organization is a joke. I want to make a difference and work to have greater stakeholder community participation in collections management and curation. I have specialist skills in lithics analysis, human osteology, zooarchaeology, and historic artifacts analysis. I would like to be recognized and respected for my experience and what I bring to the table and can help to grow BC archaeology.
- We all need CLARITY of expectations, desires, capabilities, obligations, and goals. And we need to work together!
- I did a landscape study of Graham Island...This needs to be done all over the province and the country. Looking at the pathways of movement really provides a spiritual nature as well to the work that we all can be excited about, as it connects all the work that has been done in CRM, finally. A perfect example here is the CMT and other arch site record of the northern Interior - so many sites, but nothing being done to build on

the information contained in them and the patterns of their distribution! I am seeking an opportunity to contribute to such work in my professional life.

- Now is the time for change - we need to be more proactive and less apathetic towards policy and governance as it's something created by the people for the people; if it is a broken system or policy that isn't working efficiently to best provide for its purpose, then only people can change it.
- Overlap claims are a serious impediment that require hired specialists working with First Nations to undertake all aspects of Archaeology.
- I wish there were some way to make all archaeologists more accountable for their actions when it comes to working with First Nations communities. Why is there not a requirement to follow local heritage policies for example? And because some CRM companies follow a 'cookie cutter' approach to their work, and do not put in the extra effort to work with First Nations communities, they become more competitive because they can offer the lower rates. There is little incentive to take the 'value added' approach and respect First Nations heritage.
- In CRM we walk a fine line, trying to satisfy regulatory requirements, respect and accommodate the interests of Indigenous communities, meet the policies and business needs of our employers, represent the interests of our clients, and maintain high ethical and technical standards. It can be a frustrating and even disheartening task to try to find common ground. Don't get me wrong: I make a good living from CRM (mainly relating to Indigenous heritage) and in that respect I am very fortunate. But the nature of the current CRM environment tends to put the interests of different parties at odds with one another and in many cases, everyone seems to end up dissatisfied. Anything we can do to develop a greater level of trust and shared vision can only benefit everyone, and the archaeological record.