

**Fall Consultation Feedback**

**Area of Discussion:** Protection of Sites of Aboriginal Cultural Significance

Dates and Locations that topic was presented / discussed:

Multi-Party Workshops: Sioux Lookout, October 21, 2010

Aboriginal Workshops: Wabun Tribal Council, September 28, 2010

Nishnawbe Aski Nation (NAN), September 29, 2010

Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO), Kenora, October 2, 2010

Wahgoshig First Nation, October 28, 2010

Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO), Sudbury, October 31, 2010

<b>Q: What support or tools will Aboriginal communities need to identify and provide accurate site information to MNDMF? How might the information be accessed and shared? Should sites be portrayed on a map?</b>	
<b>Feedback</b>	<b>Multi-Stakeholder &amp; First Nations / Métis Sessions</b>
MNDMF staff need to provide more education about the project's intentions to community members to ensure informed consent and so that the members understand the legislation and process requirements.	Sioux Lookout, Wahgoshig and Wabun and NAN
Work with Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) in creating these maps and to see what MNR already has. Should be greater coordination between ministries	MNO Sudbury, MNO Kenora
Communities need resources to bring people together to identify sites (i.e. money). Also may be costs to hire professionals (e.g. historians, geologists, and archaeologists).	MNO Sudbury, Sioux Lookout, Wabun, Wahgoshig
Require more community staff (e.g. Lands and Resources Departments not person, GIS training for community members)	MNO Sudbury
Need a process for data collection.	Sioux Lookout, Wabun
Information must come from the community and be a community led process.	MNO Sudbury, Sioux Lookout
Extended process to map and verify (5 plus years and half a million dollars)	Wabun

**For Discussion Purposes Only**

<p>Interpretation of cultural significance is different – flexibility is needed by individual communities</p> <p>Translation requirements for elders</p> <p>Use young people</p>	Sioux Lookout
How deep does a surface restriction go? Should be a specific depth (somewhere between 5 and 50 m would be appropriate)	NAN, Sioux Lookout, and MNO Kenora
Can the site come from an individual or family or does it have to be supported by the community?	Wahgoshig, Sioux Lookout, and MNO Sudbury

<b>Q: What kind of sites should be withdrawn? Can you list the key traits that make them very sensitive and/or significant sites?</b>	
<b>Feedback</b>	<b>Multi-Stakeholder &amp; First Nations / Métis Sessions</b>
Gathering sites (e.g. medicinal plants (if not available to teach our youth, part of our culture dies))	Multiple sites
Burial ground/cemetery (including along waterways in the Far North)	MNO Sudbury, MNO Kenora, NAN
Places of spiritual significance (ceremonies, visioning, cultural teachings – this is the core of our being)	MNO Sudbury, Wabun
Archaeological sites Pow wow grounds	Sioux Lookout, MNO Sudbury, Wabun, MNO Kenora
Change “historical” to “traditional” in criteria.	MNO Kenora, MNO Sudbury, Wabun
<p>Sacred sites should be withdrawn, but how does MNDMF define this since it is relationship to a community and different for each community.</p> <p>Sites where sacred drums have been stored until it is appropriate for a family member to get them.</p>	Sioux Lookout

**For Discussion Purposes Only**

<p>Trading posts</p> <p>Concerns that the site definition is too limited to small sites.</p> <p>Community or family harvesting and gathering areas</p> <p>Travel routes (including waterways)</p> <p>Culturally modified trees</p>	
<p>Meeting sites</p> <p>Spring water sites</p> <p>Birth sites</p> <p>Berry picking/wild rice/food, wildlife migratory routes, birch</p>	Wabun
<p>Spring water sites (spiritual)</p> <p>Elders should be specifically asked to provide input into the list</p> <p>Canoe route, encampment, travel route, portage route, spawning beds, lakes for subsistence and commercial fishing</p>	MNO Kenora
<p>Sites of refuge (safe havens) that families used to hide from those doing residential school swoops.</p>	Wahgoshig
<p>Food preparation and preserving areas</p> <p>Traditional sites of habitation</p> <p>Traditional harvesting and trading areas</p> <p>Travel ways, voyageur trails – part of our history</p> <p>If protected, will preserve plant life and rare species</p>	MNO Sudbury
<p>Fish harvesting and trapping sites</p>	Multiple locations including Wahgoshig

**For Discussion Purposes Only**

<b>Q: What information/approaches can be used to verify a site?</b>	
<b>Feedback</b>	<b>Multi-Stakeholder &amp; First Nations / Métis Sessions</b>
Oral history and traditional knowledge has to be taken into consideration.	Wahgoshig and Wabun
MNR values mapping through land use plans, community values maps etc.	Wabun, MNO Sudbury
Community has to be the one to verify a site otherwise it won't build a new relationship between government and communities or help move towards reconciliation.	Wabun, MNO Sudbury, Sioux Lookout, NAN
Documentation, e.g. Research – history/pictorials; Storybook/atlas; geographical/vegetative history; archaeology;  Research modern history which may have affected historical/heritage site  Demonstrated through ancestral connections to area – lineage (birth sites(community), school sites, employment sites)	MNO Sudbury
Elders should be engaged	Sioux Lookout, Wabun

<b>Q: What can MNDMF do so that Aboriginal communities feel that by sharing their very sensitive and significant sites that these sites will be better protected from mineral sector activities than if they were not shared?</b>	
<b>Feedback</b>	<b>Multi-Stakeholder &amp; First Nations / Métis Sessions</b>
Protect more than just small sites; sites may not be isolated (e.g. fishing sites and spreading of ashes). The smaller the area the easier someone could find and do harm to a value.	Wabun, NAN
Site type cannot be shown on CLAIMaps	MNO Sudbury

For Discussion Purposes Only

Information shared should remain confidential to MNDMF and remain the property of the Aboriginal community	MNO Sudbury, Sioux Lookout
Sacred living lands are for traditional living and activities are not to be kept “pretty” by the government	NAN
Principles of OCAP: ownership, control, access, and possession  Just note the sites identified and don't put them on the online claim map system.  Government does not need to know the information about an identified site.	Sioux Lookout
Advisory panel be set up to review and provide input to Minister on approval for sites so not solely in hands of MNDMF staff.  Recommend a process to hear appeal for decision if MNDMF rejects a site or if there is a conflict around protecting a site with another Aboriginal community.	MNO Kenora

<b>General Comments</b>	<b>Multi-Stakeholder &amp; First Nations/Métis Sessions</b>
Why only for Mining Act – why can't info be given to other ministries to protect as well	NAN
Who and how will compliance of surface restriction be enforced?	NAN
Concern over how areas will be protected (i.e. far north) in the interim while process to identify and withdraw/restrict these sites is being done	NAN
Some communities may consider sites as leverage opportunities when negotiating IBA's	Sioux Lookout
An elder may have chosen a site where they want to be buried that is a mining claim.	Sioux Lookout
Once one site is identified in a general area there may be more identified there in the future.	Sioux Lookout
The sites are referred to being culturally significant. Ecology and culture are often intertwined for Aboriginal people.	Sioux Lookout
One regulation may not be appropriate for the entire province given the uniqueness of circumstances and communities across the province.	Sioux Lookout

**For Discussion Purposes Only**