Planning for Decolonization: Examining Municipal Support of Indigenous-led Initiatives within the Settler Colonial Context of Canada

by

Skylar Niehaus

A thesis
presented to the University of Waterloo
in fulfillment of the
thesis requirement for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
Planning

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2022

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.
I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

Abstract

As a western cultural practice, planning is tethered to settler colonial logic, which results in the dispossession and harm of Indigenous peoples. Yet, within the context of ongoing recognition and enactments of reconciliation, planning has become increasingly invested in detangling the colonial logics embedded within itself, specifically when it's been called upon by Indigenous communities to do this work. Illuminating this is O:se Kenhionhata:tie, Land Back Camp, a local Indigenous-led initiative that has organized around the provision of space by and for Indigenous communities within Kitchener-Waterloo, Ontario. In their organizing O:se Kenhionhata:tie has responded to the needs of local Indigenous communities by creating space for Two-Spirit and IndigiQueer youth, increasing the visibility of local Indigenous communities, participating in solidarity work, and engaging with municipalities to produce conditions that support their work such as the provision of land, funding, and administrative support.

O:se Kenhionhata:tie's work inspires the direction of this thesis, as it examines four case studies of municipalities within Canada that have engaged in reconciliation practices relating to the provision of space for Indigenous-led initiatives. In the cities of Edmonton, Alberta; Lethbridge, Alberta, Yellowknife, Northwest Territories; and Kingston, Ontario, Indigenous communities have engaged with urban municipalities regarding the provision of space by and for Indigenous communities. The purpose of this examination is to produce knowledge about the ways planning can aid in life making practices, instead of being a source of world ending for Indigenous futures. Through a content analysis, this thesis finds both moments within planning that support Indigenous futurity, along with the continuation of settler colonial logic. The latter of which results in a failure to support just Indigenous futures, decolonization, and Indigenous life-making practices. Along with building understanding about planning, the findings of this thesis also provide the basis for how municipalities can facilitate the creation, governance, operation, and funding of Indigenous spaces in manners that are supportive for Indigenous sovereignty, self-determination, and futurity.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1 Introduction

Planning is a western cultural practice premised on a relationality of domination, which has resulted in the dispossession of Indigenous peoples, the degradation of Indigenous relationality, and the valorization of land as property (Dorries, 2017, 2022; Hibbard, Lane, & Rasmussen, 2008; Porter et al., 2017; Porter, 2010; Tomiak, 2017; Wensing & Porter, 2016). In this regard, planning operates as a spatial practice that perpetuates settler colonialism at the expense of Indigenous life. Planning also operates to achieve the settler colonial goal of foreclosing the possibility of Indigenous communities to imagine their futures within their own ways of knowing, as it ascribes value to specific ways of organizing space and conceptualizing land. Thus, planning is both spatially and conceptually enfeebling for Indigenous ways of knowing, Indigenous life, and relationality.

Yet, planning is continuously resisted, refused, and subverted by Indigenous-led initiatives (Dorries, 2017; Dorries & Harjo, 2020; Hugill, 2017; Jojola, 2013; Porter et al., 2017). These Indigenous-led initiatives embody Indigenous futurity by rooting themselves in ancestral knowledge and actively living out imagined futures by striving to meet the self-defined needs and desires of Indigenous communities (Harjo, 2019). Community futurity produces and sustains space for Indigenous peoples to dream, imagine, and activate the wishes of their ancestors, contemporary kin, and future relatives in a present temporality. This form of futurity relies on kinship, sovereignty, community knowledge, and collective power to allow Indigenous actors to step out of the grievances produced by settler colonialism to create Indigenous spatialities centred on Indigenous desires. To centre these desires, Indigenous actors activate the unrealized possibilities of their ancestors in the present moment to create the conditions for these possibilities to flourish into future existence. This operates in service to Indigenous ancestors,

present relatives, and future relatives and as such is a decolonizing methodology as it imagines beyond the prevailing conditions, which consequently decentres western and settler knowledge, ways of being, and relating to land.

Neither planning, nor Indigenous-led initiatives are stagnant, as both have shifted and will continue to transform as contextual practices. Yet, both practices have been impacted by the cultural traits of white supremacy and racial capitalism embedded in settler colonialism (Barry & Agyeman, 2020; Roy, 2017; Williams, 2020). As such, Indigenous-led initiatives and planning often respond to each other along the lines of past harms perpetuated by settler colonialism, the continuation of harm, and the perpetual un-doings of these harms, albeit in vastly different ways. Planning, as a western cultural practice, is part of and informed by the enduring traits of settler colonialism that often amount to world-ending specifically for Indigenous peoples (Sandercock, 2004; Simpson, 2017; Porter, 2021). World-ending here refers to the dismantling of Indigenous knowledge systems, the removal of Indigenous bodies from Indigenous lands, and the suppression of Indigenous cultural practices and ways of being. Whereas Indigenous-led initiatives are relational, life-making and world-building, whether they are refusing or responding to settler colonial tactics of domination, oppression, or dispossession (Harjo, 2019; Porter, 2010; Simpson, 2011; 2017; Simpson, 2014). Through this understanding, Indigenous-led initiatives and planning can be viewed as two sides of a coin, where planning represents erasure and elimination (Porter & Yiftachel, 2019; Roy, 2006), and Indigenous-led initiatives represent transformation and creation. However, as planning comes to detangle the settler colonial logics embedded within itself there may be possibilities for planning to move towards creation by supporting Indigenous-led initiatives as they undertake their own creation processes.

As already indicated, planning is a "cultural artifact" (Sharma & Gupta, 2006, p.5) of colonialism (Porter, 2010) and cannot be divorced from its colonial roots, nor its continuous role in Indigenous dispossession. However, as a contextually responsive practice that is operating in an era of heightened awareness of reconciliation,[1] planning may have the potential to undertake reconciliation and contribute to practices of decolonization by supporting Indigenous-led initiatives within urban settings (Barry & Agyeman, 2020). Social movements such as Idle No More, Black Lives Matter and Land Back have also aided in the production of this context for planning to reckon with reconciliation, as these movements have been both critical of institutions and their practices, while also transformative in producing community-led initiatives that exist outside of institutions, policy, and settler governance structures. Yet, the undertaking of reconciliation within planning cannot be viewed with naïve optimism. A critical analysis of the practices, implementation measures, and rhetoric used within these undertakings produces space for this work to be furthered, while avoiding simplistic understandings that replicate colonial relations and ways of understanding. Engaging with planning through a critical lens allows planning to hold itself accountable as a colonial practice, while identifying avenues forward that may produce meaningful and long-lasting reconciliation that perpetuates Indigenous futurity. Thus, the work of reconciliation through planning is a complex undertaking that requires persistent evaluation, ongoing commitment, valorization of specific and localized Indigenous knowledge, along with responsiveness to the self-identified needs and desires of local Indigenous communities.

---

[1] The Canadian Institute of Planners has explicitly engaged with reconciliation and has indicated a commitment on behalf of the profession within Canada to form respectful relationships with Indigenous communities and valorize Indigenous planning systems (CIP, 2019). These pursuits are prompted by the Truth and Reconciliation Calls to Action, which implicate Canadian institutions and their practices to produce meaningful and lasting reconciliation through action and policy (TRC, 2015b).

1.1 Research Context

Movements such as the previously mentioned, Idle No More, Black Lives Matter and Land Back are translocal movements that resist the systems of settler colonialism and racial capitalism (Simpson et al., 2018). This research is inspired by these translocal movements, while also being tethered to the work of a specific Indigenous-led Land Back initiative. As such, the research within this thesis begins with O:se Kenhionhata:tie, Land Back Camp, a Two-Spirit, Indigenous-led group that has organized since June 2020 (Bangishimo & Smoke, 2021). Throughout its lifespan O:se Kenhionhata:tie, has responded to the needs of local Indigenous communities by creating space for Two-Spirit and IndigiQueer youth, increasing the visibility of local Indigenous communities, participating in solidarity work, and engaging with municipalities to produce conditions that support their work (Campbell, Chartrand, & Smoke, 2020; Campbell, Smoke, & Resmer, 2020; Smoke, 2020b; Smoke, Bangishimo, & O'Neil, 2021; Smoke & Bangishimo, 2022; Bangishimo, 2021a; O:se Kenhionhata:tie, 2022c). Through these practices the Camp has embodied Indigenous futurity as it's have created new and imaginative pathways towards just Indigenous futures within the urban context of Kitchener-Waterloo, Ontario. However, it's work is consistently under threat as the Camp has been unable to secure land, nor stable funding for its initiatives, despite ongoing efforts to engage with local municipalities for the purposes of securing these supports.

To aid O:se Kenhionhata:tie's ongoing efforts, four municipalities within Canada that provided space and financial support to local Indigenous-led initiatives, were analyzed. The analysis of these municipalities produced knowledge to understand how planning can support the advancement of just Indigenous futures, particularly within urban settings. A common objective within these initiatives is the need for space for Indigenous communities within urban settings. The procurement of this space allows Indigenous communities to advance self-determination and

enact Indigenous informed relationality, both of which generate the conditions for just

Indigenous futures, while also meeting the present needs of local Indigenous communities.

The research within this thesis also contributes to the growing body of work that "makes

visible a colonial logic embedded within planning's philosophy and…practice" (Porter, 2010, p.

16). By analyzing specific examples of municipalities that have given land, along with financial

and administrative support to Indigenous-led initiatives, this research follows the understanding

that settler colonialism and its effects are bound to localized experiences that can contribute to

broad insights into how colonizing and counter-resistant/resurgent practices exist and engage

with each other (Porter, 2010). Within this research context, planning is a western cultural

practice attached to the perpetuation of settler colonialism (Porter, 2010). Whereas Indigenous-

led initiatives are understood to operate outside of colonial notions of Indigeneity; refuse to be

understood by or operate within the structural systems set by settler colonialism; and/or are

resistant to the oppressions produced by settler colonialism.

1.2 Statement of Positionality

I am an outsider-insider within this work. I am a queer white settler of German and

Austrian ancestry. In the summer of 2021, I began to engage with Amy Smoke and Bangishimo,

the co-organizers of O:se Kenhionhata:tie, Land Back Camp to understand if/how I could

develop a research project that could support their pursuits within the Kitchener-Waterloo area.

Through this engagement and the commonality of my queer identity, I am inside this research as

I share a relationship with O:se Kenhionhata:tie. However, as a white settler who has primarily

occupied space within the Treaty 6 territory of the Cree, Dene, Blackfoot, Saulteaux and Nakota

Sioux I am outside this research. Therefore, I do not speak for O:se Kenhionhata:tie, nor any of

the Indigenous peoples, nations, groups, or organizations that are a part of this research.

While I am located outside this research, I am not absolved from engaging with matters pertaining to land, Indigenous rights, and reconciliation. I am even more so implicated in these matters as I am pursuing a career within the field of planning, a field that has facilitated land theft, and undermined Indigenous self-determination, land claims, and sovereignty (Dorries, 2017, 2022; Porter, 2010, 2021). Further, as a white settler who currently lives within the city of Waterloo, it is my responsibility to (1) support reconciliation efforts at the personal, municipal, provincial, and federal level that recognize and meaningfully support Indigenous self-determination; (2) respect Indigenous sovereignty; (3) recognize my role as a treaty person; and (4) produce meaningful reconciliation efforts in the spaces I occupy, especially those that are coded for the comfort of white settlers. It is through these responsibilities that I undertake this research.

Chapter 2 Contextualizing Planning: Setter Colonialism and Indigenous Practices of Decolonization

In the following two chapters, literature is reviewed to identify existing research gaps and to position this work within the existing understanding of planning, settler colonialism, and practices that embody Indigenous futurity and self-determination. These two chapters include a consideration of literature that engages with (1) planning as a western cultural practice that perpetuates settler colonialism and its associated logics; (2) decolonization and reconciliation, specifically the difference between these two praxes and the relationships between them; (3) Indigenous self-determination and futurity; and (4) the ways municipal planning has sought to engage with Indigenous actors who undertake initiatives that meet the self-defined needs and desires of local Indigenous peoples. This chapter concludes that a gap in knowledge exists pertaining to if/how planning as a western cultural practice can deconstruct the settler colonial logic embedded within itself by providing land, administrative and financial support to Indigenous-led initiatives which facilitate the flourishing of Indigenous life through Indigenous self-determination and enactments of Indigenous futurity.

2.1 Settler Colonialism and Planning

"Settler colonialism destroys to replace," (Wolfe, 2006, p. 388), and as such it is distinct form of imperialism that hinges on the continuous dispossession of Indigenous peoples for the settlement of non-Indigenous people (Dorries, Hugill, & Tomiak, 2019; Veracini, 2011; Wolfe, 1999). To enable this dispossession, settler colonialism operates as a spatial practice that aims to destroy Indigenous relational practices, understandings of land, and life (Wolfe, 2006). This destruction then facilitates the creation of a new society that valorizes colonial cultural values and purports these values through colonial practices like planning (Blatman-Thomas, 2019; Porter, 2010).

Both settlers and immigrants move from one place to another, with the intention of staying within a new place. However, the aspect that sets immigration apart from settler colonialism is that settler colonialism aims to establish a new political order to replace the existing Indigenous polity for the purposes of invoking some measure of sovereignty (Tuck & Yang, 2012; Veracini, 2010). Thus, central to the operation of settler colonialism is the genocide and dehumanization of Indigenous peoples, which results in their erasure from place (Wolfe, 1999). Colonial practices, like planning, aid in the facilitation of this continuous erasure of Indigenous life, by actively upholding and reproducing settler colonial cultural values and politic, at the expense of Indigenous practices of relationality, ways of knowing, and organizing the world (Blatman-Thomas & Porter, 2019; Dorries, 2022; Porter, 2021). It is through this upholding and perpetuation of settler colonial logic that planning is so often a world-ending practice, instead of a life-making practice, specifically for Indigenous peoples (Porter, 2021).

2.1.1 The Logic of Elimination

As an enduring system, settler colonialism is continuously reproduced through the logic of elimination. The logic of elimination is premised on the dispossession of Indigenous peoples for settler acquisition of land (Wolfe, 1999, 2006). This logic operates to diminish Indigenous relations to land and serves to centralize western epistemology under a rationality of domination. In such contexts, Indigenous sovereignty is viewed as subordinate to Canadian sovereignty and is expected to be governed under the norms and expectations set in Canadian governance structures, such as municipal governments and planning (Barry & Thompson-Fawcett, 2020; Blackburn, 2007; Bowie, 2021; Coulthard, 2007, 2014). Thus, planning's logic fundamentally undermines Indigenous sovereignty and reasserts colonial relationships bound in the elimination of Indigenous life and ways of being. It also allows for planning to inappropriately engage with

Indigenous peoples as mere stakeholders, instead of legitimizing their claims for land and resources (Fawcett, Walker, & Greene, 2015). This is problematic because it advances the erasure of Indigenous sovereignty and concepts of relationality, as Indigenous peoples are individualized and assimilated into settler colonial systems (Tuck & Yang, 2012).

Settler colonialism aims to consume the Indigenous life and ways of being that already exist within a place by displacing and disciplining Indigenous individuals (Coulthard, 2007). It is through this aim that settler colonial practices, such as planning, are in direct opposition to Indigenous resurgence, life, and futurity. These settler colonial practices operate in a highly structural manner that allows for settler colonialism to function as a system that replenishes and reproduces itself (Bhandar, 2018; King, 2019). These practices facilitate the erosion of Indigenous life and ways of being, which forecloses Indigenous life, and forces Indigenous individuals to assimilate into settler structures for their immediate survival (Coulthard, 2014; Pasternak, et al., 2021). Through this ongoing process, settler colonialism becomes further entrenched and naturalized, resulting in a cyclical propagation of Indigenous erasure, which aims to facilitate the demise of Indigenous peoples, cultures, and relationality (Tuck & Yang, 2012; Wolfe, 1999, 2006). The settler colonial project is then focused on the constant elimination of Indigenous peoples for the proliferation and seeming naturalization of settler cultural values, ways of being, and life.

2.1.2 White Supremacy and Racial Capitalism

Capitalism requires the differential valuation of people for the accumulation of wealth (Fraser, 2016). This differentiation allows for the alienation of labour, the subordination of masses, and the accumulation of resources; at the expense of people who are subjugated and controlled by a ruling class. Yet, when speaking of capitalism, it is important to be clear that race

matters. Capitalism is an inherently racialized system, born from a world already deeply defined by ethnic and social distinctions as a means for creating difference (Robinson, 1983). During its development, capitalism exaggerated these existing distinctions to solidify racial hierarchies, and as such is better defined by the term racial capitalism (McClintock, 2018; Melamed, 2015; Robinson, 1983). Racial capitalism responds to each geographic context differently and it is through this contextualization that it is often attached to and facilitated by spatial practices such as planning (Dorries, Hugill, & Tomiak, 2019; McClintock, 2018; Williams, 2020). Within settler colonial contexts, planning advances settler domination over Indigenous life, while relying on other forms of racialized oppression for the purposes of acquiring land, turning it into property, and generating wealth (Dorries, 2022; Hugill, 2017). Racial capitalism is thus enmeshed with settler colonialism and facilitated though cultural practices processes such as planning.

Settler colonialism intersects with other forms of oppression such as racial capitalism to produce urban space (Dorries, Hugill, & Tomiak, 2019). Planning as a western cultural practice works in relation with both settler colonialism and racial capitalism, specifically because it is premised on relating to land as property for the purposes of accumulation, while utilizing a diverse range of racialized violence to facilitate this accumulation, all of which is premised on the ideology of white supremacy (Blatman-Thomas & Porter, 2019; Dorries, Hugill, & Tomiak, 2019; Dorries, 2022; Williams, 2020). Both racial capitalism and settler colonialism rely on white supremacy to vindicate the subjugation of Black, Indigenous, and racialized folks. The ideology of white supremacy organizes the world into a racial hierarchy which places whiteness at the top and results in the oppression and domination of folks who are racialized within this mode of organizing the world, albeit in often specific, yet connected ways (Eduardo, 2001;

Harris 1993; Lowe, 2015; Mills 2017). In this way, settler colonialism exemplifies one of the many ways that white supremacy is mobilized through spatial relations and associated practices like planning, while being intersecting with other forms of racism (Bonds & Inwoods, 2016; Williams, 2020). Thus, it is in concert with white supremacy and the associated systematic racisms produced by it, that planning operates to perpetuate the continued project of settler colonialism (Dorries, 2017; Dorries, Hugill, & Tomiak, 2019; Omi & Winant, 2014).

2.2 Decolonization

Decolonization is rooted in the assertion of Indigenous self-determination and sovereignty (Simpson, 2011; Simpson 2014). Settler practices, like planning, are largely outside the bounds of decolonization, as decolonization centers Indigenous individuals as actors who shift their internal thinking towards Indigenous ways of knowing, being, and relating (Corntassel, 2012; Coulthard, 2007; Hunt & Holmes, 2015). Further, "real sovereignty is often initiated outside of the normative governance structures of municipalities, counties, and states," (Harjo, 2019, p. 62). Thus, it is through Indigenous individuals and communities that decolonization work begins and ends with, as these actors create relationships between themselves that reverberate outwards to produce relational contextually grounded in Indigenous existence. Land is also a central tenant of decolonization because decolonization requires the return of land to the guidance of Indigenous communities (Tuck & Yang, 2012). As such, both Indigenous-led practices and land are central tenants to processes of decolonization.

2.2.1 Decolonization in Urban Settings

While settler colonialism operates to eliminate Indigenous life and relation to land, it is also a perpetually unfulfilled conquest that operates in a quotidian and ever-present manner as a set of relations which morph and change to fit each present context (King, 2019). This feature of

settler colonialism produces both persistent reproduction, as well as opportunities for resistance, refusal, and subversion. The latter make up Indigenous decolonization efforts, which when performed in urban settings aid in making urban space "visible as a contested space and space of contestation where competing ontologies and politics challenge settler colonial common sense and state power" (Tomiak, 2016, p. 16). Through this contestation stable notions of what urban space is are confronted with alternate histories and understandings of place that exist outside of settler colonial conceptions of land and planning practices (Dorries, Hugill & Tomiak, 2019). Through this confrontation, the authority assumed by municipal governments is undermined (Blatman-Thomas & Porter, 2019). In this process, decolonization efforts offer an avenue for Indigenous peoples to assert their self-determination within urban spaces, which simultaneously subverts settler authority (Dorries & Harjo, 2020). Decolonization efforts that make demands on municipal governments also hold promise in giving Indigenous communities the ability to move outside the bounds set by settler colonialism, while recognizing the often-necessary infrastructural support planning can offer (Jojola, 2013).

2.2.2 Refusal

Indigenous practices were once naturalized within present settler colonial contexts. However, over time settler colonial practices have become naturalized, through the valorization and perpetuation of western cultural values (Lowman & Barker, 2015; Rifkind, 2013). These processes of naturalization are premised on the ongoing dispossession of Indigenous peoples, which not only displace Indigenous peoples, but also force them into a state of dependency on settler nation-states and their associated governing bodies (Pasternak, et al., 2021), such as municipalities. Through these processes, Indigenous peoples are purposely put into impoverished positions that hinder Indigenous resurgence and sovereignty (Pasternak, et al., 2021).

The trajectory of dispossession to dependency is one that settler colonialism actively keeps Indigenous peoples in, to facilitate land theft and economic accumulation for settlers. Yet, decolonization through refusal can provide the conditions for alterative pathways of Indigenous existence beyond these confines. Refusal operates by refusing to work within the systems of settler colonialism, while creating the conditions for the flourishment of Indigenous life through community-grounded sovereignty (Harjo, 2019). The process of refusal centres the creation of collective forms of action that simultaneously provide care for community, while disrupting settler-colonialism (Dorries, et al., 2019; Dorries & Harjo, 2020; Harjo, 2019, Simpson, 2017). These forms of action do not rely on state-led practices, such as planning. Instead, they turn to community as a source of power which facilitates Indigenous resurgence, and refuses the domination and authority of settler practices, institutions, and ways of being (Corntassel, 2012; Dorries & Harjo, 2020; Simpson, 2014; Simpson, 2011; Simpson, 2017). Thus, refusal is more than turning away from settler governments for the sake of refusing their authority. Refusal is about producing generative conditions for Indigenous peoples to exercise their self-determination and build up community resources (Pasternak, et al., 2021; Corntassel, 2008; Coulthard, 2014; Dorries, 2017; Dorries & Harjo, 2020).

2.2.3 Indigenous Futurity and Imaginative Futures

Creating an Indigenous present through refusal, perpetuates alternative futures that centre Indigenous life and results in Indigenous futurity (Harjo, 2019). Futurity occurs through Indigenous "communities' ability to renovate prevailing ideas of sovereignty and achieve both the journey toward and the living out of the livelihoods they wish to see across many generations and spaces" (Harjo, 2019, p. 57). The Indigenous sovereignty component of futurity requires Indigenous peoples to practice Indigenous laws on Indigenous lands, along with the resurgence

of the philosophies that guide these laws and ways of being (Corntassel, 2012). Futurity is therefore an embodiment of what Indigenous ancestors wanted for their future kin, as well as an enactment of the knowledge Indigenous individuals carry within themselves (Harjo, 2019). As such, this form of sovereignty is not found within governance systems (Indigenous or otherwise) but through Indigenous individuals recognizing and acting through the sovereignty they hold within themselves (Simpson, 2008). This form of sovereignty situates Indigenous individuals as holders of power while refusing the notion that settler recognition is needed for Indigenous sovereignty, as this sovereignty is internal and vested in relational approaches to living and being in the world.

The creation of alternative futures requires people to actively live within a different present, so that pathways towards alternative futures can be created and allowed to fully mature within the present (Simpson, 2017). It is then through these newly created pathways that alternative futures can be reached. Indigenous life, knowledge and ways of being must also be centred within this present. The creation of alternative futures is an emergent process, where Indigenous ways of being, knowing and doing are actively centred in the present, which allows them to fulsomely emerge into the future (Harjo, 2019). This understanding of how to create alternative futures is also grounded in Indigenous knowledge, which understands that doing produces knowledge (Harjo, 2019). In other words, doing an action in the present can produce knowledge into the future and facilitate new modes of being.

2.2.4 The Land Back Movement

The popular use of the term Land Back began in 2019 after Indigenous creators like Dene member Nigel Henri Robinson and Arnell Tailfeathers of the Kainai Blood community began to create Land Back memes on social media (Gouldhawke, 2020). Shortly after the spread of these

memes, Land Back began to appear in slogans and banners at actions and rallies spearheaded by Indigenous organizers. Indigenous youth, in particular utilized Land Back and #landback to draw linkages between various Indigenous struggles, build community, and to speak to the centrality of land in the ongoing dispossession and suppression of Indigenous peoples across the globe. In its use, Land Back has been a way for Indigenous peoples to speak to the commonalities of their experiences, while simultaneously pointing to injustices and solutions for imperialism, colonialism, and settler colonialism.

The Land Back movement is grounded in assertions of decolonization as Indigenous groups call for Land Back in both literal and other forms. Land Back is a call to action rooted in Indigenous worldviews that understand land as being connected to all aspects of life (Harjo, 2019; Simpson, 2017). To demand Land Back often means to demand rematriation, which is an Indigenous feminist paradigm that expands past the colonial framework of repatriation (Gray, 2022). Repatriation centralizes ownership of land, following from western understandings of land as property. Conversely, rematriation is "a restoration of right relationships and a true action of decolonization, aimed not just at righting a past wrong but transforming our collective future" (RiVAL, 2020). Therefore, while Land Back movements and organizing is orientated around land and its return to Indigenous hands, it is not premised on colonial conceptions of land. Rather it is grounded in Indigenous understandings of relationality with land, collective modes of being, and a meeting of immediate material needs for the purposes of self-determination and enactments of Indigenous futurity.

Land Back is a call to action for settler and imperial institutions to give land back to Indigenous peoples. Yet, Land Back is also more nuanced as it is grounded in local Indigenous knowledge, which understands that land is connected to other aspects of life such as language,

cultural practices, and community relationships (Harjo, 2019; Simpson, 2017). Land therefore cannot be severed from the other aspects that create and sustain life as it is a central tenant for the flourishment of life. As such Land Back is not a monolithic focus on simply the return of land to Indigenous peoples. It is also the return of sovereignty, jurisdiction, authority, and resources to Indigenous peoples, which are necessary for facilitating the other life-making aspects intertwined with land (Palmater & Yesno, 2022).

As Anishinaabe scholar, Riley Yesno (2022a) has stated, Land Back does not have rigid boundaries. This is because it comes from Indigenous youth and social media, not academia or government organizations. As a result, Land Back reflects and remains grounded in each specific Indigenous community that organizes around this concept, which positions Land Back and any resulting reparations to be responsive to the specific needs and desires of a community. As a community driven and defined movement, Land Back is therefore multi-scalar as it intersects across broader Indigenous organizing efforts that reach international scales and local Indigenous organizing efforts that focus on specific lands, communities, and people.

Although Land Back is a newly coined term to rally behind, Indigenous organizing around the notion of giving land back has been occurring long before the term became known in this way. Indigenous nations, communities and individuals have engaged in Land Back for generations through aspects such as land claims, (re)occupations of traditional territory, blockades, land reclamations, and community organizing (Gouldhawke, 2020; Palmater & Yesno, 2022). Land Back is therefore rooted in Indigenous ancestral knowledge, experience, and connection to land, while simultaneously being a part of the legacy of those who call for justice for Indigenous peoples. The conceptualization of Land Back is also evident in the works of many Indigenous scholars who engage with decolonization (for example Corntassel, 2012; Coulthard,

2007, 2014; Harjo, 2019; Simpson, 2014; Simpson, 2011, 2017; Tuck & Yang, 2012; Wolfe,

1999, 2006).

Chapter 3 Planning in Support of Decolonization

Settler colonialism operates within urban spaces through settler interests that centralize white supremacy, western cultural practices, and racist property regimes (Coulthard, 2014; Dorries, 2022; Dorries, Hugill, & Tomiak, 2019). In this context land is viewed through a highly controlled, systematic, and resource orientated lens, where property becomes the primary way to organize and relate to land (Hugill, 2017; Dorries, 2022). These values operate through a set of relations that are contrived as subtle but work in tandem to create hegemonic systems of power that promote dispossession and violence toward Indigenous peoples (Dorries, Hugill, & Tomiak, 2019). Planning is often the embodied spatial practice for these colonial values that enables the continued existence of settler colonialism (Blatman-Thomas & Porter, 2019; Hugill, 2017; Porter, 2010; Porter & Yiftachel, 2019). However, planning is also interrelated to alternative forms of itself that are focused on sustaining and nurturing life, which allows it to be a life-making practice (Barry et al., 2018; Dorries & Harjo, 2020; Huq, 2020; Miraftab, 2009, 2017; Porter, 2010; Porter et al., 2017; Roy, 2009; Sandercock, 2004; Watson, 2009, 2013).

As already mentioned, racial capitalism works in tandem with settler colonialism and is performed through spatial practices such as planning. Indigenous scholars such as scholar Betasamosake Simpson (2011) and Glen Coulthard (2013) have framed both settler colonialism and capitalism as antagonistic to Indigenous life. Extrapolating this understanding to the field of planning requires planning to be understood as a western cultural practice that systematically manifests as antagonistic towards Indigenous life (Dorries, 2022; Hugill, 2017; Porter, 2010), but is an understanding of planning that is seldom forefront for how planning as a profession or practice views itself. It is only through uncovering this understanding and meticulously working to deconstruct the settler colonial logic inherent within planning, can alternative and imaginative

forms of planning become available (Miraftab, 2017; Porter, 2017; Lane, 2006). This is the

project of transforming planning from a world-ending practice into a life-making practice, as it is

simply not enough to recognize and expose violent structures (Bhandar, 2018; Hillier & Gunder,

2005; Miraftab, 2009; Rankin, 2010), they must be actively confronted, while alternative

practices are imagined and valorized (Dorries, 2022; Porter, 2011; Porter & Yiftachel, 2019;

Lane, 2006).

A place-based existence that centers connection to land is a core tenant for both defining

Indigeneity and the basis for settler colonial attempts to erase Indigenous peoples through

processes of dispossession (Coulthard, 2007, 2014). Thus, Indigenous peoples' active and

ongoing connection to land is required for decolonization as it asserts Indigenous connection to

land, while also undermining the dispossessive function of settler colonialism (Lowman &

Barker, 2015). While planning cannot generate decolonization, it can create the conditions for

reconciliation, which centre Indigenous self-determination, ways of relating to the land, and

access to land. Furthermore, as previously outlined Indigenous decolonization efforts can

simultaneously turn away from planning, while also forming relationships with municipal

governments to achieve their goals. It is within this context that municipalities can meaningfully

engage in reconciliation. Whereas decolonization is Indigenous-led, reconciliation is the

processes undertaken by non-Indigenous actors to reconcile with the ongoing and residual

impacts of settler colonialism that have resulted in harms to Indigenous individuals, groups, and

nations (Asher, Curnow, & Davis, 2018).

Meaningful reconciliation, like settler-colonialism, is not a one-time event. Instead, it is

an ongoing solidarity praxis that combines action with critical reflection (Gaztambide-

Fernandez, 2012), as it responds to the self-identified needs of Indigenous actors. Reconciliation

thus requires an ontological shift where acknowledgement and understanding of the past occurs, particularly the understanding of the ongoing of impacts historical trauma and its linkage to the present; along with a commitment to actively support Indigenous sovereignty, self-determination, and conceptions of reconciliation (Asher, Curnow, & Davis, 2018; McGregor, 2018b). The term meaningful reconciliation is used here to draw out the distinction between it and passive reconciliation. Meaningful reconciliation draws on Indigenous conceptions of relationality; as settler individuals, groups, and institutions come to develop relationships grounded in accountability and care, instead of domination (Wilson, 2008). While passive forms of reconciliation[2], are more concerned with "ticking boxes" and moving settlers to innocence for their comfort, than in producing justice for Indigenous peoples (Asher, Curnow, & Davis, 2018; Dorries, 2019; Lowman & Barker, 2015; Tuck & Yang, 2012). It is thus through meaningful forms of reconciliation that planning can become a life-making practice.

3.1 The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada and the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

Planning as an institution has also been implicated by The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada to develop a reconciliation praxis that addresses its colonial foundations, which are premised on the genocide on Indigenous peoples and nations; and the residual impacts of these genocidal tactics (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015a, 2015b). Planning as a Canadian profession has begun to engage with this document and its calls to justice as evidenced by the Canadian Institute of Planner's (2019) policy on planning practices and reconciliation and the Ontario Professional Planners Institute's (2019) Indigenous Planning

---

[2]Such as land acknowledgements that are detached from active forms of reparative and justice producing work that aims to meet the needs and desires of Indigenous individuals and communities.

Perspective Report and Task Force. There are four specific Truth and Reconciliation Calls to Action (2015b) that call on municipal governments and by extension, planning:

43. We call upon federal, provincial, territorial, and municipal governments to fully adopt and implement the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as the framework for reconciliation (p.4).

47. We call upon federal, provincial, territorial, and municipal governments to repudiate concepts used to justify European sovereignty over Indigenous peoples and lands, such as the Doctrine of Discovery and terra nullius, and to reform those laws, government policies, and litigation strategies that continue to rely on such concepts (p.5).

57. We call upon federal, provincial, territorial, and municipal governments to provide education to public servants on the history of Aboriginal peoples, including the history and legacy of residential schools, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Treaties and Aboriginal rights, Indigenous law, and Aboriginal–Crown relations. This will require skills-based training in intercultural competency, conflict resolution, human rights, and anti-racism (p.7).

75. We call upon the federal government to work with provincial, territorial, and municipal governments, churches, Aboriginal communities, former residential school students, and current landowners to develop and implement strategies and procedures for the ongoing identification, documentation, maintenance, commemoration, and protection of residential school cemeteries or other sites at which residential school children were buried. This is to include the provision of appropriate memorial ceremonies and commemorative markers to honour the deceased children (p.8).

These Calls to Action place the onus on municipal governments to actively engage in reconciliation work by utilizing the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. This Declaration calls for (1) an urgent need to affirm Indigenous peoples' equality to other peoples, while simultaneously affirming their difference; (2) recognition of the inherent rights Indigenous peoples have to their lands, territory and resources; (3) affirmation that settler colonial policies and practices (including planning) have led to Indigenous peoples to be treated unjustly which has produced lasting impacts on their present existence; (4) recognition of the need to promote the rights of Indigenous peoples that have been affirmed through treaties; (5) affirming that treaties represent a basis for strengthening relationships between Indigenous peoples and municipal governments; (6) respecting Indigenous epistemologies; and (7) welcoming Indigenous peoples self-organizing and self-determination (United Nations, 2007). These Calls to Action place municipal governments as actors who must rectify the mechanisms that have been and are continuously used to dispossess and harm Indigenous peoples. This is coupled with the expectation that public servants, such as planners, will receive accurate and in-depth training and education that will provide them with the tools and knowledge needed to pursue active and meaningful reconciliation.

3.2 The Shortcomings of Reconciliation in Municipal Settings

Reconciliation efforts tend to succumb to tactics that erase Indigenous presence (Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2013), or use discursive tactics to "move to innocence" resulting in rhetoric that legitimizes ongoing settler colonial occupation and/or purports white saviorism (Dorries, 2019; Lowman & Barker, 2015; Tuck & Yang, 2012). As already indicated, to be meaningful, reconciliation must avoid these tactics of recolonization by purposefully engaging with Indigenous-led decolonization efforts that call on settler actors for support, accountability,

and action. Meaningful reconciliation within urban settings also requires Indigenous-municipal

planning relationships to move beyond simplistic and temporary engagement processes towards

relational practices where Indigenous peoples are no longer bound to the inappropriate structures

of municipal planning (Nejad et al., 2019). However, a continuation of inadequate engagement

processes and outcomes is encouraged by a lack of visibility of Indigenous peoples within

municipal spaces and an ineptness within municipal planning to acknowledge the Indigeneity of

the land it operates on (Peters, 1998; Porter et al., 2017; Wensig & Porter, 2016). Furthermore,

when past attempts have been made to recognize Indigenous authority, it has been done within

the context of ongoing structures of settler colonialism that limit and contain Indigenous

authority (Barry, 2019; Coulthard, 2014; Nejad, et al., 2019; Porter & Barry, 2016). This has

resulted in decolonialization being shelved as a metaphor by settler colonial governments, which

facilitates the creation of recognition policies that are void of reparations (Fraser, 1997; Tuck &

Yang, 2012). Limiting aspects such as hierarchal recognition and inadequate co-production

processes have also led to largely unfruitful or insufficient engagement between Indigenous

peoples and municipalities (Abele et al., 2011; Porter & Barry, 2015; Porter et al., 2017;

Mohammed et al., 2017).

3.3 Municipal Engagement Processes

A high level of inconsistency and incoherency exists between the different levels of

settler governments about whose responsibility it is to carry out reconciliation within urban

settings and how planning processes with Indigenous actors ought to be carried out. Due to this

confusion a reversion to settler colonial logic has occurred to produce an inappropriate framing

of these relationships, where Indigenous actors are expected to answer to municipal

governments, instead of relationships based on equal authority between Indigenous actors and

municipalities (Barry, 2019). This has structurally lent itself to the subordination of Indigenous actors and thus recolonization, where the settler (municipal) government is positioned to be authoritative over the Indigenous actors it engages with. Jurisdictional ambiguity has also run rampant among all levels of settler government pertaining to who is responsible for urban Indigenous affairs (Peters, 2012). This ambiguity results in it being customary for municipalities to fail to engage with urban Indigenous populations or to undertake inappropriate "inclusionary"/exclusionary processes, where Indigenous peoples are haphazardly grouped in with multicultural or diversity processes (Abele et al., 2011).

There is also by and large a "lack of engagement with Indigeneity, decolonization, and Indigenous ways of knowing" (Tomiak, 2016, p. 9) within urban settings, unless these processes are initiated by Indigenous peoples. The convergence of interest between Indigenous peoples and municipalities is often the precursor for municipal engagement with urban Indigenous peoples (Belanger & Walker, 2009). Together this indicates a failing of municipal governments to engage with urban Indigenous peoples for the sole pursuit of reconciliation. It also indicates a failure to address Indigenous issues as identified by Indigenous peoples unless it also fulfills a self-serving purpose for the municipality. Therefore, municipal actions regarding "Indigenous issues" are often reflective of an inadequate uptake of Indigenous concerns into municipal priorities. Examples of this include token invitations to cultural events (Heritz, 2018) and utilizing damage centered narratives that de-historicize the harms Indigenous peoples encounter to reassert municipal governments as legitimate political actors (Dorries, 2019).

When Indigenous peoples are incorporated into engagement processes, they are often misrecognized. This occurs when Indigenous peoples are construed as one of the many stakeholder groups with equal stake in a matter (Fawcett, Walker, & Greene, 2015; Walker,

2017). Plastering the stakeholder engagement process onto the relationship between Indigenous peoples and municipalities, works to undermine Indigenous self-determination (Barry & Thompson-Fawcett, 2020; Dorries, 2017; Porter et al., 2017; Walker, 2017). This facilitates a colonial, ahistorical, and inappropriate relationship between Indigenous peoples and municipalities because Indigenous peoples are expected to operate under the jurisdiction of municipal governments (Dorries, 2019; Dorries, Hugill, & Tomiak, 2019). Thus, stakeholder engagement processes uphold colonial structures that push Indigenous peoples into relationships premised on settler-state dependency, while undermining Indigenous futurity and self-determination.

The relationships established through municipal-led engagement processes often position Indigenous actors to be inferior to settler governance structures, instead of recognizing Indigenous actors with self-determination, whose sovereignty exists outside the bounds of municipal governance. The shortcomings of these engagement processes demonstrate the settler-colonial ideals common within municipal planning, as these ideals tend to operate in a manner that supports the subversion of Indigenous self-determination (Mohammed et al., 2017; Moore et al., 2011; Nejad et al., 2020). Therefore, when Indigenous actors choose to engage with municipal governments under the structures and processes set forth by municipal planning, they are often left with two options: the subversion of their self-determination or to refuse to engage with municipalities.

3.4 Recognition and Redistribution

There is a disconnection between how municipalities attempt to include Indigenous peoples into engagement processes and how Indigenous participants interpret this inclusion (Abele et al., 2011; Fawcett, Walker, & Greene, 2015; Nejad et al., 2019). This indicates a

mismatch between how municipal planning has attempted to build relationships with Indigenous peoples and how relationships with Indigenous peoples need to be built. Remediating this mismatch increases the likelihood of municipalities being able to engage with reconciliation in an appropriate and meaningful manner that supports decolonization efforts. This remediation requires those who are situated within municipal planning to engage with Indigenous actors under the terms set by Indigenous actors (Porter et al., 2017). This operates as a recognition of Indigenous self-determination and contributes to active forms of reconciliation. However, engagement nor recognition is not enough. The restoration of resources and infrastructure to decolonization efforts must also coincide with the recognition of Indigenous self-determination for settler institutions to meaningfully undertake reconciliation (Corntassel, 2012; Porter et al., 2017). Thus, without both recognition and some form of redistribution, reconciliation efforts are likely to be short-lived, ineffective, and/or damaging.

3.4.1 The Limits of Recognition

To enact remedial and meaningful forms of reconciliation through planning requires more than just a recognition of Indigenous peoples, territory acknowledgements, and shallow forms of redress. Recognition often rings hollow for Indigenous peoples as it requires Indigenous communities to use western terms of knowledge to advocate for themselves in a way that settler institutions, like planning, will understand (Coulthard, 2014). However, through this process the stories that become naturalized are those that solidify and retrench damage-based narratives that centre poverty, harm, and community deficiency as facets of Indigenous life (Trapenberg Frick, et al. 2018). This then contrives the notion that it is Indignity, which is the cause of these facets, instead of the legacies of settler colonialism (Harjo, 2019; Tuck, 2009b). Recognition through practices such as territorial acknowledgements also work to move settler institutions towards

26

contrived innocence, while simultaneously failing to rematriate land and ways of being (Asher, Curnow, Davis, 2018). As such, the politics-of-recognition releases settler institutions from providing reparations to Indigenous communities, along with the reparative work they are responsible for, for the purposes of reconciliation and the addressal of both past and present harm (Coulthard, 2014).

Recognition is also limiting because it situates settler institutions as the giver of recognition, while simultaneously placing Indigenous communities and individuals as subjects under the settler nation-state (Corntassel, 2012; Coulthard, 2007). This process reproduces a hierarchical relationship between settler institutions and Indigenous peoples, which undermines decolonization and meaningful reconciliation. Through recognition a re-colonization of Indigenous land, life, language, culture, and ways of being often occurs, which is not only unproductive but harmful and oppressive for Indigenous individuals. This form of an asymmetrical relationship reproduces the oppressive and enduring nature of settler colonialism, which "actively operates to foreclose Indigenous futurities" (Harjo, 2019, p. 65) as Indigenous land, life, language, culture, and ways of being are re-colonized. This trap of re-colonization is understood by Indigenous scholars, as they warn Indigenous communities against seeking redress and recognition from the settler structures that oppress Indigenous communities (see Corntassel, 2012; Coulthard, 2007).

3.4.2 The Limits of Redistribution

Redistribution has also been a limiting form of reconciliation because of its focus almost solely on confronting injustices within the economic sphere (Courntassel, 2014; Coulthard, 2014). This is limiting because it often works to assimilate Indigenous calls for justice into settler frameworks of capitalism and understandings of land as property (Blatman & Porter, 2019;

Tomiak, 2017). This results in a failure to transform the structural aspects of settler colonialism, as colonial cultural values remain intact and are further entrenched through these "solutions" (Coulthard, 2014). However, this does not diminish the benefit that redistribution can offer for Indigenous peoples, as redistribution does engage with immediate material needs and can be an avenue for a political claim to sovereignty and self-determination (Barry & Thompson-Fawcett, 2020). To propel an actionable and systemically meaningful form of reconciliation requires planning to meet material needs in a format that produces Indigenous self-determination and encourages Indigenous futurity. Thus, redistribution in the form of land, resources and funding could potentially produce meaningful reconciliation by supporting Indigenous decolonization efforts which produce systemic change through the embodiment of Indigenous futurity.

3.5 Indigenous-Municipal Co-Production Processes

Co-production between municipal planning and urban Indigenous peoples has been identified as a possible avenue for pursuing productive and responsive outcomes that address reconciliation (Belanger & Walker, 2009; Fawcett, Walker, & Greene., 2015). Co-production attempts to move away from paternalistic planning processes that cause planners and city officials to assume authority over process (Belanger et al., 2018). Instead, co-production processes are shaped by all parties and aim to address issues identified by Indigenous peoples, instead of planning officials. This allows co-production to attempt to move beyond the hierarchal nature of consultation to shared practice. This process is actively pursued by both "sides" with Indigenous communities deciding on what should be addressed and how it should be addressed within the co-production process (Fawcett, Walker, & Greene, 2015; Nejad et al., 2020). Thus, co-production allows for engagement to no longer be limited by the preconceived design of

municipal planning, or colonial notions of good planning. This permits conditions to exist that allow for self-determination to become more readily realized.

Co-production is vehemently opposed to construing Indigenous peoples as simply one of the many stakeholders within the city, as this engagement process aims to recognize the self-governing authority that Indigenous peoples possess. However, there is concern over how readily processes of co-production can be pursued within the existing confines set by settler colonialism (Barry, 2019; Belanger & Dekruyf, 2017; Trapenberg et al., 2018). A growing body of literature has also identified the frequency that municipal governments fail to uphold co-production and instead revert to paternalistic planning processes that obscure Indigenous self-determination (Barry & Thompson-Fawcett, 2020; Belanger et al., 2018; Porter & Barry, 2016). These shortcomings indicate that, while co-production offers promise, it may not be the pathway forward for achieving anti-colonial processes that are grounded in Indigenous self-determination, decolonization, and productive forms of reconciliation.

3.6 Reconciliation that Supports Decolonization

There is a "a need for alternative, decolonial ways of understanding relationships between the 'planner' and the 'planned', grounded in recognition of overlapping governance roles Indigenous peoples are now (re)claiming in the urban environment" (Barry & Thompson-Fawcett, 2020, p. 412). Uncovering a gap in knowledge that contributes to alternative and decolonial ways of planning aids in the emergence of a planning framework that contends with the settler colonialism. This also actively upholds the pursuit of Indigenous futurity, while abating the structural violence inflicted through planning practices that result in (and from) exclusion or misrecognition of Indigenous self-determination (Abele et al., 2011; Mohammed et al., 2017).

Dorries & Harjo (2020) and Dorries (2017, 2018, 2019) assert that Indigenous resurgent and decolonization practices provide an avenue for self-determination that refuses municipal planning processes that continue to subvert the authority of Indigenous peoples. This assertion places Indigenous peoples as actors who will provide their own pathway forward by creating Indigenous space for Indigenous peoples while simultaneously obscuring assumed authority within western planning (Porter et al., 2017). Although this perspective captures the self-determination that Indigenous peoples possess, it may also underestimate the structural necessity municipal planning can provide for sustaining Indigenous-led initiatives (Prusak et al., 2016). Therefore, while Indigenous-led decolonization efforts rightly derive their authority outside of planning, the long-term sustainability of certain decolonization efforts may be limited unless engagement occurs between Indigenous actors and municipalities.

However, without accurate recognition of the self-determination within Indigenous-led initiatives, Indigenous-municipal relationships risk being undermined. It is then crucial to identify how planning can support Indigenous actors in their pursuit of maintaining separate and unbounded authority, while also not imposing settler frameworks onto Indigenous peoples and decolonization practices (Porter & Barry, 2015; Prusak et al., 2016). The identification of this will contribute to the "ontological and epistemological transformation" (Nejad et al., 2020, p. 440) that is needed for planning to support the long-term objective of Indigenous futurity.

The primary limitation of existing knowledge regarding Indigenous-municipal planning lies in its often-shallow engagement with decolonization. Dorries (2018) has noted, that the discourse of reconciliation often operates as a ruse for settler institutions to appear to be engaging with Indigenization while failing to alter the colonial nature of Indigenous and non-Indigenous relationships. This often means a failure to return land and provide administrative

and financial support, while producing "innocence" centered rhetoric. Through this rhetoric and lack of action, reconciliation becomes detached from its relation to decolonization. When this application of reconciliation is applied it becomes implausible to uncover how Indigenous-municipal relationships can operate outside the bounds set by settler colonialism because there is a failure to incorporate active forms of Indigenous-led decolonization within conceptualizations of Indigenous-municipal relationships. This failure results in the undermining of Indigenous self-determination and Indigenous futurity.

While reconciliation relies on conceptual understandings and support of decolonization, the inverse relationship does not exist. Indigenous-led decolonization does not require settler saviorism through reconciliation efforts. Yet, understanding how municipalities engage with Indigenous-led decolonization practices is useful for the facilitation of meaningful reconciliation efforts within urban spaces (Davoudi, 2015; Porter et al., 2017). Thus, decolonization practices need to be further acknowledged within planning literature and municipal planning processes need to be studied as they undertake productive acts of reconciliation that engage with Indigenous-led initiatives that produce decolonization as they meet the self-defined needs and desires of Indigenous communities.

Chapter 4 O:se Kenhionhata:tie, Land Back Camp: Land Back in the Urban Setting of Kitchener-Waterloo

"Reconciliation is not a goal you achieve as a "Director of", especially in colonial government structures...it's a process of actively committing to and carrying out reparations, acknowledging and respecting Indigenous Sovereignty, and physically giving Land Back."

- O:se Kenhionhata:tie, 2022d

4.1 O:se Kenhionhata:tie, Land Back Camp

O:se Kenhionhata:tie, Land Back Camp is a Two-Spirit, Indigenous-led group that has organized since June 2020 (Bangishimo & Smoke, 2021). The co-organizers of the Camp, Amy Smoke, Bangishimo, and Terre Chartrand had been organizing events within the community for several years but were becoming increasingly frustrated with having to watch their communities constantly struggle for gathering space (O:se Kenhionhata:tie, 2022c). From this frustration came the pursuit of creating a reclamation space in Victoria Park, located within the City of Kitchener. This land is a traditional gathering place for the Haudenosaunee, Anishinaabe, Chonnonton, and Huron nations under the Dish with One Spoon Wampum (Bangishimo, 2021a). It is also located within the Haldimand Tract, land promised to the Six Nations of the Grand River in the Haldimand Proclamation of 1784 (Monture, 2010).

The co-organizers of O:se Kenhionhata:tie initially intended to reclaim this space for three days (Bangishimo & Smoke, 2021). However, as Indigenous queer, Two-Spirit, trans, and non-binary youth continued to join O:se Kenhionhata:tie it became clear that the camp was addressing a need within the community, primarily the need for Indigenous gathering spaces and the need for space that is by and for Indigiqueer folks (Campbell, Chartrand, & Smoke, 2020; Smoke, 2020b; Smoke, Bangishimo, & O'Neil, 2021; Smoke & Bangishimo, 2022). From a recognition of these needs, O:se Kenhionhata:tie's aim quickly shifted. Instead of being a three-

day reclamation, O:se Kenhionhata:tie became a long-term reclamation space for Indigenous queer and trans youth to reconnect and learn about their Indigeneity (O:se Kenhionhata:tie, 2022c).

Over the course of their now three-year existence, O:se Kenhionhata:tie has hosted numerous events and activities with these goals in mind. This has included large scale events such as a Two-Spirit Social and Community Gathering that included food, music, spoken word and Indigenous vendors (O:se Kenhionhata:tie, n.d; Shetty, 2021; Weins, 2021), as well as a Winter Solstice Feast (CTV News Kitchener, 2021; Bangishimo & Smoke, n.d.a). The camp also hosts smaller scale events specifically for its campers and those a part of the camp. These events have included a make-up tutorial and clothing swap, traditional stick and poke tattoos, drum circles, guided yoga, a maple syrup event, tipi raising, creating a group painting on their tipi, pottery workshops, a wilderness survival workshop, canoeing, gardening, harvesting, ceremonies, and feasts (O:se Kenhionhata:tie, 2020c, 2021a, 2021b, 2021c, 2021e, 2021g, 2021j, 2021k, 2021l, 2022c; Smoke & Bangishimo, 2021). These events are practiced in a way that celebrate and affirm the gender diversity and queer identities of the campers, along with their Indigeneity, as these two aspects of identity are often bound together (Smoke, Bangishimo, & O'Neil, 2021). As such, O:se Kenhionhata:tie offers space that is not only safe for Indigenous youth, but also welcoming, supportive, and celebratory of Indigiqueer life (Smoke, Bangishimo, & O'Neil, 2021; Smoke & Bangishimo, 2022).

O:se Kenhionhata:tie has also demonstrated a commitment to cultivating community care and solidarity work. They have done this by participating in several public talks on topics such as climate reparations and racial discrimination (Coalition of Muslim Women – KW, 2022; O:se Kenhionhata:tie, 2022b); participating in and/or organizing rallies (Schulz, 2021b; Villella,

2021); hosting and building connections with other Indigenous groups and leaders (Pickel, 2021; O:se Kenhionhara:tie, 2022c); and giving food from their community garden to the local community fridge (O:se Kenhionhata:tie, 2021h). Other work that has come out of O:se Kenhionhata:tie includes their film, *Stories from Land Back Camp: Reclaiming Indigiqueer Space* which has been shown at seven film festivals (Smoke & Bangishimo, 2022); co-founder of the camp, Bangishimo's *On The Land* portrait series, which has exhibited in several different locations within the city of Waterloo, despite being vandalized over four times (Bangishimo, 2021c; Schulz, 2021a); a Land Back Camp zine (O:se Kenhionhata:tie, 2021o); and a photo installation in downtown Kitchener titled *Land Back Camp: Our Voices* (CAFKA, 2021). Moreover, O:se Kenhionhata:tie has seen the flourishment of their campers becoming community leaders as they have organized vigils, spoken to classrooms, talked to the media, and done work with other Indigenous organizations (Smoke & Bangishimo, 2022).

4.2 O:se Kenhionhata:tie's Initial Engagement with Municipalities

The recognition that O:se Kenhionhata:tie was providing needed space for Indigenous and queer youth led the co-organizers to engage with local municipalities about removing barriers and providing better support for Indigenous-led initiatives that met Indigenous communities' needs (Campbell, Smoke, & Resmer, 2020; Bangishimo, 2021a; O:se Kenhionhata:tie, 2022c). This included putting forth four demands to the City of Kitchener; the City of Waterloo; and the upper-tier municipality of the Region of Waterloo. These demands focused on removing barriers for Indigenous communities to publicly gather and to create concrete actions for the municipalities to implement reconciliation efforts (Doan, 2020a), such as those in the TRC Calls to Action. This last focus comes after the municipalities were criticized

for their lack of implementation of the TRC Calls to Action (Hazelwood, 2020). The demands from O:se Kenhionhata:tie are as follows:

1. We demand that all fees be waived for the Indigenous communities to host events in public spaces;

2. We demand that land in Victoria Park, and Waterloo Park, be given back to the Indigenous Peoples. These spaces will be used for gathering and ceremonial purposes;

3. We demand that the cities create paid positions, at all levels, for Indigenous Peoples to be able to engage with the First Nations, Metis, and Inuit peoples living on this territory; and

4. We demand that the cities create Indigenous Advisory Committees (paid) that will work with the Mayors and City Councillors in helping to address topics such as racial injustice, the lack of access to Indigenous services and community spaces, and addressing the TRC's 94 Calls to Actions (O:se Kenhionhata:tie, 2020a).

O:se Kenhionhata:tie initially reclaimed land in Victoria Park and later Waterloo Park (located in the city of Waterloo) for six months in 2020 (Bangishimo, 2021a; Shetty, 2020b). Throughout this time, they engaged with the Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo through weekly meetings, public petitions, letter writing campaigns, and addressing city councils at public meetings (CBC, 2020; Doan, 2020a; Doan, 2020b; Doan, 2020c; Bangishimo & Smoke, 2020a, 2020b; Bangishimo, & Smoke, 2021; Kooner, 2020; O:se Kenhionhata:tie, 2020, 2021m; Schulz, 2020; Shetty 2020a; Smoke, 2020a; Textile KW, 2021; Thompson, 2020). This engagement resulted in them succeeding in having three of their four demands met. These demands being "to waive all fees for Indigenous events hosted in public facilities, hire Indigenous people to city

positions, and create ceremonial gathering space in both Victoria Park and Waterloo Park,"
(Bangishimo, 2021a). However, there remains the discussion of the municipalities giving land
back and how the municipalities will permanently support Indigenous-led initiatives through
their reconciliation efforts (Smoke, 2020b).

After their 6-month reclamation of space in Victoria and Waterloo Park, O:se
Kenhionhata:tie retired for the winter in January 2021 (Kooner, 2020; O:se Kenhionhata:tie,
2020b). During this time, they worked to secure land for the upcoming summer as they
continued to provide space and programming for Indigenous youth, while maintaining
engagement with the municipalities (O:se Kenhionhata:tie, 2021c; Smoke & Bangishimo, 2021).
The Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA)[3] offered them temporary space in the Laurel
Creek Conservation area. O:se Kenhionhata:tie was located here from May 2021 to October
2021 (GRCA, n.d.a; O:se Kenhionhata:tie, 2021i). However, after repeated harassment and
racialized violence, along with the camp organizer's experience of lack of response from the
GRCA, the space proved to be ill-suited for O:se Kenhionhata:tie (Jackson, 2021; Bangishimo,
2022b; O:se Kenhionhata:tie, 2021d; O:se Kenhionhata:tie, 2022a; O:se Kenhionhata:tie, 2022c;
Smoke & Bangishimo, 2022; Wong, 2021).

Through their engagement with the municipalities, O:se Kenhionhata:tie has also made
clear the distinction between the resources needed for settler education at the municipal council
and staff levels, and the resources needed to support Indigenous-led initiatives. Making this
distinction is important for ensuring that funds allocated for reconciliation efforts are not spent
on internal training and education instead of providing financial and infrastructural support to
Indigenous-led initiatives (Campbell, Chartrand, & Smoke, 2020; Bangishimo & Smoke, 2020a).

---

[3] The GRCA is a corporate body that manages water and other natural resources on behalf of 39 municipalities.

Both education and support for Indigenous-led initiatives are needed, but settler education cannot overwhelm budgets and agendas allocated for reconciliation. This distinction between settler education on aspects such as colonialism, decolonization, and reconciliation; and producing meaningful support for Indigenous actors is also mirrored in the different TRC Calls to Action that mention municipalities (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015b).

4.3 O:se Kenhionhata:tie's Ongoing Engagement with Municipalities

There is still no permanent space large enough for the Indigenous communities to gather within the Region of Waterloo, nor a permanent space for O:se Kenhionhata:tie (O:se Kenhionhata:tie, 2022c). While the co-organizers of O:se Kenhionhata:tie continue to organize to secure land for the camp, they have also undertaken organizing for the creation of an Indigenous Community Hub within the Region of Waterloo (Bangishimo & Smoke, 2021; Smoke & Bangishimo, 2022). This Hub could provide much-needed, permanent space for various Indigenous organizations and communities within the area (Groleau, 2021). Thus, two separate yet connected pursuits for Land Back have been undertaken by the co-organizers of O:se Kenhionhata:tie.

While the search for permanent space for the camp has included engagement with those outside of the municipalities, securing land for an Indigenous Community Hub is currently aimed at engagement with the Region of Waterloo (Ghonaim, 2021; Groleau, 2021). In the fall of 2021, the co-organizers of O:se Kenhionhata:tie, working with other Indigenous organizations, put forth a petition directed towards the Region of Waterloo with the following calls to action:

1. A call on the Region of Waterloo to support and lead alongside the Indigenous community in advocating for an Indigenous community hub in the heart of Kitchener;

2. A call on the Region of Waterloo to publicly share how much of the $15 million designated for Black and Indigenous initiatives is earmarked for the Indigenous community;

3. A call on the Region of Waterloo to use that earmarked funding for the Indigenous community in the creation of an Indigenous community hub;

4. A call on the Region of Waterloo to support Indigenous leaders and organizations as they design and craft a plan for the space;

5. A call on the Region of Waterloo to explicitly keep any police-led organizations, inclusive of Wellbeing Waterloo Region, from leading these engagements; and

6. We call on Waterloo Regional Council to reallocate and prioritize in the 2022 Budget the funding of (1) Indigenous-led Community Care Services, (2) Indigenous-led Inclusive and Accessible Housing and Supportive Housing, (3) The creation and sustainability of Indigenous Community Hub (Bangishimo, 2021b).

These calls to action reinforce the previous engagement undertaken by O:se Kenhionhata:tie, as space for Indigenous communities remains a prominent need. These calls also further underpin the need for permanent and ongoing municipal funding to be used for Indigenous-led initiatives (Ghonaim, 2021). This demonstrates that municipal engagement with Land Back efforts requires giving physical land back, along with financial and administrative support. These calls to action also demonstrate that municipalities must be transparent in how they are supporting Indigenous-led initiatives, including how they are internally hiring positions to oversee reconciliation efforts (Bangishimo, 2022a; Smoke & Bangishimo, 2022). O:se Kenhionhata:tie and the work of its co-organizers have proven that municipalities must work

alongside Indigenous communities calling for Land Back and avoid operating in a siloed and paternalistic manner that replicates harmful colonial relationships.

4.4 A Context for Research

The work O:se Kenhionhata:tie has done to engage with municipalities reveals the concerted effort that municipalities need to undertake to pursue meaningful and impactful forms of reconciliation. The persistent lack of a permanent space for O:se Kenhionhata:tie, along with their ongoing search for space for an Indigenous Community Hub demonstrates how the combination of land, financial support, and administrative support is a potential avenue for municipalities to pursue meaningful reconciliation. This avenue has potential because it is grounded in what is being asked of municipal bodies by Indigenous communities. It also has potential because of its ability to produce reconciliation efforts that avoid reasserting colonial and racist hierarchical relationships between Indigenous communities and municipalities. Furthermore, O:se Kenhionhata:tie demand for the land in Victoria Park and Waterloo Park be given back to the Indigenous Peoples still remains unmet, despite the passing of two years since O:se Kenhionhata:tie first made the demand.

Understanding how this avenue of reconciliation has been undertaken by other municipalities could be instructive for the municipalities within the Kitchener-Waterloo context, as they move towards more active and purposeful forms of reconciliation that are responsive to the Indigenous-led work that is being done within the area. The work of this thesis aims to contribute to this understanding by collecting data on municipal examples that have pursued reconciliation by providing Indigenous-led initiatives with land, financial support, and administrative support. The purpose of this is to provide an instructional roadmap and guidance for the municipalities O:se Kenhionhata:tie engages with by critically examining how other

municipalities have implemented this avenue of reconciliation. Thus, the aim of this work is to aid in developing the basis for meaningful acts of reconciliation that support the pursuits of O:se Kenhionhata:tie.

Chapter 5 Methodology

This chapter details the development of the research within this thesis. This includes an overview of the early engagement processes that occurred with O:se Kenhionhata:tie, the theoretical approaches to undertaking this research, how the research was undertaken, and a discussion of why certain cases studies were included as opposed to others. The use of secondary data and the utilization of a content analysis as the main proponents of the research is also explained.

5.1 Research Approaches

This research has been guided by participatory action research (PAR) and Indigenous research approaches (Absolon, 2011; Coombes, Johnson & Howitt, 2014; Hart, Straka, & Rowe, 2017; Tuck, 2008, 2009a; Smith, 2004; Weber-Pillwax, 2011; Wilson, 2008). Taking a PAR and Indigenous research approach means that Indigenous peoples impacted or associated with the research jointly shaped the research questions, focus, and outcomes. Two-eyed seeing, a principle brought forward by Mi'kma'ki Elder Albert Marshall in 2004 (Bartlett, Marshall, & Marshall, 2012; Sylliboy, et al., 2021; Reid, et al., 2020), also influenced this research, so that Indigenous epistemologies were upheld and allowed to be incommensurables with western epistemologies, while settler colonial logic was also confronted (Asselin & Basile, 2018; Coombes, Johnson & Howitt, 2014; Dorries & Ruddick, 2018; Peltier, 2018; Todd, 2016; Tuck & Yang, 2012; Tuck & Yang, 2014b). Using this type of a research approach meant that Indigenous concepts and embodiments of futurity were not analyzed using western concepts, as these concepts are typically unable to fully capture, nor understand Indigenous ways of

knowing[4]. This research operated under a transformative worldview to align with the objective of upholding Indigenous sovereignty for the pursuit of developing knowledge that can contribute to the discontinuation of planning that perpetuates settler colonial logic, dispossession, and oppression of Indigenous peoples.

5.2 Early Engagement and Development of Research

Early engagement was undertaken with the co-organizers of the O:se Kenhionhata:tie Land Back Camp, Amy Smoke and Bangishimo for the purposes of this research. Conducting early engagement is an ethical protocol required for research with Indigenous peoples. This form of engagement is done to ensure Indigenous peoples well-being is maintained within the research and to give them control over the research (Panel on Research Ethics, 2018). Through appropriate early engagement processes, Indigenous peoples determine if research occurs and how it occurs. This allows Indigenous peoples to assert control over the research from the onset as their values, needs, and desires become embedded within the research and its objectives. Early engagement is therefore essential for creating ethical research that involves or impacts Indigenous peoples; and is a crucial step for performing a praxis of ethical research that is vested in Indigenous sovereignty and self-determination, decolonization, reconciliation, and the dismantling of settler colonialism.

Through early engagement I built a relationship with Amy, Bangishimo, and the Camp, to determine the appropriateness of a research project that could support their work. This relationship was initiated through an informal conversation in the summer of 2021, as I

---

[4] Mvskoke scholar, Lara Harjo (2019) explicitly discusses how Indigenous futurity cannot be fully understood, nor captured by western, linear notions of space and time as futurity is realized through a dialectical process across multiple space-time configurations, which is predicated on space and time being understood as relational processes that occurs across spatial imaginaries. Applying a western, linear understanding of space and time to futurity is inappropriate because it fails to fully encapsulate Indigenous futurity and the Indigenous ways of knowing that it comes from.

approached them to discuss the possibility of undertaking research that analyzed Indigenous-municipal relationships within urban settings. From the onset of this engagement I was clear that I did not intend to study O:se Kenhionhata:tie, Land Back Camp, but was interested in how planning and municipalities were responding to Indigenous-led initiatives, such as theirs. From this initial conversation I continued to undertake early engagement with O:se Kenhionhata:tie to further refine my research and build a reciprocal and ongoing relationship with them. To ensure my relationship with O:se Kenhionhata:tie was reciprocal and not extractive, I provided O:se Kenhionhata:tie with support during a Two-Spirit community event, took meeting minutes, and aided in the removal of seasonal garden beds at the camp. Overtime I became "a friend of camp," (a term Amy and Bangishimo have used to introduce me to others) and have been invited to events O:se Kenhionhata:tie has organized for the Camp and friends of the Camp. This has included a Winter Solstice Feast and a gathering for National Indigenous Peoples Day.

Through early engagement this research has been altered to better support O:se Kenhionhata:tie's goals, as they continue to undertake engagement with the municipalities of the Region of Waterloo, the City of Kitchener, and the City of Waterloo for the purposes of gaining land, and financial and administrative support for both their Camp and an Indigenous Community Hub. To support O:se Kenhionhata:tie's ongoing efforts, it was determined that the research would undertake an examination of municipalities within Canada that are engaging in giving land, and financial and administrative support to local Indigenous-led initiatives. This examination is meant to produce knowledge for how planning can support the long-term advancement of Indigenous futurity and sovereignty within urban settings. The work also speaks directly to the municipalities of the Region of Waterloo, the City of Kitchener, and the City of Waterloo by providing them with a roadmap for how to create the conditions needed for O:se

Kenhionhata:tie to thrive, as O:se Kenhionhata:tie continues to meet the self-defined needs and desires of local Indigenous communities. The secondary objective for this research is a theoretical contribution, as the field of planning is analyzed through the lens of settler colonialism. Through this contribution planning is further attached to practices that allow it to be a life-making practice that centers Indigenous sovereignty, self-determination, and futurity, instead of being a world-ending practices that facilitates the dispossession and oppression of Indigenous peoples.

5.3 Ongoing Relationship with Community

From early engagement, an ongoing relationship has been established with O:se Kenhionhata:tie pertaining to the work within this thesis. This ongoing relationship has allowed Amy and Bangishimo to have ongoing authority over the research as they have been included at various points throughout its progression. This has included updates on the development of the research prior and during data collection; soliciting their input on the selection of case studies and data collection; providing them with chapter three of this thesis to review to ensure they have control over the narrative of their story; updating them on research findings; and lastly sharing the final results of the research with them. This last action is done to ensure that the research goes back to the community it is associated with, which is often a closing step for research with community to ensure they have access to the outcomes of the research and to maintain commitment to a relational research practice that minimizes the extractive qualities of community-based research (McGill University, 2022).

5.4 Environmental Scan

To undertake this research an environmental scan was first conducted to identify examples of municipalities within Canada that are engaging with giving land and resources to

Indigenous-led initiatives within urban settings. Canada was chosen as the geographical scope

for this research of the similarities cases within this context are likely share with the context O:se

Kenhionhata:tie operates within. Thus, these cases are most likely to contain knowledge relevant

for O:se Kenhionhata:tie's pursuits.

The environmental scan consisted of an initial internet scan with the terms,

"reconciliation" and "city." From this initial scan a list of municipalities that have at the

minimum engaged with reconciliation and have mentioned it on their websites were identified.

This list consisted of the cities of Burnaby, BC; Mission, BC; Port Coquitlam, BC; Kamloops;

BC; Vancouver, BC; Victoria; BC; Calgary, AB; Edmonton, AB; Leduc, AB; Lethbridge, AB;

Fort Saskatchewan, AB; Red Deer, AB; St. Albert, AB; Wetaskiwin, AB; Yellowknife, NWT;

Saskatoon, SK; Winnipeg, MB; Barrie, ON; Brampton, ON; North Bay, ON; and Ottawa, ON;

and Toronto, ON. The official websites for each of these cities were surveyed. Most municipal

websites merely mentioned the TRC, contained a statement on reconciliation, listed resources

pertaining to residential schools, recognized National Truth and Reconciliation Day and National

Indigenous Peoples Day, and/or listed any corresponding events being held within the city. Other

websites mentioned Indigenous initiatives, ongoing commitments to reconciliation, and/or active

projects that have a stated purpose of reconciliation. Some websites also mentioned city-led

reconciliation committees and associated projects. The websites that mentioned anything relating

to an initiative, project, or planning process that centred giving space to Indigenous communities

within the city were further surveyed. Beyond this internet scan the municipal website for each

provincial and territorial capital city was surveyed (if not already covered from the internet

scan), along with one to three other large to mid-size cities in each province and territory. Large

to mid-size cities were focused on because of their likelihood of sharing similarities with the

Kitchener-Waterloo context, such as similar resource and funding capacity, infrastructure, and municipal proceedings. Some case studies were also identified because they were mentioned as an example in another city's planning document. Lastly, word of mouth was also used to identify potential case studies[5].

Conducting an environmental scan on this topic required extensive time and effort as this is an emerging topic within planning. There is very little academic research that engages with municipalities giving urban land to Indigenous groups, nor noted examples of this occurring (see Porter & Barry, 2016; Thompson-Fawcett & Riddle, 2017; Tomiak, 2017). There are also few materials that explicitly engage with reconciliation processes that center giving land back within a municipal setting, let alone contain information on municipalities that are undertaking this action. As such, much of the work for this research was conducting the environmental scan for potential case studies to analyze.

5.5 Case Study Selection and Scope

Once identified, case studies were chosen based on the criteria of (1) a municipality's demonstrated engagement with Indigenous-led initiatives, (2) their committed effort to provide these initiatives with land and/or a building, along with (3) ongoing financial and administrative support. These criteria produced four case studies for analysis. Only four case studies were analyzed due to the limited timeframe and scope of a Master's thesis, as well as limited findings from the environmental scan. The four selected case studies were chosen based on the availability of data for each case, as some had more documents for analysis than others, along

---

[5] Prior to undertaking this research, I was aware of the Arctic Indigenous Wellness Foundation's On the Land Healing Camp in Yellowknife, NWT from conversations with my supervisor, Janice Barry. From previous coursework, I knew about Anishnawbe Health Toronto's mixed-use Indigenous Hub, which is proposed for development. Information publicly shared by Bangishimo alerted me to the example of Kihciy Askiy in Edmonton, AB. Amy and Bangishimo also directed me towards a few other possible case studies to consider for analysis.

with the ability of the case to provide insights into municipal governance, as some cases relied more readily on provincial or federal funding, resources, and processes. Below is a brief overview of each of the four case studies, along with a table listing the municipal documents used for analysis for each case study:

- The City of Lethbridge is undergoing a planning process for the creation of an Indigenous Cultural Centre. Through this process they have produced a feasibility study, conducted community engagement, contemplated various governance structures, and are currently looking for a building/land for the Centre.

- The City of Kingston is currently undertaking a process with local Indigenous communities to create a permanent Indigenous Cultural Centre. Through this process they have supported the Kingston Indigenous Language Nest (KILN) to produce an interim gathering space to meet the present needs and desires of the local Indigenous communities, while they continue to undertake planning for a permanent Centre.

- The City of Edmonton is presently constructing Kihciy Askiy, a ceremonial and land based educational space, which will be operated by the Indigenous Knowledge and Wisdom Centre (IKWC). The City is also beginning to undertake the planning process for the creation of an Indigenous Cultural and Wellness Centre, which is at present led by EndPovertyEdmonton's Indigenous Circle.

- The City of Yellowknife provided land to the Arctic Indigenous Wellness Foundation (AIWF) for the creation of an On the Land Healing Camp that provided space and care for unhoused folks in Yellowknife[6]. This Camp existed

---

[6] According to City estimates, 90% of unhoused people in Yellowknife were Indigenous in 2018 (City of Yellowknife, 2019c).

within the city from 2017 to 2022 but has since relocated 20 minutes outside of

the city (Morritt-Jacobs, 2022).

Table 1.1 Municipal Documents

Municipality	List of Municipal Documents Analyzed
City of Lethbridge	- Capital improvement program 2018-2027 (2017, June) - Reconciliation Lethbridge advisory committee minutes (2019, November) - Lethbridge Indigenous cultural centre: Feasibility study (2020, February) - Reconciliation Lethbridge Advisory Committee Minutes (2020, May) - Briefing memo to Reconciliation Lethbridge Advisory Committee (2021, February) - Briefing memo to Reconciliation Lethbridge Advisory Committee Agenda (2021, June) 2022-2031 Capital improvement program (2021, June) 2021 Reconciliation Annual Report (2021, September) - Reconciliation Lethbridge Advisory Committee Minutes (December 2021, December) - Briefing memo to Reconciliation Lethbridge Advisory Committee (2022, January) - Reconciliation Lethbridge Advisory Committee minutes (2022, February)
City of Kingston	- Kingston First Peoples: Purposeful dialogues - Relationship building: Phase 1 (2015) - Report to council: Report number 18-091 (2018, April) - Engage for change: Phase II what we heard report (2020, February) - Report to council: Report number 20-060 (2020, March) - Report to council: Report number 21-215 (2021, September) - City council meeting number 19-2021 (2021, September) - City of Kingston annual report 2021 (2021) - City council meeting number 01-2022 (2021, December) - Report to council report number 22-006: Lease and municipal capital facility agreement – 610 Montreal Street, Kingston Indigenous Languages Nest (2021, December) - City of Kingston information report to council: Report number 22-106 (2022, March) - Engage for change website (2020)
City of Edmonton	- Update: Indigenous peoples strategy initiative (2015) - End poverty in a generation: A roadmaps to guide our journey (2016, May) - Kihciy Askiy (sacred earth) in Whitemud Park: environmental impact assessment final report (2017, October) - Terms of reference: Indigenous peoples strategy (2017) - Kihciy Askiy sacred earth formal edc submission: Submission for development permit (2017)

	• Site location study for Kihciy Askiy (Sacred Earth) in Whitemud Park: Final report (2017, November) • Kihciy Askiy sacred earth environmental impact assessment and site location study (2018, January) • Indigenous culture and wellness centre e-scan final report: The journey begins (2018, December) • Community and public services committee agenda (2019, October) • Kihciy askiy partnership agreement (2019, October) • Letter of intent made between Indigenous Knowledge and Wisdom Centre Ltd. & City of Edmonton (2019, December) • Community and public services committee – Agenda (2020, December) • City council – Agenda (2020, December) • Community and public services committee (2021, March) • Community and public services committee report (2021, March) • Proposal for business case portion of strategy phase within ICWC development (2021, March) • Indigenous and wellness centre report (2021, March)
City of Yellowknife	• Municipal services committee report (2017, February) • Adopted council minutes (2017, February) • City of Yellowknife: Trail enhancement and connectivity strategy (2018, November) • Arctic Indigenous Wellness Foundation and City of Yellowknife memorandum of understanding (2018, June). • Municipal services committee report (2018, April) • Adopted special council minutes (2018, April) • Memorandum to committee (for information only) (2018, July) • Governance and priorities committee report (2018, November) • Special governance and priorities committee report (2018, November) • Council agenda (2018, December) • 2019-2022 goals and objectives (2019) • Indigenous relations - An update: Presentation to the Governance and Priorities Committee (2019, February) • Reconciliation: Starting the conversation (2019, June) • Adopted council minutes (2019, September) • Governance and priorities committee agenda (2019, September) • Governance and Priorities committee report (2019, September) • Council agenda (2019, October) • Governance and priorities committee agenda (2020, January) • Governance and priorities committee agenda (2020, October) • Community advisory board on homelessness (2021, February) • Reconciliation framework draft (2021, June) • Governance and priorities committee report (2021, June)

The four selected cases varied in terms of where they were within the process of providing land and support to Indigenous-led initiatives. Having this variation for analysis produced a more fulsome account for how municipalities can undertake this work, as analysis undertaken at different stages within a process can produce more specific knowledge about each stage. The cases at earlier stages also tended to provide more material for analysis, which resulted in greater insight into the processes for producing these conditions within municipal contexts. This focus on process aligns with Indigenous ways of knowing, which often emphasize process over outcome, as process indicates an ongoing course of action that implies relational continuity and considers the impacts of how something is done (McGregor, 2018a). Whereas outcomes often indicate an end result, which can be understood as the end of a relationship, while also discounting the impacts produced through the process of reaching the end result.

Some cases found within the environmental scan were excluded from analysis for various reasons. First, cases of Indigenous-led initiatives that relied on federal or provincial governments for land and funding were excluded, even if the initiatives were located within an urban municipal context[7]. These cases could provide relevant knowledge on other potential funding sources for O:se Kenhionhata:tie. However, these cases are largely outside the scope of planning at the municipal level and therefore outside the scope of this thesis. Second, cases were excluded if a project was a joint initiative between First Nation and municipal governments because these cases were not as relevant for analyzing governance relationships between Indigenous grassroots

---

[7] The Anishnawbe Health Toronto's mixed-use Indigenous Hub in Toronto, ON was excluded because the provincial government of Ontario returned land to Anishnawbe Health Toronto in 2014, not the municipality of Toronto (Bowden, 2021; Pagliacolo, 2020). The municipality also failed to play a role in financing the planning of this Hub. However, the case study could provide insights into municipal governance and planning regarding development approval processes for Indigenous Hubs; and partnerships between Indigenous organizations, provincial and municipal governments for the purposes of creating Indigenous spaces within urban settings. The newly established rental housing units operated by the Lu'ma Native Housing Society in Vancouver, BC was also excluded for this reasoning (Ministry of Attorney General and Responsible, 2021).

organizations/groups and municipalities[8]. Further, these cases are often explicitly tied to land claims and disputes, which is outside the scope of this research. Lastly, private transfers of land and buildings to Indigenous-led initiatives were also excluded in the case selection[9]. These cases are often one-off instances and are unlikely to provide knowledge that can be utilized within other contexts, nor are they relevant for producing knowledge about structural change within planning and municipal governance.

The scope of analysis within chosen cases did not include an entire analysis of reconciliation policies and implementation actions from each municipality. Within some cases the scope of analysis considered how the initiative related or worked in combination with broader reconciliation goals, policies and implementations purported by the municipality. However, this was not the focus of analysis and was only considered when it was essential for understanding a municipality's direct engagement with a local Indigenous-led initiative.

5.6 Secondary Data Collection

Chapter three of this thesis was produced solely from secondary data such as media reports, public talks, social media posts, delegations at municipal council meetings, and public statements from O:se Kenhionhata:tie. This chapter was written using material O:se

---

[8] The Jericho Lands planning program in Vancouver, BC was excluded because this planning process is between the xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (Musqueam), Sḵwx̱wú7mesh (Squamish), and səlilwətaɬ (Tsleil-Waututh) (MST) Partnership, the Canada Lands Company (CLC), and the City of Vancouver (City of Vancover, n.d.; McElroy, 2021; Meiszner, 2021). The xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (Musqueam), Sḵwx̱wú7mesh (Squamish), and səlilwətaɬ (Tsleil-Waututh) nations also purchased half of this land themselves in 2016. If studied, this case could provide further insights into joint planning initiatives between First Nations and municipal governments, as they aim to co-manage and co-develop land within urban settings; as well as community engagement and settler responses to these types of initiatives, as this development is presently being opposed by Vancouver residents (Boynton, 2022; Miljure, 2022)

[9] The transfer of a building owned by the Hudson's Bay Company's in Winnipeg, MB to the Southern Chiefs Organization, which represents 34 Anishinaabe and Dakota Nations, was excluded because this was a transfer of a privately owned building, not a municipally owned building (Austen, 2022; Bundale, 2022; MacLean, 2022). This case could provide insights into the creation of Indigenous Hubs within urban settings, along with partnerships between Indigenous government organizations, federal and municipal governments, as the latter two are set to provide funding for the development of this building into an Indigenous Hub (Lambert, 2022; Stranger, 2022). This case is also developing as the building was transferred in April 2022.

Kenhionhata:tie had already produced and disseminated into the public realm to avoid burdening Amy and Bangishimo with more work, especially when they had already produced knowledge about O:se Kenhionhata:tie for audiences such as the greater public and municipalities. Using secondary data also avoided inappropriate sharing of information within this thesis as O:se Kenhionhata:tie retained control over what type of information was shared outside of their community. This safeguarded against sharing any information that would be inappropriate or harmful to include within this thesis.

Secondary data was also used for the case studies analyzed for this research. Municipal meeting minutes, plans, communications materials, and official documents such as Memorandums of Understanding were used as primary texts for analysis. The choice to use secondary data again aligns with the goal of avoiding burdening Indigenous organizers with more work and respecting what information is already shared by Indigenous-led initiatives. Municipal planners were also not interviewed as text documents function on their own accord after their creation as they are interpreted and used. Additionally, to interview planners but not Indigenous organizers could have potentially given planners more input over the results of this research which could have reproduced existing colonial hierarchies. Lastly the time restraints of a Master's thesis limited the research scope. It would have been unfeasible to both build a relationship with O:se Kenhionhata:tie and collect primary data within the typical two year time-frame of a Master's thesis. As such, only secondary data was utilized within this research.

5.7 Content Analysis

The literature previously reviewed within this thesis establishes not only the gap within academic knowledge, and thus the direction for this research, but also the theoretical framework for analysis. Settler colonial theory supplemented this analysis by contextualizing it within a

broader context of understanding planning as western cultural practice that displaces and

assimilates Indigenous people for the perpetuation of settler colonialism (Blatman-Thomas &

Porter, 2019; Wolfe, 2006). The analysis also utilized Tuck and Yang's (2012) definition of

decolonization, which stipulates that decolonization requires the rematriation of land to

sovereign Indigenous bodies and the upholding of Indigenous futurity. This definition was

further refined according to the views of O:se Kenhionhata:tie and reflected within the analysis.

This research analyzes specific examples of reconciliation work within four different

municipalities within Canada, specifically pertaining to those that provide land, and financial and

administrative support to Indigenous-led initiatives within an urban setting. Content analysis of

municipal policy documents, media content, and documented municipal proceedings[10] was

undertaken for this research. Manifest content analysis was used primarily used (following

Bengtsson, 2016; Cope, 2010; and McLeod et al., 2015), which entailed identifying key terms,

phrases, and sections within documents that were useful for understanding the relationship

between an Indigenous-led initiative and the corresponding municipality, along with how the

municipality engaged in reconciliation efforts by providing the initiative with support. The

surface content of each text-based document produced by a municipality was searched for terms

that corresponded to an Indigenous-led initiative.[11] Within the documents these terms were

found, broader terms were then searched for. This included the terms "reconciliation,"

"decolonization," and "Indigenous." A descriptive account of each case study was produced

from this analysis. Next, a latent content analysis was conducted as the sections within the

documents that were flagged during the prior analysis were examined and coded for themes to

---

[10] Videos of municipal council meetings were transcribed for analysis.

[11] For example, the terms "Kihciy Askiy," "Native Counselling Services of Alberta," NCSA," "Indigenous Knowledge and Wisdom Centre," "IKWC," "Indigenous Circle," "Indigenous Cultural and Wellness Centre," "Indigenous Centre," and "Indigenous Cultural Centre" were searched for in City of Edmonton documents.

find the underlying meaning of the text (Bengtsson, 2016; Downe-Wambolt, 1992). The identification of these themes was an iterative process informed by both early engagement and the literature review. The common themes identified were (1) rhetoric used by municipalities, (2) governance and operations, (3) funding models, and (4) the need for Indigenous space within urban settings. These themes were chosen because of their relevancy for producing a roadmap for this form of reconciliation and producing insights into planning as a western cultural practice in the context of reconciliation.

5.8 Limitations

A limitation of this work exists regarding the generalization from the research results, as each municipality sits on a different type of territory (e.g., unceded, ceded, contested, uncontested) and consists of different Indigenous communities, all of whom have different and varying needs and desires. Due to these differences, the research results cannot be conflated with how every municipality ought to undertake planning for the pursuit of reconciliation and decolonization. Instead, the results offer general insight into how planning can aid in the subversion of settler colonialism, while also producing a potential roadmap for how other municipalities could pursue reconciliation based on the successes and failures found within these case studies.

Another limitation exists pertaining to my own positionality in undertaking this research. The analysis found in the proceeding chapters is one from a white settler perspective. Although Indigenous perspectives are incorporated and centred in this research, the analysis is still limited by my positionality. This limitation also corresponds to the understanding that planning as a profession needs to become more inclusive to diverse perspectives to facilitate anti-oppressive

knowledge generation, proceedings, and practices. As such, any Indigenous perspective

proceeding this research would overcome this limitation.

A small sampling of case studies also presents a limitation within this research as only

four case studies were analyzed. As previously indicated, planning's engagement with

reconciliation itself is a somewhat recent[12]. Several municipalities are only just beginning to

create policies pertaining to reconciliation and the recognition of settler colonialism and

Indigenous sovereignty (albeit often in limited forms such as passive territorial

acknowledgements that are void of reparative action). While many municipalities have yet to

even engage with reconciliation. This is also an emerging topic within the academic field of

planning. As such, few potential case studies were identified and analyzed within the timeframe

allocated for this research. A more expansive review of municipalities could overcome this

limitation, as well as a geographical broadening of scope to include municipalities across all of

Turtle Island, instead of just those within the Canadian context.

The reliance on secondary data presents a fourth limitation. The choice to use this form of

data has already been covered, however it is important to still identify it as a limitation for this

research. A more contextually expansive and illustrative analysis would likely be produced with

the incorporation of primary data, alongside secondary data. For example, incorporating

Indigenous research methods that focus on the collection of primary data, such as story work

(Archibald, 2008; Wilson, 2008), could provide greater insights into the relationships between

Indigenous-led initiatives and municipalities; the lasting impacts of municipalities providing

---

[12] The TRC's Calls to Action implicating municipalities and by extension, planning was published in 2015; the Canadian Institute of Planner's (2019) published the policy on planning practices and reconciliation in 2019; and the Ontario Professional Planners Institute (2019) created an Indigenous Planning Perspective Task Force in 2018, resulting in a Report in 2019. This is also evident from the dates of the municipal documents used for analysis, as two of the four case studies begin with documents from 2015, while the other two begin with documents created in 2017 (see table 1.1)

Indigenous-led initiatives with land, financial and administrative support; and a sharper

understanding regarding the implications of different funding, governance, and operation

models. This would also further centralize Indigenous perspectives and lived experience within

the research.

Chapter 6 Findings from the Case Studies

Four case studies were chosen for analysis from the environmental scan. The following chapter includes a description of each case study, as well as a consideration of each case study for the previously mentioned themes of (1) rhetoric used by municipalities, (2) governance and operations, (3) funding models, and (4) the need for Indigenous space within urban settings. There is variance amongst the cases selected, as different initiatives centered the creation of different spaces such as Indigenous community hubs, cultural centers, wellness centres, ceremonial spaces, and healing camps. The variation between these initiatives reflects the diversity between different Indigenous communities as each initiative responded to local needs and desires. Variance also exist regarding the separation between the municipalities' involvement in the facilitation of the initiative and the initiative itself.

6.1 The Creation Process for an Indigenous Cultural Centre in Lethbridge, Alberta

The City of Lethbridge began to plan for an Indigenous Cultural Centre (ICC) in 2017 proceeding from a vision crafted by the Native Counselling Services of Alberta, who collaborated with the City's Urban Indigenous Interagency Committee to create the 2016 Urban Indigenous Action Plan (City of Lethbridge, 2017, 2021a). The tentative creation of an ICC comes from the need to build community capacity for Indigenous cultural health and well-being; and is envisioned as a place for Elders, cultural leaders, and community groups to gather and share space. The ICC Study states that the creation of the ICC will be completed through a co-design process with the community to ensure it meets Indigenous cultural values and reconciliation commitments (Manasc Isaac, 2020).

Following the completion of the ICC Study, governance planning for the ICC was undertaken over the course of 2020 and 2021 (City of Lethbridge, 2020a). This planning

included consultation with local urban and on-reserve Indigenous communities to explore three possible forms of governance models of (1) City owned and operated, (2) Indigenous owned and operated, or (3) a hybrid between the latter two models. A search for possible external funding sources outside of the City also accompanied this planning (City of Lethbridge, 2021a; Stein, 2021a). In 2021 the City approved funding for the project[13] (Stein, 2021b), facilitating the following site planning activities:

- piloting governance frameworks that shift the leadership of the project from the City to the Indigenous communities;

- using site selection criteria from the ICC Study to identify possible locations for the ICC;

- creating a business case for the City to develop or acquire lands for the ICC;

- creating a Comprehensive Site Plan for the ICC; and

- completing a detailed design for an outdoor gathering space for the ICC (City of Lethbridge, 2021a).

The process for creating the ICC is currently ongoing as two Indigenous organizations have indicated interest in becoming permanent members of the ICC as of February 2022, demonstrating that the ICC has continued to meet Indigenous communities' needs (City of Lethbridge, 2022). However, there has also been stated frustration from Indigenous community members regarding the bureaucracy of the City as this has hindered the timely creation of the ICC and potentially prevented a City-owned building being used by the Indigenous communities (Dorozio, 2022).

---

[13] This funding has not discontinued the search for external funding (Stein, 2021b).

6.1.1 Municipal Rhetoric

Throughout its undertaking, the ICC Study sought to incorporate traditional Indigenous knowledge, findings from broader public documents that center Indigenous needs and desires for reconciliation (such as the TRC and UNDRIP), while also remaining grounded to findings from community engagement with local Indigenous communities. Yet, the views expressed within the ICC Study somewhat diminish these Indigenous needs and desires. This is evident from (1) the City's description of the ICC as a place for education and awareness, daily cultural activities, a place for economic opportunities for Indigenous peoples, and local tourism ventures (City of Lethbridge, 2017); (2) public statements made by city administration (Caldwell & Olsen, 2020); and (3) the following destination statement in the ICC Study:

> *The Lethbridge Indigenous Cultural Centre will be for everyone. It will be a safe place*
> *that bridges the distance between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in the*
> *Lethbridge region, and it will meet the community's physical and cultural needs through*
> *the creation of Ethical Space* (Manasc Isaac Architects, 2020)

This type of municipal rhetoric indicates that while the ICC will be for Indigenous peoples, it will also be for non-Indigenous people. The central inclusion of non-Indigenous peoples within the ICC may create educational opportunities that addresses anti-Indigenous racism and produce conditions for cross-cultural community building. However, it may also burden Indigenous folks who would utilize the space to access their culture, escape racism, and be around people with similar lived experiences; as they may be put into uncomfortable positions that privilege non-Indigenous folks' education, instead of their mental, emotional, and physical well-being. Thus, if Indigenous peoples don't feel safe, comfortable, or ownership over the space the ICC risks becoming a space that is not primarily for Indigenous peoples. As such, by centring non-Indigenous use the space risks failing to reach its stated goals, and potentially contributing to

ongoing Indigenous dispossession within urban spaces, while counteractively intending to increase Indigenous visibility and inclusion within the city.

The City leveraged the ICC Study to purport reconciliation as it described it as a project that worked towards addressing the calls to justice put forth by the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls Final Report (City of Lethbridge, 2021a; Stein, 2018; The National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls, 2017). The City also described the ICC Study as a culturally appropriate and decolonial approach for improving initiatives that respond to Indigenous homelessness within the city (City of Lethbridge, 2019). Yet, this rhetoric of decolonization is despite the City's failure to center Indigenous self-determination, a crucial condition for the generation of Indigenous futurity. The City also frames the ICC as a place for Indigenous economic activity, which is a limited form of reconciliation as it resituates Indigenous calls for justice and reparations into the settler-colonial framework of capitalism (Coulthard, 2014). Furthermore, as already alluded to, the City positions the ICC as a place for non-Indigenous peoples to spectate Indigeneity, which may have harmful implications for Indigenous peoples and dissuade more Indigenous community members from using and accessing the space.

6.1.2 Governance and Operation

Although the vision for the ICC was Indigenous-led, the process for undertaking the ICC Study has been City-led (City of Lethbridge, 2021a). Thus, a potential shortcoming of the ICC creation process is the lack of Indigenous involvement and control over the process. Without direct Indigenous control over the planning of the ICC, the creation process runs the risk of being a City project, instead of an Indigenous-led initiative that is supported by the City. This type of City-led process is counter-intuitive to enactments of reconciliation, which require Indigenous

self-determination over not just the visioning of a project, but also the process for its creation. The upside to a City-led process is the increased insurance that City resources are used to facilitate the creation of an ICC, and thus reparations through redistribution will be fulfilled. Nonetheless, this is a lacking form of reconciliation because it fails to engage with the structural change needed to produce conditions for long-term Indigenous sovereignty and governance over a space, as only immediate and material needs are addressed.

Different ownership and governance models were explored through the ICC Study, resulting in the recommendation of a hybrid governance model, which exists between Indigenous owned and operated, and City owned and operated models. (Manasc Isaac, 2020). Through a hybrid model a non-profit board structure will be created to become the governing body, allowing the ICC to register as a charity and increase the fundraising potential for the space. The ICC Study suggests that a hybrid model will ensure that local Indigenous peoples feel a sense of representation within the ICC. However, a precondition for this type of governance model and the ICC itself to be successful, is that the City must leave decision making up to the Indigenous communities (Manasc Isaac, 2020; Von Der Porten, 2012). This understanding of needing to centralize Indigenous self-determination over the ICC for its success is a required component for establishing Indigenous futurity through the ICC yet concerns exist regarding the reasoning for the ICC Study to advocate for the City's involvement in the governance and operation of the ICC.

These concerns include the four limitations the ICC Study listed for an Indigenous owned and operated model. These limitations were (1) existing limited capacity in the Indigenous communities, (2) the hinderance it would place on a collaborative relationship with the City, (3) curtailed opportunities to generate new joint initiatives and (4) diminished possibility for inter-

cultural learning (Manasc Isaac, 2020). Of these limitations only the first one is solely about the

Indigenous communities. Yet, the hinderance of this limitation is weakened later in the ICC

Study when it states that the regional Blackfoot First Nations and the Metis Nation both have the

experience and capacity to take on governing roles for the ICC (Manasc Isaac, 2020). The

second and third limitation follow a City-orientated perspective, which perpetuates City

involvement in the ICC for City benefit, as the City can leverage their involvement with the ICC

as an act of reconciliation. Thus, the optics of a hybrid model are more appealing to the City than

an Indigenous owned and operated governance model would be. The fourth limitation also

comes from a non-Indigenous, City-orientated perspective as inter-cultural learning may be a

tactic for overcoming weariness and/or opposition from non-Indigenous residents about

initiatives that are exclusively by and for Indigenous peoples.

Through an overview of these stated limitations, it becomes clear that the ICC Study

aimed to incorporate the needs and desires of the urban Indigenous communities, but not at the

expense of the needs and desires of the City. This is further illustrated by the statement that the

ICC Study aimed to "ensur[e] that the recommendations regarding an ICC align[ed] with the

planning policy and the needs of the City" (Manasc Isaac, 2020). This positions the City as both

the authoritative and determinative body over the creation of the ICC, which does not aid in

producing decolonial relationships between Indigenous communities and the municipality. Thus,

while the creation of the ICC is meant to address the material needs and desires of the local

Indigenous communities, it lacks in facilitating decolonial relationships that readily produce

environments where Indigenous sovereignty and futurity can flourish.

The ICC Study also explored a City owned and operated model, yet because the City had

decided to "embrace strong, meaningful relationships with the Indigenous community" (Manasc

Isaac, 2020) it was not recommended for the ICC. This assertion displays the power municipalities often have over Indigenous-led initiatives and that it is a relinquishing of this power that allows for any possibility of reconciliation to be pursued. In the same vein, while a hybrid model may ensure a sense of Indigenous community ownership, it also maintains City control and thus power over the space, which is retroactive for the facilitation of reconciliation. Therefore, the recommendation for a hybrid model, instead of an Indigenous owned and operated model may operate to quell City concerns related to relinquishing power to Indigenous communities while also producing a context for the City to purport reconciliation, rather than facilitate Indigenous sovereignty within an urban setting.

6.1.3 Funding Model

The City allocated $350,000 for the ICC Study, which was spent on consultative services (City of Lethbridge, 2017, 2021a). In 2021 the City had listed no project costs for the ICC beyond 2022, nor projected funding allocations for the continuation of the project, despite receiving funding from the Federal government to support the future planning of the ICC (City of Lethbridge, 2021a, 2021b). However, by 2022 the City rehired the same consultant to continue working on the planning for the project, including the development of a working group for the creation of the ICC (City of Lethbridge, 2021c; Stein, 2022). As such, through ongoing funding commitments and spending, the City has remained steadfast in the ICC creation process thus far.

Although the City is committed to funding the creation process for the ICC, it is not interested in being the sole funder of the ICC's operation, nor its development[14]. In 2020 a business plan for the ICC outlined that $12.7 million is needed for a financially viable ICC,

---

[14] This is despite the City's interest in being embedded within the governance and operations of the ICC.

including an estimated land area of 2 acres for the site (Manasc Isaac, 2020). This business plan assumes land will be "donated" by the City, which will represent a portion of the City's contribution to the ICC. The plan also notes other sources of possible funding for the development of the ICC[15], which positions the City as a funding facilitator and small funding partner for the ICC. This positioning potentially allows for the City's governance role to be diminished, as an Indigenous-led organization is likely be the body controlling the operational and development funds for the ICC. However, it also positions the City to evade ongoing financial reparations that could be a part of the City undertaking ongoing and meaningful reconciliation. Thus, a non-City orientated funding model for the ICC's operation and development holds promise in its potential centering of Indigenous self-determination, while also producing a context where the City can avoid ongoing funding commitments for the longevity of the ICC.

6.1.4 Need for Indigenous Space

Through the ICC Study it was determined that the ICC needed to (1) be a physical place that centered Indigenous culture, (2) increase Indigenous visibility within the City by operating as a landmark, and (3) provide a culturally safe space for community to come together (Manasc Isaac, 2020). Organizing the ICC around these spatial goals allows two separate but connected properties to potentially exist. First, a highly visible gathering place may allow Indigenous peoples to feel safer and more welcomed within the city. In this way the anticipated visibility of the ICC aims to produce conditions that improve Indigenous peoples' well-being, while also addressing the material need for space by and for local Indigenous peoples. However, the second

---

[15] For example, the plan noted the Federal program, Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program (ICIP), as a potential funding source for the ICC, as it has an interest in funding community hubs and provides up to 75% of the funding for a project with Indigenous partners who are not-for-profits organizations (Manasc Isaac, 2020).

property of focusing on the visibility of the ICC may overshadow the needs of the Indigenous communities that remain unmet through the ICC. In this way the ICC could produce shortcomings that are associated with the limits of recognition, where practices are shaped more by the optics of reconciliation, rather than meeting the ongoing and shifting needs and desires of local Indigenous communities.

The ICC is also meant to be a space for existing programs and events that cater to Indigenous peoples. Providing this space is meant to strengthen and build relationships between these operations, while also avoiding the duplication of existing services (another aspect noted as important for the creation of the ICC) (Manasc Isaac, 2020). This objective was further supported by the ICC Study investigating service gaps that the ICC could address, resulting in a list of uses to incorporate in the creation of the space. These uses include a large gathering area, a ceremony space, children's space, multi-functional classrooms, resource library, exhibits, a market, a cafe, a community kitchen, a maker space, and space to provide land-based learning. The provision of housing for Indigenous tenants is also suggested for grander models of the ICC which requires additional funding.

6.2 The Creation Process for an Indigenous Cultural Centre and Provision of an Interim Space in Kingston, Ontario

In 2013 the Katarokwi Native Friendship Center (KNFC) in Kingston lost its funding and closed after twenty-one years of operation, resulting in the loss of a cultural and gathering place for Indigenous peoples within Kingston (Brennan, 2015; Hammell, 2020; Huigenbos & Wiginton, 2020). The year following the KNFC's closing, the City of Kingston undertook the Kingston First Peoples Purposeful Dialogues Project. This project was undertaken because the Alderville First Nation Council suggested that the City establish an understanding of the needs and desires of the urban Indigenous peoples within Kingston. After the completion of this

project, the City undertook their Engage for Change #YGK Reconciliation Journey[16], which is an

ongoing reconciliation process that includes the creation of both interim and permanent space for

local Indigenous peoples to host social gatherings, traditional feasts, language reclamation

programs, and healing and wellness drumming and singing circles.

A City created timeline from 2020 set out that by 2023 the City would (1) provide the

Indigenous communities with access to an interim community space, (2) provide resources and

support for the operation and maintenance of the space; (3) and collaborate with the communities

to develop a committee to oversee the operations of this space and create a governance model for

it (Huigenbos & Wiginton, 2020). As of 2022, the City has been successful in the first two

commitments as they have provided an interim space, along with funding to the Indigenous

organization, Kingston Indigenous Language Nest (KILN). The interim space will function as a

centre of operations to support other Indigenous-led initiatives and organizations through the

provision of meeting and program space for small groups, as well as providing KILN with the

space for programming such as Indigenous language revitalization, land-based cultural teachings

and activities, and smaller community gatherings (Agenes & Campbell, 2021b; Agnew &

Campbell, 2021a; City of Kingston, 2021a, 2021b; Tye, 2022). The City has proclaimed that the

provision of this space will not deter from the creation of a permanent Indigenous-operated

Cultural Centre (Agnew & Campbell, 2021a; City of Kingston, 2021a, 2021b). The declaration is

promising; however, a lot of questions remain unanswered in terms of governance model,

---

[16] Engagement processes focused on urban Indigenous peoples in Kingston, while being underpinned by Nation-to-Nation relations with the Alderville First Nation and the Tyendinaga-Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte, along with maintaining connections with other neighbouring First Nations (Huron-Wendat of Wendaki, the Mohawk Council at Akwesasne, the Algonquins of Pikwàkanagàn, the Algonquins of Sharbot Lake, the Algonquins of Ardoch and the Six Nations of the Grand River) (Huigenbos & Wiginton, 2020). The acknowledgement and inclusion of the First Nations, whose ancestral land Kingston is located on, demonstrates that creating Indigenous spaces within urban settings is unlikely to be a siloed process and may include First Nations with claims to the land a municipality is located on.

operational costs, and permanent funding sources for the creation of a permanent Indigenous Cultural Centre.

6.2.1 Municipal Rhetoric

A 2018 City of Kingston report stipulates that the City should not dictate the direction of reconciliation, but must play a supporting role by working in partnerships with local Indigenous communities (Hurdle & Wiginton, 2018). The report also frames these relationships to require mutual benefit to produce increased agency and self-determination for Indigenous communities (Hurdle & Wiginton, 2018). The concern with the inclusion of the latter sentiment is that the City may only commit to the creation of mutually beneficial arrangements and may be unwilling to "sacrifice" resources for the singular benefit of Indigenous communities. This relationship framework is limited as the purpose of reconciliation and decolonization is not to produce mutual benefit for both settler institutions and Indigenous communities. Instead, it is to aid in the facilitation of Indigenous sovereignty and support the flourishment of Indigenous futurity, as defined by Indigenous peoples.

While the 2018 report frames Indigenous-municipal relationships in a limiting manner regarding benefit, it also includes a promising understanding of the ongoing commitment required for meaningful reconciliation. This was further recognized in a 2020 report that described reconciliation as a complex and enduring process that would require the City to incorporate reconciliation and Indigenous knowledge into their proceedings to foster agency and self-determination for Indigenous peoples (Huigenbos & Wiginton, 2020). While the City is unable to grant Indigenous sovereignty to Indigenous people, as Indigenous sovereignty operates outside of settler institution, it can recognize this sovereignty by removing barriers to enactments of Indigenous sovereignty and actively creating contexts where Indigenous peoples can readily

assert agency over themselves, their culture, and the land. This sentiment is recognized in the City's goal to co-create change that is symbolic, substantive, and systemic through joint efforts between the City, Indigenous community members, Alderville First Nation, and the Tyendinaga-Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte (Huigenbos & Wiginton, 2020. The outcome for this goal is for it to lead to self-determination on behalf of local Indigenous peoples, and to produce active and purposeful reconciliation on behalf of the City, both of which can be achieved through the creation of space for urban Indigenous communities within Kingston.

City rhetoric in recent years indicates a commitment to the creation of a permanent space for Indigenous peoples within Kingston, yet a vagueness still exists in how the City will support the creation of a permanent Indigenous Cultural Centre. This vagueness is reflected in a 2022 report, that indicates that staff will continue to support capacity development and remain at the table for discussions about the City's role in a future Indigenous Centre (Hurdle, 2022). While this rhetoric indicates the City's interest in facilitating the creation of this Centre, it also communicates an indeterminate level of ongoing commitment to aid the Indigenous communities in the creation of the Centre. This is compounded when the preceding statement discusses the City-owned building KILN has been provided with. These two statements together may indicate that the City views itself as having "done enough" in the provision of Indigenous cultural space within the city, when the need for a larger and permeant space is still unfulfilled. It may also diminish the continuous nature of reconciliation, in that this work requires persistent commitment, active engagement, and ongoing implementation that builds on all previous work.

6.2.2 Governance and Operation

The Indigenous communities within Kingston have communicated that the importance of an Indigenous Centre relates to both their ownership of identity, and their ownership over the

space (Huigenbos & Wiginton, 2020; Brennan, 2015). Alongside this, is the Indigenous communities indication that the City's role is to support Indigenous capacity building for the operations, programming, and governance of an Indigenous Cultural Centre (Huigenbos & Wiginton, 2020). They have also indicated that the creation process for an Indigenous Cultural Centre will be lengthy because it will take time for the Indigenous communities and the City to come together and "figure this out together in a good way" (Hammell, 2020, p. 18). To facilitate this creation process, a protocol is currently being established to frame how the multiple Indigenous communities within Kingston and the City will work together to secure the resources and space needed for a permanent Centre (Agnew & Campbell, 2021).

This protocol is meant to establish the City's role for the creation of the Centre, while providing room for multiple Indigenous communities to be actively involved and represented within the process. The City is leading the establishment of this protocol, which is favorable because the City has the resource capacity to undertake community engagement. Yet, it also poses the risk of re-establishing colonial hierarchies between the City and the Indigenous communities by centring the City as the authoritative body over the establishment of the protocol. The City has attempted to address this risk by a hiring third-party facilitator, First Peoples Group[17] to undertake this community engagement (Huigenbos & Wiginton, 2020). This choice was made because of the "neutrality" of a third party as opposed to the already mentioned, hierarchical relationship often experienced between Indigenous communities and municipalities (Hurdle & Wiginton, 2018). However, this decision could also be viewed as insensitive to the knowledge and ability of the local Indigenous communities to undertake this

---

[17] First Peoples Group is a Certified Aboriginal Business that has expertise in reconciliation.

work themselves, especially if the City had directly provided them with the resources needed to do this work.

The Indigenous communities within Kingston suggested that the City provide space for a temporary Indigenous cultural space to address the immediate needs of the urban Indigenous communities while the creation protocol and proceeding Centre are established (Hammell, 2020). The City has since met this suggestion, as staff identified City-owned facilities and commercial leases for immediate lease in 2020, which were then brought to a community meeting for consideration and assessment (Huigenbos & Wiginton, 2020). Following this, a Service Legal Agreement was created in 2021 for the Indigenous organization, KILN to use and operate a City-owned building. This space will act as a place for the Indigenous communities to come together and continue the long-term planning for the permanent Cultural Centre, while also acting as a space for ceremony (Hammell, 2020). Through the provision of this interim space the City has produced a context that supports Indigenous self-determination, while engaging in a form of reparative work often required for meaningful reconciliation. Further, the creation of an interim space allows the City to address both the long-term, self-identified needs of the Indigenous communities, as well as providing a short-term response to these needs.

Despite the promising aspects of the provision of interim space there is a substantial shortcoming regarding the governance of the interim space. KILN's operation of this building and the assistance from the City though the Service Level Agreement only partially aligns with findings from the previous community engagement, which indicated that the Indigenous communities should own and operate both interim space and the permanent Centre (Hammel, 2020). Assistance from the City is welcomed as it is acceptable for the City to work in partnership with the Indigenous communities to secure this these spaces, yet the Indigenous

communities have communicated that they require full ownership over both the interim and permanent space for these spaces to be considered successful. By renting the building to KILN[18] the City has only partially met the self-identified needs and desires of the Indigenous communities, as this fails facilitate Indigenous ownership of the interim space. If the City had facilitated KILN to own the interim space this would have created a context that supported a deeper level of Indigenous sovereignty to be readily performed, but instead municipal authority over Indigenous sovereignty is maintained.

6.2.3 Funding Model

As previously outlined, a City-owned building, 610 Montreal Street, has been leased in its entirety to KILN for a period of up to five years for an annual rent of $1.00, with the option to extend the lease for an additional five-year term once the first term is up (Agnew & Campbell, 2021a, 2021b; City of Kingston, 2021c). This lease includes the City waiving property taxes for the building and providing funds to support KILN's programming and operational services identified as outlined in the Service Legal Agreement between KILN and the City (City of Kingston, 2021b). This Service Legal Agreement identifies services that will be provided by KILN and the associated funding the City will issue for those services. The amount approved within this agreement is $62,500, with the City allocating $50,000 as an annual commitment to support KILN's programming (Agnew & Campbell, 2021a, 2021b). The City's budget projections beyond 2022 will also include the Service Level Agreement and the building operations of 610 Montreal Street. By including the funding commitment in proceeding annual budgets the City is ensuring that this funding will be annually consistent and thus relied upon, which facilitates the long-term existence of KILN and the programing they provide. The

---

[18] The City has committed to renting the building to KILN for the next five years, with the option to extend the lease for a second five-year term (Agnew & Campbell, 2021a, 2021b; City of Kingston, 2021c).

provision of exclusive use of a building also provides KILN with self-determination over the space as they no longer have to vie to rent space for their events or programing (Postovit, 2021). Thus, the funding the City is providing KILN with for the interim space is indicative how a municipality can provide meaningful financial support to an Indigenous-led initiative, as this support is both ongoing, consistent, and void of stipulations.

In 2018 a City report described a need for sustained funding to support the coordination and presentation of Indigenous-led cultural events and community programming (Hurdle & Wiginton, 2018). By 2020 City funds began being allocated directly to Indigenous-led community programming and events that create spaces for community education, celebration, and ceremonies[19] (Huigenbos & Wiginton, 2020). These funds are provided directly to Indigenous-led initiatives to facilitate an actionable implementation of reconciliation practices, as the City financially supports the creation of space by and for Indigenous communities. Although, funding for these events and programming is piecemeal and thus largely unreliable for Indigenous-led initiatives, it does address the various needs and desires that exist within the Indigenous communities. It also facilitates another form of an interim approach for meeting these self-identified needs and desires and is thus an example of resource redistribution, where short-lived reconciliation meets the immediate material needs of Indigenous community members.

6.2.4 Need for Indigenous Space

Although Kingston is currently procuring the creation of a gathering space for Indigenous peoples, this has been a lengthy process that comes from years of unmet needs, as the need for a

---

[19] Examples of Indigenous-led programming and events include a Prisoner's Justice Day film screening and healing circle, busing for Indigenous community members to attend the annual Tyendinaga Powwow, bi-weekly community drum circles, and an Indigenous languages research symposium (Huigenbos & Wiginton, 2020).

gathering space was first reported by local Indigenous communities in 2014[20] (Huigenbos & Wiginton, 2020). The lack of Indigenous spaces within the city has contributed to Indigenous peoples to experience ongoing invisibility within Kingston. From this invisibility Indigenous peoples have self-reported a devaluation of their Indigenous identity, which acts as a barrier for connection within the Indigenous communities within Kingston (Brennan, 2015). Thus, the creation of an Indigenous Cultural Centre by and for Indigenous peoples would act as a direct remedy as it would produce space where Indigeneity and Indigenous peoples would be forefront, aiding in the alleviation of this harmful invisibility as this would act as a space for Indigenous peoples to access their culture and build connection with each other.

There is reportedly a lack of knowledge among local Indigenous individuals regarding the existing services for Indigenous peoples within Kingston (Brennan, 2015). Without a centralized hub that acts as a facilitator between the various services and Indigenous peoples, services are being under-accessed by Indigenous individuals. The City has outlined that the next steps for addressing this lack of awareness and service use, including a collective impact approach where relationships will be built between organizations and shared objectives are collectively worked towards (Brennan, 2015). The provision of space by and for Indigenous communities within Kingston is meant to aid in producing the conditions for these relationships. As such the creation of interim space and a permanent Cultural Centre is likely to play a role in addressing this persistent lack of connection between Indigenous individuals and the services that exist for them. The interim and permanent spaces may also operate as centralized locations where organizations can collaborate and work towards shared objectives.

---

[20] The City's anticipated project timeline for the Centre estimates it will take over 20 years to fully meet the need for Indigenous community space based on when it was first recognized by the City to when the Indigenous Cultural Centre is expected to be built (Huigenbos & Wiginton, 2020).

The City's reconciliation processes have focused largely on the creation of an Indigenous community space, however aspects such as settler education and cultural awareness training for City staff have also been considered (Huigenbos & Wiginton, 2020). These aspects of the process have been held largely separate from the creation of a future Cultural Centre and have been pursued to a secondary degree, mainly because of the emphasis the Indigenous communities have put on the need for an Indigenous community space. The existence of these "secondary" aspects within City's reconciliation processes demonstrate the recognition that activities such as cultural awareness training often need to accompany more reparative work, but that implementation measures that meet the self-defined needs and desires of the Indigenous communities need to be forefront and often held separately for reconciliation efforts to be effective.

6.3 Kihciy Askiy, the Provision of a Ceremonial Space and the Ongoing Creation Process for an Indigenous Cultural and Wellness Centre in Edmonton, Alberta

The procurement of two different spaces for Indigenous-led initiatives within Edmonton have been advanced. The first is Kihciy Askiy a ceremonial and land-based learning site, while the second is an Indigenous Cultural and Wellness Centre (ICWC). Kihciy Askiy is currently being constructed, while a separate creation process for ICWC is being undertaken. The process for creating Kihciy Askiy began when Indigenous communities communicated a need for a cultural and learning space to the City in 2006[21]. The process for creating Kihciy Askiy has been lengthy, as it began over 15 years ago, and involved numerous Indigenous groups engaging with

---

[21] In 2006 the Edmonton Indigenous Cultural Resource Counsel gave the City a proposal that outlined the creation of a permanent site for Indigenous cultural events and learning experiences (Manasc Isaac, 2017a). Following this, the Indigenous Elders Cultural Resource Circle Society (who later merged with Native Counselling Services of Alberta) submitted a proposal for a project for the site Kihciy Askiy is being constructed on (City of Edmonton, 2018a). These proposals prompted the City to amend an Area Concept Plan in 2009 to include the development of Kihciy Askiy as a cultural site.

the City to insure its creation. However, according to some City reports this project officially

began in 2012, indicating a discrepancy for understanding the background leading to this project

(City of Edmonton, 2018a; City of Edmonton, 2020a). Nevertheless, construction for Kihciy

Askiy began in November 2021 and is set to be completed by the end of 2022.

The ICWC comes from the City's EndPovertyEdmonton project and is led by the

project's Indigenous Circle working group[22]. This initiative is much more recent in its

conception as it began in 2016 when the City published the EndPovertyEdmonton roadmap. This

first goal within the roadmap is for the City to move toward true reconciliation as "eliminating

poverty is a profound act of reconciliation" (EndPovertyEdmonton, 2016, p.24). Within this goal

is the action of designing and planning a new ICWC, where the City will work with Indigenous

organizations and businesses, along with other social services that Indigenous peoples readily

interreact with, to create the ICWC. The process to create ICWC is currently underway and as of

2021 a workplan for the creation of the ICWC had been proposed.

6.3.1 Municipal Rhetoric

Various policies and public declarations have directed the City of Edmonton to aid in the

pursuit of both Kihciy Askiy and the ICWC. This includes Council's declaration that 2015 would

be a Year of Reconciliation in Edmonton in alignment with the TRC Calls to Action (City of

Edmonton, 2015; EndPovertyEdmonton, 2016). Within this declaration three commitments were

made including the development of spaces to conduct Indigenous cultural activities and

ceremony within Edmonton (City of Edmonton, 2015). The 2017 terms of reference for the

City's Indigenous People's Strategy also note Kichiy Askiy as an existing program that aids in

---

[22] EndPovertyEdmonton is comprised of six working groups who are meant to implement the of goals and objectives found within the roadmap. One of these working groups is the Indigenous Circle, whose key role is to "ground the work in Indigenous knowledge" (EndPovertyEdmonton, 2016, p.17).

reaching their first outcome of supporting the development and planning of spaces for wellness, ceremonies, and cultural learning (City of Edmonton, 2017), while the TRC Calls to Justice are further iterated as guiding principles for the provision of this space in a report on the site location for Kichiy Askiy (Manasc Isaac, 2017b).These public facing documents and declarations work to position Edmonton as a municipality that is actively undertaking meaningful forms of reconciliation, while highlighting the importance of space for Indigenous peoples within the city. Additionally, the rhetoric of "eliminating poverty is a profound act of reconciliation" (EndPovertyEdmonton, 2016, p.24) followed by the goal of creating an ICWC indicates that the City understands the multiplicity and insidious implications of settler colonialism, while also being invested in acts that undo or at least address these lasting implications.

In December 2019 the Indigenous Knowledge and Wisdom Centre (IKWC) and the City created a letter of intent to outline their respective roles for Kihciy Askiy (IKWC & City of Edmonton, 2019). This included the overarching agreement "to create a natural setting for different Indigenous groups to host land-based learning, spiritual ceremonies and practices that will be shared from time-to-time with Edmontonians when appropriate" (IKWC & City of Edmonton, 2019, p.1). This statement highlights the main use of the space to be by and for Indigenous communities. Yet, it also highlights a conditional aspect, where gaining the necessary infrastructural support and land needed for this Kihciy Askiy requires the space to also be partially available for non-Indigenous individuals. This statement displays a potentially a hierarchical relationship between the City and IKWC, as the City remains in a position of power over IKWC, while purporting benevolence for supporting an Indigenous-led initiative and describing Kihciy Askiy as an effort in reconciliation (City of Edmonton, 2020a). This re-assertion of colonial hierarchies does not dissuade from the real material impact Kihciy Askiy

has for local Indigenous communities, but it does prevent Kihciy Askiy from being described as an example of colonial relationships being thwarted in favour of Indigenous sovereignty.

Within the letter of intent, it is affirmed that:

- IKWC would be the sole operator of Kihciy Askiy once in operation;

- the protocol and development of site operations would remain under the guidance of the Kihciy Askiy Council of Elders;

- IKWC and the City would share their networks for community engagement processes that would inform the development of the operations and governance models; and

- the commitments that followed within the letter would be subject to further approval and refinement by the City Council and the Chiefs of Treaty 6, 7, and 8[23] (IKWC & City of Edmonton, 2019).

The letter also committed IKWC to engage and involve the broader Indigenous community in Edmonton, along with other groups including educational and non-profit partners. This positions IKWC to be responsible toward multiple Indigenous communities including the Chiefs of Treaty 6, 7, and 8; the Kihciy Askiy Council of Elders; and multiple local Indigenous communities within Edmonton. The multiplicity of Indigenous involvement in this one site, along with the check and balances built into the letter of intent demonstrates the complexity of diverse Indigenous inclusion. Thus, creating this Indigenous space within an urban setting is a complex process that includes varying outlooks and needs of different Indigenous voices. This facet of the letter also supports the need for more Indigenous specific spaces within Edmonton, as one ceremonial and learning space is unlikely to fulfill all local Indigenous communities' needs.

---

[23] Edmonton is located on Treaty 6 territory and the IKWC is jointly operated by the Chiefs of Treaty 6, 7, and 8.

The letter of intent positioned IKWC to be obligated to non-Indigenous bodies such as the City and any other educational or non-profit organizations that may use the site (IKWC & City of Edmonton, 2019). This is potentially problematic because involving non-Indigenous organizations could detract from the Indigenous-led aspect of this project and could diminish the primary focus of this space being by and for Indigenous folks. However, this obligation may be included because these organizations are potential funding partners for the site, and/or they already provide services to Indigenous community members. This former reasoning is further supported by the City having only committed funding to the phase one design and construction of Kihciy Askiy when the letter was signed.

The diminishment of the Indigenous-led aspect of the site is further illustrated by City rhetoric used in a 2017 development permit submission, which described Kihciy Askiy as a place that would "provide a natural setting for urban Indigenous groups to host spiritual ceremonies, grow medicinal herbs, practice traditional crafts, and facilitate intergenerational learning," (Manasc Isaac, 2017a, p.3) while also being open to the general public for them to learn about the traditions of Indigenous peoples. The Indigenous focused use of this space reflects an addressal of the need for more spaces within Edmonton that are by and for Indigenous peoples. However, the inclusion of the general public as an audience for this space may diminish the safety, welcoming aspects, and ceremonial use of the space for Indigenous peoples. This facet of the space's use poses the risk for spectatorship and racism to occur, where Indigenous peoples may be othered and viewed as cultural artefacts of a "long lost culture." It also poses the risk of Kihciy Askiy becoming a space for settler education, which could result in the diminishment of the cultural and ceremonial use of the space for Indigenous peoples.

6.3.2 Governance and Operation for Kihciy Askiy

From 2012 to 2018, Native Counselling Services of Alberta (NCSA) acted as the partner for Kihciy Askiy. During this period, it was anticipated that NCSA would operate Kihciy Askiy, while the City maintained the site and facilities (Spencer Environmental Management Service, 2017; City of Edmonton, 2019b). However, in June 2018 City staff were directed to explore expanded partnerships regarding the operations of Kihciy Askiy as NCSA became unable to fulfill their anticipated role of site operator (City of Edmonton, 2019a). This resulted in informal conversations and formal working sessions between City staff and local organizations. Through this engagement organizations expressed their support of the site and its programming; along with their interest in using the site (City of Edmonton, 2019b). However, no organization demonstrated interest in being the site operator.

The organizations included in these discussions were the Edmonton Public Schools, Edmonton Catholic Schools, MacEwan University, Norquest College, NAIT, Yellowhead Tribal College, the University of Alberta, Fort Edmonton Management Company, Canadian Native Friendship Centre, and NCSA (City of Edmonton, 2019b). A concerning aspect of this engagement is that while these organizations have the capacity to operate Kihciy Askiy and many have mandates related to the flourishment of Indigenous language, education, and cultures; most of them are not exclusively Indigenous-led. Indigenous self-determination over the site requires the site to be governed by an explicitly Indigenous body. Thus, the engagement process for finding an operations partner for Kihciy Askiy would have likely resulted in the undermining of Indigenous self-determination over this space if one of the previously listed organizations had indicated interest in operating the site. The engagement with these selected organizations displays the City's ignorance regarding how central Indigenous self-determination is for this site to function as a structural, meaningful, and lasting act of reconciliation.

While the City engaged with other organizations, NCSA recommended that the Indigenous Knowledge and Wisdom Centre (IKWC) be included in discussions pertaining to the governance and operations of Kihciy Askiy (City of Edmonton, 2019a; City of Edmonton, 2019b). IKWC originates from Treaty 6, 7, and 8 chiefs passing a Chiefs Resolution in 2013 for the creation of a non-profit mandated to promote the languages, cultures, and histories of the Indigenous peoples in these regions (City of Edmonton, 2019b; IKWC, n.d.). As such, IKWC represents the interests and values of many local Indigenous peoples and is tethered to the ancestral knowledge of the First Nations whose traditional land Edmonton is located on, while being responsive to the diversity that currently exists within the local Indigenous communities.

NCSA's request for IKWC's inclusion was met, as City staff began to hold meetings with IKWC in 2018 (City of Edmonton, 2019b). In these meetings IKWC formally expressed their interest in facilitating the creation of Kihciy Askiy and agreed to be the site's operator (City of Edmonton, 2019a). City staff worked with IKWC to create an operations plan, a budget, and a draft governance model, which included an ongoing role for the Elders Council that had been a part of the Kihciy Askiy process from the beginning (City of Edmonton, 2019b). This allowed for both the development of Kihciy Askiy to proceed with a new partner, while maintaining relational continuity with those already involved in the project. Meeting the NCSA's request to include IKWC indicates the City's responsiveness to the Indigenous partners involved in Kihciy Askiy. Yet, a hierarchical relationship is still maintained between the City and the Indigenous partners of both NCSA and IKWC, as the City acts as the determinate body for who operates the site and is included in discussions pertaining to site operation. It may be necessary for the City to have this role because of its resource capacity for facilitating these types of discussions, however the City did little to diminish the hierarchy between itself and the Indigenous organizations

81

demonstrating a shortcoming regarding the City's undertaking of reconciliation that results in structural change.

6.3.3 Governance and Operation for the Indigenous Cultural and Wellness Centre (ICWC)

In 2021 an environmental scan further demonstrated the findings from previous community engagement, which dictated that the ICWC needed to be Indigenous led, owned and operated; while the City should fulfill a supportive role as a community partner, along with other levels of government (City of Edmonton, 2018b, 2021b). This finding is clearly reflected in the EndPovertyEdmonton business case proposal for the ICWC as key deliverables include the creation of a legal entity to be responsible for the remaining project development phases, and to provide governance and oversight of the building and operation (City of Edmonton, 2021c). This legal entity will be Indigenous-led and owned and will operate as the representative for Indigenous governance within legal structures. This deliverable showcases the City's commitment to ensuring the Indigenous communities' fulsome control over the ICWC and its creation.

In 2021 the Indigenous Circle requested that the City transfer leadership over the project from the City to the Indigenous Circle to ensure ICWC would be Indigenous-led (City of Edmonton, 2021a). This was accompanied by a funding request for $202,042 for the completion of a business case for the ICWC (City of Edmonton, 2021b, 2021c). To facilitate the use of these funds, the United Way of the Alberta Capital Region acted as the fiscal agent on behalf of the Indigenous Circle because the Indigenous Circle is not a legal entity and cannot enter into a funding agreement with the City. In this scenario the United Way was an interim legal entity for the space and their role was to plainly act as a body for the funds to transfer over to facilitate work (City of Edmonton, 2021d). The transfer of these funds demonstrated the City's ongoing

commitment to facilitate Indigenous control over the ICWC and its creation, while being mindful

of the immediate need for a space like the ICWC and thus worked to expediate a timely funding

transfer.

The ICWC business case workplan, proposes work to start in January 2021 and be

completed by December 2021 (City of Edmonton, 2021c). The ICWC governance body will

control tasks such as the evaluation of proposals for hiring a consultant to undertake the work

and overseeing the consultant's outputs (City of Edmonton, 2021c). The workplan includes

direction from Indigenous ways of knowing as ceremony will begin and mark the completion of

work for the ICWC. However, the workplan is largely dictated by City processes and thus is still

largely reflective of colonial ways of being and producing work within a municipal context.

Thus, Indigenous self-determination exists within creation of the ICWC, albeit in a limited and

nested capacity as this self-determination must operate within the structure of a settler institution.

6.3.4 Funding Model

In 2017 the City approved $4.51 million for phase one capital costs for Kihciy Askiy

(City of Edmonton, 2018a, 2019b). The construction of Kihciy Askiy is divided into three

phases. City funding is approved for phase one, which entails the design and construction of the

main areas of the site[24], and renaturalization of the site (City of Edmonton, 2018a; Manasc Isaac,

2017b). This funding was approved in the 2015-2018 Capital Budget for $2 million and later

increased twice[25] (City of Edmonton, 2019b). The second funding increase was subjected to

meeting the conditions of creating a report on fundraising efforts, as well as providing Council

---

[24] The main areas of the site include four sweat lodges constructed around a permanent stone heating device; a storage building large enough for utility vehicles, tipi poles, firewood; change rooms and washrooms; a gathering room; an amphitheatre, which will be created from the exterior of the storage building; and space for tipis (Manasc Isaac, 2017a, 2017b).

[25] First in 2016 by $550,000 during the spring supplemental capital budget adjustment, and again in 2017 by $700,000 for phase one enhancements (City of Edmonton, 2019b).

with an update on the program and business plan for the site. By October 2019 the design and tender for Kihciy Askiy was completed, however construction was paused due to pending confirmation of funding on behalf of the City and the beforementioned search for a new operating partner (City of Edmonton, 2019b).

From 2017 to 2020 the City held the last remaining $700,000 of the $4.51 million committed to the project, in abeyance in response to NCSA becoming unable to continue as a partner and the need to find a new operating partner for the site (City of Edmonton, 2020a, 2020b). This reasoning for holding the money in abeyance is valid, as an Indigenous operating partner is needed at minimum for Kihciy Askiy to remain Indigenous-led. However, it does not negate the clear display of power differentiation between the City and the Indigenous partner who would be running the site and undertaking the labour of creating an operations manual and governance model, albeit supported by City staff in this undertaking (City of Edmonton, 2020a).

Overall, the City acts as a colonial body asserting control over an Indigenous initiative by remaining in control of the funds allocated for the creation of Kihciy Askiy. In this context material resources are parceled out if, and when the City deems the Indigenous partner capable of handling the task at hand. This scenario replicates colonial institutions positioning themselves in power over Indigenous groups and asserting control over their self-determination. For the City to release the remaining $700,000, IKWC had to first create an operating budget, a fundraising stability plan, an operations policy and procedure manual, while also spending a summer reconnecting with members of the Kihciy Askiy Elder Council to share these documents and gain their input on them (City of Edmonton, 2020a). Yet, even after the IKWC completed these tasks the City still debated if they would release these funds due to concerns they had with the

Indigenous partner being able to fulfill their obligations during the respective Council meeting, which plainly demonstrates the City's control over the project (City of Edmonton, 2020b).

Long term operational funding is also not included, or not yet included in the creation of Kihciy Askiy. A 2020 staff report indicates that IKWC intends to ask the City to fund annual operating costs for Kihciy Askiy first five years of operation (City of Edmonton, 2020a). This funding is estimated to be between $178,000 to $225,000 per year and will represent 35 percent of the site's operating costs. The remaining 65 percent will be fundraised by IKWC, leading to potentially inconsistent funding for the site's future operation, which may impact the services it offers, along with the site's upkeep and long-term existence. Proceeding construction phases[26] currently also remain unfunded by the City (City of Edmonton, 2018a; City of Edmonton, 2019b), which creates uncertainty for when these phases will be completed, while also indicating the City's desire to relinquish funding for this space onto another body. This is further supported by the City's insistent inclusion of non-profit organizations within the creation process. Thus, while the City plays a primary funding role in the creation of Kihciy Askiy, they have neglected to dedicate funding towards the long-term existence of the space. This produces the risk of a short-lived space, which could perpetuate Indigenous reluctancy to engage with municipalities as they undertake reconciliation processes. It also represents a failure to uphold the ongoing nature that is required for meaningful reconciliation to occur.

6.3.5 Need for Indigenous Space

The site selected for Kihciy Askiy was the only site considered because of its historic and cultural significance to local Indigenous communities (Manasc Isaac, 2017a, 2017b; Spencer Environmental Management Services, 2017). The design of the space was created through

---

[26] These phases in include the creation of a herbal garden, trail connections, signage and an Earth Lodge (City of Edmonton, 2018a).

dialogue with Native Counselling Services of Alberta (NCSA) and the Elder's Council, as well as previous engagement with local Indigenous communities (Manasc Isaac, 2017a). Overall, the Indigenous communities' participation and desires are heavily reflected within the design of Kihciy Askiy. This inclusion makes it likely that this space will be used by the local Indigenous communities. This is further supported by the Indigenous communities' interim use of the site, as prior to construction they used a temporary fire pit for ceremonies and gatherings (Manasc Isaac, 2017a). However, this interim use required them to apply for fire permits every time they wished to hold a sweat ceremony, reflecting that the City is still the body who controls the land the site is located on. The interim use of the site also indicates a pressing need for Indigenous spaces within the city.

As indicated in preceding text, Kihciy Askiy is unlikely to fulfill the needs of all local Indigenous communities and more Indigenous spaces are needed within the city. The City has affirmed this need through its commitment to the creation of an Indigenous Culture and Wellness Centre (ICWC). This space will provide (1) ceremonial and cultural space, (2) meeting and gathering space, and (3) act as a resource center (City of Edmonton, 2021a). The City has framed the ICWC as a centre for the same audiences as Kihciy Askiy, in that this space is for Indigenous peoples in the region, along with non-Indigenous people who wish to learn about local Indigenous practices (City of Edmonton, 2021c). Thus, the same risks exist regarding Indigenous peoples' feelings of both real and perceived safety for using the space and Indigenous peoples' having to compromise on the use and design of the space to appease non-Indigenous users. By actively including non-Indigenous peoples as users and a group to be included in community engagement for the site (City of Edmonton, 2021c), the City jeopardizes the importance of this space being for Indigenous peoples' exclusive use. This need for a space to be dedicated for

Indigenous use is also reflected in the community engagement undertaken by the City's Task Force to Eliminate Poverty in 2014-2015, where communities voiced a longstanding need for a space for Indigenous peoples, where they could gather in ceremony to celebrate their history and culture (City of Edmonton, 2021d).

6.4 The Arctic Indigenous Wellness Foundation's On the Land Healing Camp in Yellowknife, Northwest Territories

In 2017 the Arctic Indigenous Wellness Foundation (AIWF) approached the City of Yellowknife about obtaining a land gift from the City for a 30-year lease to operate a land-based healing facility and cultural site (City of Yellowknife, 2017). AIWF requested a specific parcel of land where they could have a healing centre, a traditional Inuit house, a shed, two sweat lodges, a wood arbour, a tipi, and a greenhouse. The specific parcel of land requested was chosen by AIWF because of its ability to house these various structures, its natural state, access to water, provision of privacy for ceremonies due to its set back, and the natural buffers it offered from other built-up areas. From this request the City recommended that administration create a Memorandum of Understanding for a proposed partnership between the AIWF and the City, which facilitated AIWF's use of the site from 2017 to 2022 (City of Yellowknife, 2017a, 2017b). During this time AIWF operated their On the Land Healing Camp year-round, providing services in both summer and winter months. After one year of operation the camp was consistently attended by approximately 20 individuals, most of whom arrived at the Camp through transportation provided by AWIF and remained at the camp for the entirety of the day (City of Yellowknife, 2019d). The Camp experienced continuous use from Indigenous community members throughout its duration

6.4.1 Municipal Rhetoric

The City often leveraged AIWF's Camp to achieve its own priorities, such as the priority to provide Indigenous wellness and cultural supports (City of Yellowknife, 2018c), the City goal of ensuring a high quality of life for all (City of Yellowknife, 2019a), and listing their support of AIWF under their actions that support reconciliation, specifically regarding the City's 10-year plan to end homelessness (City of Yellowknife, 2019b, 2019f, 2019g). The City also leveraged the Camp to "provide a healthy alternative and positive choice for individuals who may choose other venues to gather during the colder winter months" (City of Yellowknife, 2019g, p.2). This leveraging was a part of the reasoning the City used to approve AIWF's request for additional funding in 2019 and was further illuminated in 2020 when the City listed the Camp as a way for the City to address disturbances in City facilities (City of Yellowknife, 2020a). Through this specific statement the City acknowledged the lack of positive spaces for unhoused people to gather in (most of whom are Indigenous), particularly in the cold winter months. However, instead of the City addressing this lack of space, they channeled short-term funding to an Indigenous-led initiative that directly addressed this lack of space. This decision resulted in a solution by and for Indigenous peoples being bolstered by the City. Yet, this Indigenous-led solution remained precarious because AIWF had to continuously ask the City for funding, with the City agreeing to one-time fund transfers, instead of providing a long-term funding solution such as adding funding for AIWF into the annual City budget (City of Yellowknife, 2019g). Thus, while City rhetoric framed the provision of land for the Camp as an act of reconciliation and leveraged the Camp itself to fulfill City directed goals, the City failed to produce a context where Indigenous sovereignty was actively supported through ongoing reparative work.

6.4.2 Governance and Operation

In 2018 AIWF and the City entered a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) specifically pertaining to AIWF's wish to establish an interim urban healing camp where they would provide traditional Indigenous health services, counseling, cultural skills workshops, wellness workshops, and traditional healing (City of Yellowknife & AIWF, 2018). By signing the MOU the City was able to address the TRC Calls to Action which they adopted in 2015. This was evident from the inclusion of the Calls to Action within the MOU (City of Yellowknife & AIWF, 2018). The MOU also stated that supporting this initiative was an opportunity for the City to act in accordance with UNDRIP on multiple levels. This included assisting with "Indigenous peoples exercising their right to develop and administer social programs" (City of Yellowknife & AIWF, 2018, p. 4), and addressing the harms of residential schools by supporting AIWF as they improve the social conditions of local Indigenous people (City of Yellowknife & AIWF, 2018). The MOU also noted that colonial logic operated as an obstacle for the establishment of this Indigenous-led initiative which resulted in the initiative being delayed by many years due to the "disconnect between colonial law and Indigenous cultural practices" (City of Yellowknife & AIWF, 2018, p. 4).

To address this colonial logic, the MOU stipulated that AIWF's use of the land would not have to strictly adhere to colonial law and that the City would work with AIWF to facilitate better coexistence between these laws and Indigenous cultural practices (City of Yellowknife & AIWF, 2018). However, colonial laws are largely upheld within the MOU as the City does not transfer ownership of the land to AIWF; the site is to be used only by AIWF for the stated purpose of the Camp with all other uses prohibited; the City contends that it will not be held liable for the condition of the site, including its environmental condition or suitability for the

Camp; and AIWF is initially only given two years to use the site (City of Yellowknife & AIWF, 2018).

The City further reinforces their control over the site by stipulating the following within the MOU:

- only trail improvements deemed necessary for the accessibility of the site are permitted to be done by AIWF;

- AIWF must seek written approval from the City prior to making other changes to the site;

- AIWF must ensure the site remains unaltered;

- AIWF must promise to keep the site clean and in good condition;

- the items and changes AIWF can make to the site are listed in the MOU and consist of a teepee on a wooden floor, two wall tents on a wooden floor, a sweat lodge, a firepit, and a small shed to secure tools and equipment;

- AIWF must allow persons authorized by the City to enter and examine the site;

- AIWF and any persons who rely on the services AIWF provides can only use the site between the hours of 11:30am to 5:00am;

- if the City deems the site to be negatively altered AIWF is responsible for the remediation of the site to the satisfaction of the City;

- if the City determines that AIWF has not fulfilled its obligations as set out in the MOU the City has the sole discretion to remove AIWF and their items, structures, and fixtures from the site, while charging them for this removal;

- the City can terminate the MOU if AIWF breaches any of the terms set within the MOU; and

- the City will not be liable to give AIWF any compensation if they terminate the MOU without notice (City of Yellowknife & AIWF, 2018).

These conditions for site use immediately set up a power differentiation between AIWF and the City that follows from settler colonial logic. Through the MOU the City has positioned itself as the authoritative body that AIWF must answer to, as the City dictates how the site may be used. AIWF is also in a disadvantaged positioned because they must meet the City's demands to gain the material resources needed for the betterment of Indigenous peoples lives in Yellowknife. This is especially relevant in Yellowknife, where 90% of the unhoused population is Indigenous (City of Yellowknife, 2019e), which is the target demographic for the Camp. Thus, while the City claims to be committed to undoing the colonial relationship that prevented the Camp from earlier existence, the standards they hold AIWF to in exchange for temporary land use, display multiple examples of an Indigenous-led initiative having to concede to colonial laws.

The City also sets out to share little of the cost or risk associated with the Camp as the MOU states that AIWF will have to pay for any services and utilities they need for the site[27] (City of Yellowknife & AIWF, 2018). The City also remains the legal landowner of the site, which adds precarity to AIWF's initiative. By not transferring ownership of the land to AIWF, the City fails to facilitate Indigenous self-determination over this initiative. The precarity of the land being used by and for AIWF is further underpinned by the Camp being discussed as an interim initiative with no long-term initiative being described to eventually replace the Camp and fulfill its role on a permanent capacity (City of Yellowknife, 2018a, 2018b; City of Yellowknife & AIWF, 2018). However, Council minutes from September 2019 mention that the Camp was established on an interim basis until their permanent location is ready (City of Yellowknife,

---

[27] This includes electrical, heating, water, sewage, and garbage disposal.

2019d). Thus, while the City does acknowledge a long-term avenue for the initiative, this acknowledgement is absent from the legal document of the MOU. Ultimately, the MOU positions the AIWF to have little control over this site and its long-term future use. However, this does not dissuade the City from describing the act of providing land to AWIF as "an unprecedented, non-colonial process" (City of Yellowknife, 2021b, p. 11) that acted as an application of UNDRIP principles to land considerations.

Whereas the MOU positions AIWF to have lesser control over the site, there is an instance of AIWF's determination over the site being upheld when a consultant hired by the City declared that AIWF's interests must take precedence over any trail work that would be proposed to happen on a proposed trail adjacent to AIWF's location (Dillon Consulting Limited, 2018). The consultants had worked with AIWF to align this work under the City's previous adoption of the TRC Calls to Action, which required the City to support the work of AIWF by awaiting their direction and completion of the Camp prior to making any trail design or creation (City of Yellowknife, 2018d, 2018e, 2018f; Dillon Consulting Limited, 2018). In doing this, AIWF and the Indigenous needs they met was given priority over other needs and desires within the city. The City also amended a By-law to exempt the type of structures AIWF would be using to not require a building permit (City of Yellowknife, 2018a, 2018b). This amendment reflects the City's desire to facilitate AIWF's use of the site for the Camp. However, it additionally displays the authoritative stance colonial laws have over Indigenous cultural practices, as the colonial law had to be adjusted for the Indigenous cultural practice to occur more readily.

6.4.3 Funding Model

When the Camp began, AIWF relied on $1 million they won in 2017 through the Arctic Inspiration Prize, along with an additional $53,000 from the City[28] (City of Yellowknife, 2019d, 2019f, 2019g). The additional City funding was used to extend the Camp's hours of operation, increase the programs offered at the Camp, and provide increased transportation services during the winter months (City of Yellowknife, 2019g). In 2019 the City allowed AIWF to use City funded transportation from their Street Outreach Program (SOP), during the off hours of the SOP[29] to increase the capacity of the Camp's transportation services (City of Yellowknife, 2019c). While this increased the Camp's capacity, it only did so on a small and precarious scale, as the City quickly became weary that this practice would become an issue because of potential increase in vehicle maintenance resulting from the increase in use (City of Yellowknife, 2019c, 2019g). At the same time, AIWF asked the City for $50,000 to extend their service level (City of Yellowknife, 2019e), further indicating the need for this initiative, along with its precarity.

In 2020, City funding for the Camp decreased to $19,000 (City of Yellowknife, 2020b), while funding increased to $459, 629 in 2021 due to funding for COVID-19 emergency relief[30] (City of Yellowknife, 2021a). The variation in funds allocated to AIWF from 2017 to 2021 exhibits funding inconsistency, which produces instability for an initiative. The unprecedented event of COVID-19 makes it difficult to draw generalities about this inconsistency. However, it does allow for the conclusion that the temporary increase in funding was not meant to specifically facilitate the Camp's long-term existence nor to support the development of its

---

[28] This funding was through the Federal Urban Programming for Indigenous People (UPIP) funding programing (City of Yellowknife, 2019d, 2019c, 2019d).

[29] Off hours were between 7:00am to 10:00am from November 2019 to March 2020, Monday to Friday.

[30] This funding consisted of $112,084 from a $500,000 COVID-19 Emergency and $347,545 from another $1,469,258 given to the City to address the impacts of COVID-19 (City of Yellowknife, 2021a, 2021c).

infrastructure. Instead, funding was meant to facilitate urgent and short-term mediations that addressed the immediate impacts of COVID-19.

Along with inconsistency, the City also remained largely in control of any additional funds that became necessary for the long-term existence of the Camp. This is evident by AIWF providing the City with ongoing updates to relay the successes they reached due to additional City funding (City of Yellowknife, 2019g); along with the City detailing which amounts of City funding were to be used for specified aspects of the Camp (City of Yellowknife, 2021c). The provision of these updates; the specificity required for City funding to be allocated to the Camp; along with the lack of commitment by the City to provide long-term funding for the Camp displays the hierarchical nature of the relationship between AIWF and the City. Thus, the City did not commit to the long-term existence the Camp, as the City failed to create an environment where AIWF could rely on stable forms of annual funding. The context created by the City also failed to facilitate Indigenous sovereignty, and at times undermined Indigenous self-determination over the Camp, which is particularly evident through the City specifying how funds were to be used.

6.4.4 Need for Indigenous Space

An important finding from this case study it that the City did not attempt to reorient the Camp from being a space by and for Indigenous people. Thus, despite the City leveraging the Camp to meet its definition of reconciliation and failing to facilitate the long-term existence of the Camp within Yellowknife, this case study holds promise in terms of its demonstration of a City allowing an Indigenous-led initiative to produce space that is explicitly for Indigenous folks. There is no indication in any of the analysed document of the City attempting to appropriate the Camp for aspects such as settler education, cross-cultural community building, tourism, or

economic opportunities. However, as previously mentioned the City did leverage the Camp to address city-wide concerns. Additionally, the Camp was primarily a space for unhoused people, which does not readily present avenues for tourism, or economic opportunities and therefore limits the ability of the City to appropriate this initiative.

Chapter 7 Discussion: Broader Implications for Planning and Identifying Appropriate Roles for Municipalities to Support Indigenous-Led Initiatives

This chapter re-engages with the knowledge presented in the literature review chapters two and three, while considering the findings from the four case studies. Throughout the chapter the findings from the case studies are critically analyzed and understood in relation to settler colonial logics within planning, and the ability of municipalities to support decolonization through Indigenous-led initiatives that embody Indigenous self-determination, sovereignty, and futurity. This chapter begins with unpacking the importance of space by and for Indigenous communities within urban settings, whilst recognizing how this need for space is limited or undermined by municipalities. Next, the analysis produces a type of roadmap for municipalities to facilitate meaningful reconciliation, where four aspects are identified for the production of meaningful support for Indigenous-led initiatives and the provision of Indigenous spaces within urban settings. These aspects are (1) Indigenous authority over the creation processes for these spaces, (2) governance and operation models that lend themselves to enactments of Indigenous sovereignty and self-determination, (3) rhetoric within official City documents that create contexts for Indigenous communities to lead processes and avoid the assertion of municipal power over Indigenous-led initiatives, and (4) the provision of long-term and stable municipal funding that is void of conditional obtainment for Indigenous-led initiatives. This chapter also determines that reconciliation pursued through the provision of space for Indigenous-led initiatives is often weakened by factors such as a lack of Indigenous self-determination over the creation process for these spaces; non-Indigenous use and mutual benefit being centered in the creation of spaces; Indigenous-led initiatives being expected to adhere to municipal understandings of contractual relationships; municipalities providing funding in ways that

reassert colonial relations of domination and control; and municipalities retaining ownership over the land and/or buildings provided to Indigenous-led initiatives.

7.1 Indigenous Spaces Counteract Invisibility within Urban Settings

When Indigenous communities experience invisibility within urban settings it can contribute to ongoing harm and marginalization. The Indigenous communities within Kingston have experienced this, as they reported a devaluation of Indigenous identity and a lack of connection within the Indigenous communities resulting from their invisibility within Kingston (Brennan, 2015). To address this invisibility and the harms produced by it, the Indigenous communities along with the City of Kingston are working towards the creation of an Indigenous Cultural Centre. While the creation of spaces such as these address urban Indigenous invisibility, they can also provide recognition for the Indigenous communities' ongoing existence within an urban setting, which contributes to the advancement of a city being reconceptualized as not only a place for Indigenous peoples, but also an Indigenous place itself (Porter et al., 2017; Tomiak, 2017). Kihciy Askiy, the ceremonial site currently being developed within Edmonton, further provides evidence of this, as the selected site holds both historical and cultural significance for the local Indigenous communities (Manasc Isaac, 2017b, 2019; Spencer Environmental Management Services, 2017). Incorporating the traditional relationships Indigenous communities have to land within an urban context legitimizes these relationships and contextualizes them as ongoing, which actively facilitates a context for Indigenous futurity.

7.2 Indigenous Organizations' Capacity is Increased through the Provision of Indigenous Space

Spaces such as Indigenous Cultural Centers facilitate connection within local Indigenous communities as they build community capacity through community-defined use of the space. Associated with the utility of these spaces is their accessibility pertaining to aspects such as

transportation and location within a city (such as that found within the site selection process for Kihciy Askiy (Manasc Isaac, 2017b)), along with the centralization of Indigenous use of the space. The provision of interim space for the Kingston Indigenous Language Nest (KILN) illustrates both of these aspects, as KILN's exclusive use of the city-owned building allows this Indigenous initiative to experience stability and increased capacity because it no longer needs to vies for space to host events (Postovit, 2021). Thus, the security of space allows time and resources to be put towards programing and events for Indigenous peoples, which increases the capacity within the organization. Exclusive use of space also enables Indigenous community members to experience greater levels of safety and inclusion within a space, as they are provided with a place to escape anti-Indigenous racism, connect to culture, and experience connection with those who share similar lived experiences. The success of the Arctic Indigenous Wellness Foundation's (AIWF) On the Land Healing Camp also exemplifies how the accessibility of a space dedicated to Indigenous cultural learning and healing can produce these type benefits for Indigenous community members (City of Yellowknife, 2019d). This Indigenous space provided a place for the mostly Indigenous unhoused population in Yellowknife to gather and partake in culturally healing activities. In centering exclusive Indigenous use of the site AIWF was able to readily meet the cultural needs of the Indigenous communities it sought to serve and as such was successful in its operation because of the Indigenous self-determination over the space.

7.3 Both Multi-Use and Single-Use Indigenous Spaces are Often Required

The spaces for Indigenous-led initiatives within urban settings are often multi-use spaces, where activities such as ceremony, healing, gathering, education, training, programming, and language reclamation can occur. Creating these types of multi-use spaces produces a centralized place for Indigenous communities to gather, build relationships, access community support, and

engage in cultural activities, while also increasing Indigenous services providers ability to reach Indigenous peoples. Further, a centralized space enables service providers to build connection amongst themselves, which can produce more networked approaches to care and lead to the diminishment of service duplication, which is often a substandard use of resources. This ability for multi-use space to increase service access is evident in the creation processes for Indigenous Centers in Edmonton, Kingston, and Lethbridge (Brennan, 2015; City of Edmonton, 2021a; Manasc Isaac, 2020).

Although multi-use spaces hold immense value and utility, spaces that are more specific in use and operation are also crucial for the development of Indigenous futurity within urban settings. The provision of singular use spaces often fills voids experienced by more marginalized Indigenous community members, while operating in recognition of the variance within local Indigenous communities and the associated variance of their needs and desires. Two examples of this include AIWF's On the Land Healing Camp, which exemplifies the benefits of creating space that is for a specific use and Indigenous community, and Kihciy Askiy, which exemplifies the value of providing space that is specifically for Indigenous ceremonial use[31]. The need and desire for these single-use spaces demonstrates that both multi- and single-use spaces are often warranted for ongoing reconciliation processes that uphold decolonization efforts which adequately attend to the diversity within Indigenous communities. Municipalities should therefore avoid simplistic approaches to the creation of Indigenous-led spaces and consider the possibilities for the provision of multiple spaces for Indigenous-led initiatives. The context within Edmonton further supports this, evidenced by the ongoing creation process for the multi-

---

[31] However, this use is undermined by the City's instance of including non-Indigenous use within the space.

use space of an Indigenous Cultural and Wellness Centre (ICWC), which is occurring alongside

the development the predominantly ceremonial space of Kihciy Askiy.

7.4 The Shortcomings of Framing Relationships through the Lens of Mutual Benefit

Municipalities often frame Indigenous-municipal relationships through a lens of mutual

benefit. However, this lens of mutual benefit can undermine meeting Indigenous communities'

needs and desires, as municipalities may be unwilling to "sacrifice" resources for the singular

benefit of Indigenous communities. For instance, the City of Kingston frames relationships

between Indigenous communities and the City to require mutual benefit for both the Indigenous

communities and the City (Hurdle & Wiginton, 2018), which positions the City to be disinclined

to perform reparative work that is vital for meaningful reconciliation. This is particularly

problematic because reconciliation often requires settler institutions to engage in the type of

reparative work that requires sacrifice, loss, or cost on behalf of the institution. The City of

Yellowknife further illustrates the limitation of mutual benefit as the City leveraged AIWF's On

the Land Healing Camp for its own goals and objectives while providing AIWF with limited

support (City of Yellowknife, 2018c, 2019a). Thus, the function of mutual benefit resulted in the

City utilizing AIWF to fulfill its own goals, which produced an extractive relationship where the

City benefited from AIWF. However, this did not prevent the City from framing this relationship

as one of mutual benefit as they listed both their support of AIWF under their actions for

reconciliation (City of Yellowknife, 2019b, 2019f, 2019g) and AIWF as an avenue for the City's

provision of Indigenous wellness and cultural supports (City of Yellowknife, 2018c).

The City of Lethbridge also exhibited the use of mutual benefit to frame the governance

and operations of an Indigenous Cultural Centre (ICC). The Study for the creation of the ICC

stated its intention to align its recommendation for potential governance and operations models

100

with pre-existing municipal policy and plans, which meant that the Study incorporated the desires and needs of the Indigenous communities when it examined different governance and operative models for the space (Manasc Isaac, 2020). However, these desires and needs were not fulfilled if it would result in the expense municipal desires and needs. Thus, the framework of mutual benefit resulted in the elevation of municipal goals over Indigenous sovereignty or self-determination, especially because this Study recommended a jointly Indigenous-City governed and operated ICC. This recommendation was established through reasoning that was focused more on the potential benefits for the City than on the governance and operation model that would most benefit the local Indigenous communities. The three examples of mutual benefit found in the Cities of Kingston, Yellowknife, and Lethbridge display how defining Indigenous-municipal relationships and the creation of Indigenous spaces through a lens of mutual benefit is at best limiting and at worst harmful, as Indigenous communities' needs become secondary to municipal agendas.

7.5 The Shortcomings of Centering Non-Indigenous Use of Space

The centring of non-Indigenous use of space within Indigenous-led initiatives, diminishes Indigenous determination over the space and constrains Indigenous futurity being embodied within and through the creation of these spaces. The Cities of Edmonton and Lethbridge have both exemplified the inclusion of non-Indigenous use alongside Indigenous use of spaces for Indigenous-led initiatives. The City of Edmonton exemplified this by including the "general public" as a potential audience in the 2017 development permit submission for Kihciy Askiy, as the space could provide non-Indigenous peoples with access to learning about Indigenous traditions (Manasc Isaac, 2017a). The City of Edmonton also opened the possibility of Kihciy Askiy becoming non-Indigenous led and operated when they primarily engaged with non-

Indigenous organizations during their search for a replacement operator of the space in 2018[32] (City of Edmonton, 2019b). However, the City was able to sidestep this potential pitfall by listening to the former Indigenous partner for Kihciy Askiy, who recommended another Indigenous-led organization as their replacement. The instances of centering non-Indigenous use from the City of Lethbridge include explicitly stating that an Indigenous Cultural Centre (ICC) would be a place for everyone, where the distance between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples could be bridged (Manasc Isaac, 2020), and purporting tourism as potential economic venture for the space (City of Lethbridge, 2017). The first instance is based on the prospect of cross-cultural community, while the second produces a context of spectating of Indigenous peoples, their cultures, and traditions.

As outlined by these two examples, the common guiding intentions behind the inclusion of non-Indigenous use is often cross-cultural community building and educating non-Indigenous people about Indigenous cultures. Cross-cultural community building can increase community capacity, produce coalitions, and produce the conditions for respecting cross-cultural identities within Indigenous communities. While non-Indigenous education is often a crucial step for addressing anti-Indigenous racism. Thus, both actions can provide benefit for Indigenous communities, however, this benefit may be at the expense of Indigenous community members feeling ownership over the space. Further, the inclusion of non-Indigenous people as a central audience within a space by and for Indigenous peoples is likely to diminish feelings of safety and access amongst some Indigenous community members, while also diminishing the ceremonial use of a space for Indigenous peoples. This is because Indigenous peoples are likely to use a space for Indigenous-led initiatives to access their culture, escape racism, and be around people

---

[32] This occurred after Native Counselling Services of Alberta became unable to continue as the Indigenous organization within the Kihciy Askiy creation process (City of Edmonton, 2019b).

with similar lived experiences, all of which produce feelings of safety and connection. Yet, cross-cultural community building, and non-Indigenous education may put Indigenous users of the space into uncomfortable positions, especially if the education of non-Indigenous folks is privileged. This privileging of non-Indigenous peoples occurs at the expense of Indigenous peoples' mental, emotional, and physical well-being. Indigenous peoples' use of the space therefore becomes at risk of becoming secondary to non-Indigenous use, which is counter-active to not only the provision of the space, but also reconciliation.

Non-Indigenous use of the space also poses the risk for spectatorship and racism to occur, as Indigenous peoples may be othered and viewed as cultural artefacts of a "long lost culture", especially if one of the central facets of the space is ceremonial use. Further, if Indigenous peoples don't feel safe, comfortable, or ownership over a space, the space may no longer be viewed as primarily for Indigenous peoples. The Indigenous communities within Kingston have supported this sentiment by communicating that it is important for them to have ownership over both physical spaces, as well as their identity (Huigenbos & Wiginton, 2020; Brennan, 2015). Thus, a space can fail to support an Indigenous-led initiative, and as a result contribute to ongoing Indigenous dispossession within urban settings if the space is appropriated for non-Indigenous use, as this can result in the alienation of Indigenous community members and a deidentification with the space. This can occur regardless of a municipality's viewpoint that the provision of space is an act of reconciliation because the provision of space fails to achieve the imperative goal of producing a place that Indigenous peoples view as by and for Indigenous peoples.

While this appropriation of Indigenous space for the inclusion of non-Indigenous use is an ongoing concern with these creation processes of Indigenous spaces, the Cities of

Yellowknife and Kingston have demonstrated how these concerns may be avoided. The City of Yellowknife did not attempt to recontextualize who AIWF's On the Land Healing Camp was for. As evidenced, throughout the Camp's existence within Yellowknife, the City remained steadfast in understanding that AIWF dictated who this space was for, which allowed it to remain by and for Indigenous peoples, resulting in the efficacy of the space for reaching its target audience (City of Yellowknife, 2019d). In a different, yet similar vein the City of Kingston displayed how "secondary" aspects within reconciliation processes, such as cultural awareness training, can be held separate from the provision of space for Indigenous-led initiatives (Huigenbos & Wiginton, 2020). Thus, while activities like settler education and cross-cultural community building are advantageous for producing ongoing and meaningful reconciliation, they do not have to detract from spaces that are by and for Indigenous communities. Instead, these activities can be pursued alongside, albeit outside of the provision of spaces for Indigenous-led initiatives. In doing this Indigenous peoples' wellbeing is upheld over settler comfort and education.

7.6 Indigenous Self-Determination and Sovereignty over the Creation, Development, Governance, and Operation of Space

The previous sections outlined how the provision of spaces within urban settings that are explicitly by and for Indigenous communities counteracts the invisibility that Indigenous communities may be experiencing, provides a location for service providers for Indigenous peoples to create networked approaches to care, valorizes Indigenous ancestral connections to place, and creates a place for Indigenous peoples to experience safety, inclusion, and increased community capacity. A central facet of these types of spaces being impactful is that Indigenous communities practice self-determination over the space by acting as the gatekeepers for who outside the Indigenous communities can access the space, how the space is programed, designed, and used, as well as having authority over the creation processes. Without these features these

spaces fail to facilitate Indigenous futurity as Indigenous self-determination over the space is not respected nor cultivated.

Maintaining municipal control over the creation, development, governance, and operation of a space for Indigenous-led initiatives is ineffective for producing reconciliation, as this reinforces settler colonial logic, instead of producing contexts for Indigenous sovereignty and the recognition of Indigenous authority. The material needs and desires of local Indigenous communities may still be addressed within these contexts, but decolonial Indigenous-municipal relationships are not produced. Thus, limited forms of reconciliation are enacted resulting from a lack of structural and relational change on behalf of municipalities. To create contexts that bolster Indigenous futurity, municipalities need to (1) allow creation processes for Indigenous spaces to be Indigenous-led, (2) relinquish control and ownership over the land and buildings they provide to Indigenous-led initiatives, (3) facilitate Indigenous governance and operation over these spaces, and (4) provide ongoing and consistent funding for all stages leading to the space, including the creation process, development of the site, and operation of the space. Without these four factors, municipalities risk reproducing colonial relationships and fail to disrupt settler colonial logic, both of which are antithetical to meaningful and lasting reconciliation.

7.6.1 Indigenous Authority Over Process

Indigenous self-determination over a creation process enables Indigenous peoples to embody Indigenous futurity by playing an active role in the creation of what they envision for themselves and their future kin (Harjo, 2019). A municipality can further facilitate this type of futurity by providing Indigenous groups with the resources needed to undertake community engagement and other processes needed for the creation of space. For instance, the Indigenous

Circle's request for a transfer of leadership over the creation of an Indigenous Cultural and Wellness Centre (ICWC) from the City of Edmonton to the Indigenous Circle clearly exhibits the need for Indigenous authority over the creation of an Indigenous space (City of Edmonton, 2021a). This request was additionally teamed with a funding request to facilitate the Indigenous Circle undertaking work for the ICWC's creation (City of Edmonton, 2021b, 2021c), which illustrates the need for municipalities to financially support Indigenous authority over creation processes.

The City of Kingston also provides a clear demonstration of the need for Indigenous authority within creation processes, specifically in the City's recognition of when a municipal-led engagement would be inappropriate. This recognition comes from the potential risk of recolonization if the City were to be the interpretative body for engagement regarding the creation of a protocol that would define the roles of the Indigenous communities and the City in the creation of an Indigenous Cultural Centre (Huigenbos & Wiginton, 2018, 2020). Yet, despite this recognition the City missed an opportunity to create a context where Indigenous communities asserted control over the creation process, as the City hired a third-party facilitator to undertake the engagement instead of channeling these funds to the Indigenous communities, who could have undertaken this engagement themselves. If this was done, the Indigenous communities could have acted as the interpreter of engagement results, which would have valorized their self-determination, sovereignty, and perspective within the process. It would have additionally positioned them to readily asserted control over how engagement was conducted, which would have also furthered the beforementioned attributes. The shortcoming of the City's choice is that it potentially undermines the knowledge, authority, and capacity within the local Indigenous communities, while failing to facilitate Indigenous control over process.

Without direct Indigenous control over the planning of a space from the onset, a creation

process runs the risk of being a municipal project, instead of an Indigenous-led project that is

supported by a municipality. Pursuing a creation process that is municipal-led is counter-intuitive

to reconciliation, as Indigenous self-determination is required over not only the visioning of a

project, but also the process for its creation. This is evident in the City of Lethbridge's failure to

facilitate an Indigenous-led creation process for an Indigenous Cultural Centre, despite this

process being tethered to a vision from a local Indigenous organization[33] and further embedded

in the City's Urban Indigenous Community Action Plan (City of Lethbridge, 2017). The City of

Lethbridge also demonstrates the same shortcoming as the City of Kingston, as they too hired a

third-party consultant to undertake a co-design process with Indigenous communities and

produce an analysis of potential governance models for the Centre (City of Lethbridge, 2020a;

Manasc Isaac, 2020).

7.6.2 The Function of Municipal Rhetoric

The rhetoric found within municipal documents often sets the parameters for how a

municipality will engage in an Indigenous-municipal relationship, which has been termed a

textually-mediated contact zone (Porter & Barry, 2015). Within these contact zones

municipalities' acknowledgement that reconciliation is a complex and enduring process operates

as a precondition for the creation of conditions that facilitate Indigenous futurity. Outcomes

from this acknowledgment can include engagements processes that are not dictated by

municipalities, but instead controlled by Indigenous participants in terms of both objectives and

process; and the recognition of the diversity within Indigenous communities, as multiple and

competing needs and desires are allowed to simultaneously exist, leading to the potential

---

[33] The Native Counselling Services of Alberta produced the initial vision for an Indigenous community space.

fulfillment of these needs and desires through multiple avenues. The other aspect that ought to be embedded in these municipal forms of rhetoric is the avoidance of policy and directive that purports shallow reconciliation, which can occur if a municipality fails to acknowledge its positionality within the long-term advancement of Indigenous futurity by refusing to give power and resources over to Indigenous-led initiatives.

It is common practice within municipalities to create documents that define working relationships, roles and expectations between a municipality and an external body. Municipalities have continued this practice by creating documents that define the relationship between Indigenous communities and a municipality, as well as the Indigenous communities' use of municipal-owned space. However, while relationships and roles are defined in these documents, they are typically void of Indigenous relational practices, ways of knowing and understandings of land outside of property. Thus, the documents tend to do little work to define Indigenous-municipal relationships in a way that aligns with Indigenous epistemologies, resulting in a failure to inscribe decolonial relationships between the Indigenous communities and the Cities through the documents or to move outside the understanding of land as property. The MOU between the Arctic Indigenous Wellness Foundation (AIWF) and the City of Yellowknife and the Service Level Agreement between the Kingston Indigenous Language Nest (KILN) and the City of Kingston are both examples of this type of document. The MOU and Service Level Agreement both set the parameters for the Cities' obligation to the corresponding Indigenous-led initiative, while also being indicative of how the Cities would engage with the initiatives. For instance, the MOU between AIWF and the City of Yellowknife positioned the City to assert power over AIWF by dictating how the site they provided AIWF with could be used. The MOU also insinuated that the City was in a position to terminate both the MOU and AIWF's use of the

space if at any point that the City deemed the Indigenous organization to be in violation of the parameters within the MOU (City of Yellowknife, 2018).

The Service Level Agreement between KILN and the City of Kingston also situated the City in a position of power over the Indigenous organization as the City retained ownership of the site they provided KILN with, yet there were less stipulations for how KILN could use the space (Agnew & Campbell, 2021a, 2021b; City of Kingston, 2021c). The Service Level Agreement committed the City to support KILN's use of this space for a minimum of five years by ensuring KILN did not pay property taxes nor rent for their use of the building, and facilitating KILN's operation and use of the space through an annual funding commitment (City of Kingston, 2021b). Thus, while documents such as MOUs and Service Level Agreements position municipalities in an authoritative position over Indigenous initiatives and remain grounded in the settler colonial logic that land is City property, they can also produce instances of ongoing and meaningful reconciliation, specifically if a municipality provides financial and administrative support to Indigenous communities by way of the document.

As previously stated, municipal rhetoric that acknowledges reconciliation is a complex and enduring process while being teamed with the transfer of power and resources to Indigenous-led initiatives is precursory for municipalities to position themselves in support of Indigenous futurity. Public declarations made by the City of Edmonton first in 2015 (City of Edmonton 2015, EndPovertyEdmonton, 2016) and then later reinstated textually in the 2017 terms of reference for the City's Indigenous Peoples' Strategy (City of Edmonton, 2017) provide the basis for the provision of space for Indigenous peoples and the need for more than one type of space, as spaces for wellness, ceremonies and cultural learning are all listed within the declarations. The City of Edmonton teamed these declarations with the provision of ceremonial space through

Kichiy Askiy and the ongoing creation for an Indigenous Knowledge and Wisdom Centre (IKWC). The City facilitating the provision of multiple spaces for Indigenous peoples indicates an understanding that Indigenous communities are not monolith and are likely to require more than one site for the fulfillment of their spatial needs. As such, the City is vested in multiple pathways of reconciliation, which proceed from public commitments for undertaking reconciliation in this manner.

Yet a caveat still exists despite the City's facilitation of Indigenous space, in so much that although the City of Edmonton facilitates the materiality of space needed for Indigenous communities within urban settings, the City fails to produce the conditions for Indigenous sovereignty over these spaces. The City demonstrates this failure in its assertion of power over the Indigenous operative body for Kichiy Askiy, the Indigenous Knowledge and Wisdom Centre (IKWC). Within the document outlining IKWC and the City's respective roles, the City remains that Kichiy Askiy will be for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous use (City of Edmonton, 2019). Including non-Indigenous use within this document implies that a requirement for procuring Indigenous space is that it must remain available for non-Indigenous peoples to use. As such, the City's inclusion of non-Indigenous use can be read as a conditional aspect for IKWC to gain site access. Thus, while the City does address the Indigenous communities' material need for space through Kichiy Askiy, it is does not thwart settler colonial relations of power for the facilitation of Indigenous sovereignty over space.

7.6.3 Governance and Operation of Spaces

Indigenous governance and operation over spaces facilitates Indigenous sovereignty and self-determination and are thus crucial preconditions to produce contexts that support Indigenous futurity. It is also within these contexts that Indigenous actors can more securely perform refusal,

as they are less likely to be obligated to standards set by settler institutions (such as municipalities) for the continued use of this space. Thus, both Indigenous governance and operation over space is a prerequisite for Indigenous peoples to freely refuse settler colonialism and its harmful impacts. The City of Yellowknife illuminates this by exemplifying how municipalities impede on Indigenous governance and operation over a space, which is most explicitly demonstrated in the MOU between AIWF and the City. Within this document the City stipulates the terms and conditions for Arctic Indigenous Wellness Foundation (AIWF) to use City-owned land, including the stipulation that the City could remove AIWF if the City determined that AIWF failed to fulfill its obligations set out in the MOU, such as gaining written approval from the City to make changes to the site outside those already agreed to by the City and limiting the space's operation hours (City of Yellowknife & AIWF, 2018). By setting these stipulations the City asserted their governance over the space, while also setting parameters around the operation of the space, both of which undermine Indigenous sovereignty and self-determination over the space. These factors are also underscored by the City's refusal to transfer the land over to AIWF, which would have nullified most of the governance and operation limitations the City had placed on AIWF.

As evidenced by the City of Yellowknife, municipalities fail to relinquish ownership of the land and buildings they provide Indigenous-led initiatives with. The Cities of Edmonton and Kingston further demonstrate this failure as the City of Edmonton has maintained ownership over Kihciy Askiy, despite the space being operated by the Indigenous Knowledge and Wisdom Centre (IKWC). While the City of Kingston has failed to transfer building ownership of an interim Indigenous community space over to the Kingston Indigenous Language Nest (KILN), although the City of Kingston is providing KILN with this building, rent-free for five to a

possible ten years (Agnew & Campbell, 2021a, 2021b; City of Kingston, 2021c). The lack of

Indigenous ownership over these spaces produces a limited form of governance as Indigenous-

led initiatives are placed in a subordinate position with restricted power and control over their

spaces as they are required to meet City demands for the ongoing use of the space. The failure to

transfer land and building ownership to Indigenous-led initiatives is therefore a major hinderance

to active forms of decolonization that are produced through Indigenous-led initiatives. As such,

municipalities are only producing limited forms of reconciliation by reasserting colonial and

hierarchical relationships between themselves and Indigenous communities through their failure

to transfer ownership of land and buildings over to Indigenous communities.

7.6.4 Municipal Funding for Indigenous Spaces

The provision of large sums of funding for Indigenous-led initiatives is often dependent

on a municipality's conceptualization of its role within the initiative, which might reproduce

assimilation tactics as Indigenous-led initiatives are reinscribed into municipal understandings of

reconciliation, instead of the inverse occurring. This also positions the municipality in a position

of power over the Indigenous-led initiative, as funding is not freely given. In 2017 the City of

Edmonton committed $4.51 million to the capital costs for the creation of Kihciy Askiy (City of

Edmonton 2018a, 2019b). However, from 2017 to 2020, the City held the last remaining

$700,000 in abeyance because the original Indigenous operator for the space became unable to

continue in the creation process, which lead to the Indigenous Knowledge and Wisdom Centre

(IKWC) becoming the new operator in 2019 (City of Edmonton 2020a, 2020b). The City

continued to hold funding in abeyance despite the existence of a new Indigenous operator,

demonstrating a clear power differentiation between the City and IKWC. This power

differentiation was further illuminated by Council's debate over releasing these funds to IKWC,

due to concerns with IKWC meeting their obligations for creating Kihciy Askiy, which were simply based on the delay of the project and not IKWC's ability to undertake the work (City of Edmonton, 2020b). Additionally, the City of Edmonton fails to commit to funding the operation of Kihciy Askiy after its development (City of Edmonton, 2020a). In this case it becomes evident that the redistribution of financial resources is not enough to produce decolonial contexts and relationships, as the municipality retains control over funds and extend this control over the initiative itself. This type of limited funding arrangement, albeit large in sum, is illustrative of the limits of redistribution within reconciliation processes.

When separation is largely maintained between a municipality and an Indigenous-led initiative, municipal funding for the initiative tends to be sporadic. This type of funding inconsistency places Indigenous-led initiatives into precarious positions, where time and resources must be put towards securing funding, instead of programming and events. Settler colonial logic is evident within these funding scenarios, as municipalitiess fail to facilitate the flourishment of Indigenous-led initiatives by denying them annually consistent funding, which may be specifically detrimental for initiatives that actively subvert settler colonialism and municipal authority through practices of refusal. The City of Yellowknife demonstrates the limitations of a sporadic funding model. Despite Arctic Indigenous Wellness Foundation's (AIWF) ongoing need for funding for programing and operation of their On the Land Healing Camp, the City refused to provide them with a long-term and consistent funding agreement (City of Yellowknife, 2020b, 2021a). Instead, AIWF competed with other community initiatives to gain City funding, which they had to apply for every year leading them to have funding they could neither annually rely on, nor plan for. Further evident of this precarity is the variance in the

sums of funding the City provided AIWF with each year[34]. The City also attached specific

expectations to the different amounts of funding given to AIWF (City of Yellowknife, 2021c),

which undermines AIWF's sovereignty and places the City in a position of power over both

AIWF and the programing and operation of the Healing Camp. Neither of which facilitate a

context for the flourishment of Indigenous futurity, nor does it produce a decolonial relationship

between the City and AIWF.

While the City of Yellowknife demonstrates the limitations of sporadic funding models,

the City of Kingston displays an avenue for how municipalities can actively commit to ongoing

reconciliation by including funding for Indigenous-led initiatives within their annual budget

projections. The City of Kingston has provided the Indigenous organization, the Kingston

Indigenous Language Nest (KILN) with interim space while the creation process for an

Indigenous Cultural Centre is undertaken (Agnew & Campbell, 2021a, 2021b). The City has

actively facilitated the provision and ongoing use of this space by waiving the property taxes for

the building, providing the building to KILN rent-free, and funding KILN's programming and

operation of the building; all of which is included in a Service Level Agreement that will be

incorporated in the City's annual budget projects for the next five years. The City has also

bolstered other Indigenous-led initiatives by funding Indigenous-led events and programming

(Huigenbos & Wiginton, 2020), which furthers the City's interim response to Indigenous needs

and desires while the creation process for an Indigenous Cultural Centre is being undertaken.

This tactic of interim funding is also responsive to the diversity of needs and desires among the

local Indigenous communities, as more than one Indigenous-led initiative is being granted

---

[34] The City gave AIWF $53,000 in 2017 (City of Yellowknife, 2019c, 2019d, 2019g), $19,000 in 2020 (City of Yellowknife, 2020b), and $459,629 in 2021 (City of Yellowknife, 2021a), with this last sum reflective of COVID-19 emergency funding responses.

financial resources. As such, the City demonstrates potential avenues for providing direct and actionable funding that meets the self-defined needs and desires of the Indigenous communities, while aiding in the advancement of multiple Indigenous-led initiatives.

Beyond ongoing, consistent, and faceted funding responses, municipalities may also position themselves as funding facilitators for Indigenous-led initiatives, instead of being a funder for Indigenous-led initiatives. The City of Lethbridge's ongoing search for external funding for the operation of an Indigenous Cultural Centre (Manasc Isaac, 2020) signifies the potential of this positionality. As indicative from the City of Yellowknife and the City of Edmonton, municipalities tend to assert power over Indigenous-led initiatives when they provide initiatives with funding. To overcome this shortcoming, Indigenous-led initiatives may opt out of securing funding from municipalities and can instead advocate for municipalities to play a facilitator role in the initiative gaining funding from other governance bodies such as a provincial or federal government source. Municipalities often have more time and resources to put towards researching funding sources than Indigenous community organizers do, while also with pre-existing relationships and knowledge pertaining to external funding sources. This positions municipalities to readily undertake this work for Indigenous-led initiatives and thus meaningfully support Indigenous-led initiatives while avoiding the recolonization that some municipalities demonstrate when they directly fund Indigenous-led initiatives.

Chapter 8 Conclusion

The outcomes of settler colonialism are self-perpetuating because they breed new and ongoing forms of displacement towards Indigenous folks, their ways of being, and sovereignty (Bhandar, 2018; Coulthard, 2014; King, 2019; Pasternak, et al., 2021). In this sense, settler colonialism and planning as a western cultural practice are world ending (Porter, 2021). Furthermore, what may be even more dangerous about planning and planning policy, is that it is often used to justify the ending of worlds, specifically those worlds that are deemed "necessarily" dispensable by settler colonial logic (Porter, 2021). It is through these acts of planning and policy measures that violence against Indigenous peoples is so often excused. Yet, there are simultaneously planning scholars and practitioners who are crafting a different type of planning that centralizes life making (see Miraftab, 2009, 2017; Dorries & Harjo, 2020; Porter, 2010; Porter & Barry, 2016; Thompson-Fawcett & Riddle, 2017, Sandercock, 2004; Wensig & Porter, 2016). Orientating planning towards life making produces the possibility for planning practices to work in solidarity with Indigenous-led initiatives that are grounded in Indigenous understandings of relationality, care, and ways of being and thus supportive of Indigenous futurity (Harjo, 2019).

The question of if/how planning as a western cultural practice can deconstruct the settler colonial logic embedded within itself by providing land, administrative and financial support to Indigenous-led initiatives within urban settings is addressed through this thesis. This thesis also remains tethered to a localized context where O:se Kenhionhata:tie continues to engage with the municipalities of the Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo and the Region of Waterloo to gain the support and space they need for their initiatives. To answer the research question that stems from this localized context this thesis collected moments within municipal planning practices and

policy that hold the potential for life-making solidarity through the facilitation of land, financial and administrative support to Indigenous-led initiatives. By collecting these moments and reading them together, the promise of a different form of planning becomes more possible as the settler colonial logic that underpins so much of planning is deconstructed for the pursuit of life-making solidarity that centralizes the importance of Indigenous life through initiatives by and for Indigenous peoples, specifically through the provision of space. Thus, it is through analyzing these actions and policy statements that planning can learn a new language and logic. However, this research is not entirely optimistic. Planning is still grounded in the settler colonial logics of elimination, white supremacy, land as property, and dispossession. As such, a crucial aspect within this research has been to both uncover the moments of deconstructions that produce pockets for life-making, while critically analyzing the other aspects surrounding these moments, in which planning remains tied to settler colonialism and its ongoing reproduction.

The findings from this research demonstrate that the provision of space for Indigenous peoples within urban settings is necessary for the process of meaningful reconciliation. When municipalities provide Indigenous-led initiatives with land and/or buildings planning can activate a form of reconciliation that produces justice for Indigenous communities. This occurs as the self-defined needs and desires of Indigenous communities are met, while the harm and marginalization that results from Indigenous invisibility within urban contexts is addressed. However, the findings from this research also display that municipalities often reassert their own objectives within these reconciliation processes by centering non-Indigenous use of space, which leads to the subordination of Indigenous authority over reconciliation processes and results in the subversion Indigenous self-determination, sovereignty, and the active facilitation of Indigenous futurity. Municipalities can additionally fail to centre Indigenous benefit within the creation,

operation, and governance of these spaces by framing these spaces through the lens of mutual benefit. The function of mutual benefit is to reinscribe settler colonial logic, which again strips Indigenous peoples of their sovereignty and self-determination over the creation, operation, and governance of these spaces, as their needs and desires are considered within the process but not met if it means the expense of municipal needs and desires. Thus hierarchal relationships, based in settler colonial logic, continue to be produced between municipalities and Indigenous communities through both the centring of non-Indigenous use and mutual benefit.

Rhetoric found within municipal documents often sets the bounds for roles and relationships between Indigenous communities and municipalities for the provision, governance, and operation of spaces for Indigenous-led initiatives. Municipal documents that include rhetoric acknowledging the complex and enduring nature of reconciliation can be precursory for municipalities transferring authority and resources to Indigenous-led initiatives. However, most municipal documents function to situate municipalities in a position of power over Indigenous-led initiatives. This is particularly evident when municipalities dictate how Indigenous communities use municipally provided spaces, resulting in the undermining of Indigenous self-determination. This also functions to reproduce settler colonial logic by re-establishing a hierarchy between a settler institution and Indigenous communities. Indigenous communities are thus conceptualized as being governed under municipalities, instead of being understood as sovereign, which produces a preventative, instead of supportive context for Indigenous futurity.

Indigenous governance and operation of spaces for Indigenous-led initiatives is crucial for the fulfillment of Indigenous sovereignty and self-determination. Yet, this research displays that municipalities frequently fail to relinquish governance over these spaces by disdaining from transferring land and/or building ownership over to Indigenous communities. A limited form of

governance is thus produced within this failure as Indigenous communities are "allowed" to operate these spaces but are not given full control over their current and future use of the space. Indigenous communities are then required to maintain relationships with municipalities for their continued use of a space, which compromises their ability to practice refusal and Indigenous futurity.

Indigenous control over the creation processes for these spaces is also necessary for producing the conditions that support Indigenous self-determination, sovereignty, and futurity. However, finding demonstrate that municipalities typically fail to facilitate Indigenous authority over creation processes. Instead, municipalities tend to hire third parties to undertake engagement, interpret engagement results, and produce recommendations for the creation of these spaces. Hiring a third-party operates to overcome the risk of recolonization that is associated with a municipality undertaking these processes. Yet, in the hiring of a third-party, the capacity, knowledge, and authority of Indigenous communities is overlooked as municipalities fail to funnel resources directly to Indigenous communities who could undertake these processes themselves. By not giving Indigenous communities the resources to undertake the creation of their own spaces, planning is unsuccessful in producing a context for Indigenous self-determination and futurity to thrive.

The channeling of resources and funding from a municipality to Indigenous communities is also vital for the long-term operation and success of spaces for Indigenous-led initiatives. Yet, when municipalities provide Indigenous-led initiatives with inconsistent, piecemeal, or conditional funding the reproduction of assimilation tactics occurs as Indigenous-led initiatives are forced into vulnerable and dependent positions. Settler colonial logic is therefore exerted through these forms of funding, demonstrating that, the provision of funding is not enough to

produce meaningful reconciliation. Instead, municipalities need to produce contexts where Indigenous-led initiatives can rely on consistent annual funding while also not being subjected to conditional funding arrangements set by municipalities.

Teasing out the importance of Indigenous space within urban settings and analyzing how municipalities have functioned to support these spaces in their creation, governance, operation, and funding, provides an illumination of both the settler colonial logic embedded within planning, while also pointing towards pathways that provide supportive contexts for Indigenous sovereignty, self-determination, and futurity. Within this analysis is the production of an outline that can provide the Municipalities of the Region of Waterloo, and the Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo with the basis for how to produce meaningful reconciliation by giving O:se Kenhionhata:tie and other local Indigenous communities the space and resources needed for Indigenous-led initiatives to practice sovereignty, self-determination, and futurity, as they meet their own needs and desires. Thus, by engaging with planning through a critical lens, this thesis has added to the production of knowledge that both aids in the pursuits of Indigenous-led initiatives, while furthering understanding of planning's role within the context of meaningful reconciliation, specifically in urban settings.

References

Abele, F., LaPointe, R., Leech, D, J., & McCrossan, M. (2011). Aboriginal people and public policy in four Ontario Cities. *In Peters E.J. (Eds.), Urban Aboriginal Policy Making in Canadian Municipalities (pp. 87-126).* McGill-Queen's University Press.

Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada. (2012). *Aboriginal populations in Canadian cities: Why are they growing so fast?* Government of Canada. https://www.aadncaandc.gc.ca/eng/1352402108618/1352402154515

Absolon, K. E. (2011). *Kaandossiwin: How We Come to Know: Indigenous Re-search Methodologies.* Fernwood Publishing.

Agnew, P., & Campbell, J. 2021b, December 7. *Report to Council Report Number 22-006: Lease and Municipal Capital Facility Agreement – 610 Montreal Street, Kingston Indigenous Languages Nest*. City of Kingston.

Agnew, P., & Campbell, K. 2021a, September 7. *City of Kingston Report to Council: Report number 21-215*. City of Kingston.

Angelovski, I. (2020, October 19). *CKMS news – 2020-10-19 – Land back is here to stay* [Radio Broadcast]. CKMS-102.7 FM. https://radiowaterloo.ca/ckms-news-2020-10-19-land-back-is-here-to-stay/

Archibald, J. (2008). *Indigenous storywork: Educating the heart, mind, body, and spirit*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Arvin, M., Tuck, E., Morrill, A. (2013). Decolonizing feminism: Challenging connections between settler colonialism and heteropatriarchy. *Femin Format*, 25 (1), 8–34.

Asher, L., Curnow, J., & Davis, A. (2018). The limits of settlers' territorial acknowledgments. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 48(3), 316-334.

Asselin, H., & Basile, S.I. (2018). Concrete ways to decolonize research. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies,* 17(3), 643-650.

Austen, I. (2022, April 30). *A Winnipeg landmark rich in symbolism comes under Indigenous control*. The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2022/04/30/world/canada/hudsons-bay-winnipeg.html

Bangishimo. (2021a, March 1). *Land Back Camp: Our voices*. Briar Patch Magazine. https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/land-back-camp-our-voices

Bangishimo. (2021b, September 30). *KW needs an Indigenous community hub*. Change.org. https://www.change.org/p/region-of-waterloo-kw-needs-an-indigenous-community-hub

Bangishimo. [@bangishimo_]. (2021c, November 22). *My photo installation On The Land went back up a few days ago. I received an email this morning from* [Tweet]. Twitter. https://twitter.com/bangishimo_/status/1462795151580053509?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw

Bangishimo. [@bangishimo_]. (2022a, January 3). *@amysmoke1 and I sat in many meetings, in the heat and cold, with the cities and helped create these positions.* [Tweet]. Twitter. https://twitter.com/bangishimo_/status/1478141098568552449?s=20&t=0dSeU-pkCK492yE1zekvBg

Bangishimo. [@bangishimo_]. (2022b, January 11). S*ummer 2021, Land Back Camp was led to believe by the GRCA that they would be working together in partnership.* [Tweet; thumbnails]. Twitter. https://twitter.com/bangishimo_/status/1480998796662390789?s=20&t=0dSeU-pkCK492yE1zekvBg

Bangishimo., & Smoke, A. (2020a, October 19). *Oct 19 - community and infrastructure services.* City of Kitchener. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jCx8sMcG_ds

Bangishimo., & Smoke, A. (2020b, December 7). *City of Waterloo special council meeting December 7, 2020 @ 3:00 PM.* City of Waterloo. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LcNP2_Ei6nU&list=UUVP6QGtoGy5jmMkKhE3FRPA&index=8

Bangishimo., & Smoke, A. (2021, November 1). *2022 plan and budget public input meeting - November 1, 2021.* Region of Waterloo Council. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5fBvG3-rEGs

Bangishimo., & Smoke, A. (n.d.a). *Winter Solstice Feast* [Facebook Page]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/events/401816664767980/?acontext=%7B%22event_action_history%22%3A[%7B%22extra_data%22%3A%22%22%2C%22mechanism%22%3A%22left_rail%22%2C%22surface%22%3A%22bookmark%22%7D%2C%7B%22extra_data%22%3A%22%22%2C%22mechanism%22%3A%22left_rail%22%2C%22surface%22%3A%22bookmark%22%7D%2C%7B%22extra_data%22%3A%22%22%2C%22mechanism%22%3A%22calendar_past_events_unit%22%2C%22surface%22%3A%22bookmark_calendar%22%7D]%2C%22ref_notif_type%22%3Anull%7D

Barry, J. (2019). Being neighbourly: Urban reserves, treaty settlement lands, and the discursive construction of municipal–First Nation relations. *International Indigenous Policy Journal,* 10(5), 1-18.

Barry, J., & Agyeman, J. (2020). On belonging and becoming in the settler-colonial city: Co-produced futurities, placemaking, and urban planning in the United States. *Journal of Race, Ethnicity and the City,* 1(1-2), 22-41.

Barry, J., & Thompson-Fawcett, M. (2020). Decolonizing the boundaries between the 'planner' and the 'planned': Implications of Indigenous property development. *Planning Theory & Practice,* 21(3), 410-425.

Barry, J., Horst, M., Inch, A., Legacy, C., Rishi, S., Rivero, J. J., ... & Zitcer, A. (2018). Unsettling planning theory. *Planning Theory*, 17(3), 418-438.

Bartlett, C., Marshall, M., & Marshall, A. (2012). Two-Eyed Seeing and other lessons learned within a co-learning journey of bringing together indigenous and mainstream knowledges and ways of knowing. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences*, 2, 331-340.

Belanger, Y., & Dekruyf, K. A. (2017). Neither citizen nor nation: Urban Aboriginal (in)visibility and co-prodution in a small southern Alberta city. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, 37(1), 1-28.

Belanger, Y., & Walker, R. (2009). Interest convergence and co-production of plans: An examination of Winnipeg's 'Aboriginal pathways.' *Canadian Journal of Urban Research,* 18(1), 118-139.

Belanger, Y., Dekruyf, K. A., & Walker, R. (2018). CALGARY, CANADA: Policy co-production and indigenous development in urban settings. *In S. Darchen & G. Searle (Eds.) Global Planning Innovations for Urban Sustainability (pp. 12-25)*. Routledge.

Bengtsson, M. (2016). How to plan and perform a qualitative study using content analysis. *NursingPlus Open*, 2, 8-14.

Bhandar, B. (2018) *Colonial Lives of Property: Law, Land, and Racial Regimes of Ownership*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Blackburn, C. (2007). Producing legitimacy: Reconciliation and the negotiation of Aboriginal rights in Canada. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute,* 13, 621–638.

Blatman-Thomas, N., & Porter, L. (2019). Placing property: Theorizing the urban from settler colonial cities. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 43(1), 30-45.

Bonds, A., & Inwoods, J. (2016). Beyond white privilege: Geographies of white supremacy and settler colonialism. Prog*ress in Human Geography*, 40(6), 715-733.

Bowden, O. (2021, June 21). *First Indigenous Hub in Ontario set to offer crucial health services and provide a 'home.'* The Star. https://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2021/06/21/first-indigenous-hub-in-ontario-set-to-offer-crucial-health-services-and-provide-a-home.html

Bowie, R. (2021). Reconciliation and Indigenous resurgence in the Ontario Far North and Mushkegowuk Cree land use planning processes. *EPC: Politics and Space,* 39(4), 722-739.

Boynton, S. (2022, April 7). *Residents call fight over Jericho Lands redevelopment 'a battle for the soul of Vancouver.'* Global News. https://globalnews.ca/news/8744286/jericho-lands-development-fight/

Brennan, T. 2015. *Kingston First Peoples: Purposeful dialogues - Relationship building: Phase 1*. City of Kingston.

Bundale, B. (2022, April 22). *Hudson's Bay Company calls donation of Winnipeg building an act of reconciliatio*n. CTV News. https://winnipeg.ctvnews.ca/hudson-s-bay-company-calls-donation-of-winnipeg-building-an-act-of-reconciliation-1.5872367

CAFKA. [CAFKATV]. (2021, August 12). *CAFKA.21: Shawn Johnston (Bangishimo), Land Back Camp: Our voices* [Video file]. YouTube.

Canadian Institute of Planners. (2019). *Policy on planning practices and reconciliation.* CIP. https://www.cip-icu.ca/getattachment/Topics-in-Planning/Indigenous-Planning/policy-indigenous-en-interactive.pdf.aspx#:~:text=The%20nature%20of%20planning%20casts,which%20healthier%20relationships%20can%20grow.

Caldwell, C., & Olsen, E. (2020, February 10). *Lethbridge Indigenous Cultural Centre moves ahead to planning stages*. Global News. https://globalnews.ca/news/6532003/lethbridge-indigenous-cultural-centre/

Campbell, L., Chartrand, T., & Smoke, A. (2020, August 20). *Regional Council - August 20, 2020*. Region of Waterloo Council. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PkCUKvTa6m0

Campbell, L., Smoke, A., & Resmer, M. (2020, June 30). I*ndigenous activists reclaim history — and a tiny piece of Victoria Park*. Rubin, J. The Record. https://www.therecord.com/news/waterloo-region/2020/06/30/indigenous-activists-reclaim-history-and-a-tiny-piece-of-victoria-park.html

CBC. (2020, August 24). *Rental fees waived for Indigenous ceremonial, cultural events in Waterloo.* CBC News. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/kitchener-waterloo/indigenous-ceremonial-cultural-events-rental-fee-waterloo-kitchener-1.5697890?__vfz=medium%3Dsharebar&fbclid=IwAR3O5JlH7UP0FDzzF0Us0EvRbjRGeAEZlmSXcHwBVlpfzJpLNcFnf1ceU0A

City of Edmonton. (2015). *Update: Indigenous peoples strategy initiative*. City of Edmonton.

City of Edmonton. (2017). *Terms of reference: Indigenous peoples strategy*. City of Edmonton.

City of Edmonton. (2018a, January 29). *Kihciy Askiy sacred earth environmental impact assessment and site location study.* City of Edmonton.

City of Edmonton. (2018b, December 31). *Indigenous culture and wellness centre e-scan final report: The journey begins*. City of Edmonton.

City of Edmonton. (2019a, October 16). *Community and public services committee agenda.* [Video]. City of Edmonton. https://pub-edmonton.escribemeetings.com/Meeting.aspx?Id=fd12c81f-dd4e-4a3e-866d-484b88feec34&Agenda=Agenda&lang=English#.

City of Edmonton. (2019b, October 16). *Kihciy askiy partnership agreement*. Community and public services committee. City of Edmonton.

City of Edmonton. (2020a, December 2). *Community and public services committee - Agenda*. City of Edmonton.

City of Edmonton. (2020b, December 7*). City council - Agenda*. [Video]. City of Edmonton. https://pub-edmonton.escribemeetings.com/Meeting.aspx?Id=4e7083a0-20c8-4c76-b2af-cf8b25ab7a7d&Agenda=Agenda&lang=English&Item=53&Tab=attachments.

City of Edmonton. (2021a, March 3). *Community and public services committee*. City of Edmonton. https://pub-edmonton.escribemeetings.com/Meeting.aspx?Id=c2b14173-7b92-4481-a252-0c0f97b4959e&Agenda=Agenda&lang=English&Item=22&Tab=attachments.

City of Edmonton. (2021b, March 3). *Community and public services committee report*. City of Edmonton.

City of Edmonton. (2021d, March 3). *Indigenous and wellness centre report*. Community and public services committee. City of Edmonton.

City of Kingston. (2020). *Home*. Engage for Change. https://www.engageforchange.ca/

City of Kingston. (2021, December 7). *City council meeting number 01-2022*. City of Kingston.

City of Kingston. (2021a). *City of Kingston annual report 2021*. City of Kingston.

City of Kingston. (2021b, September 7). *City council meeting number 19-2021*. City of Kingston.

City of Lethbridge. (2017, June 19). *Capital improvement program 2018-2027*. City of Lethbridge.

City of Lethbridge. (2019, November 28). *Reconciliation Lethbridge advisory committee minutes*. City of Lethbridge.

City of Lethbridge. (2020a, May 15). *Reconciliation Lethbridge Advisory Committee Minutes*. City of Lethbridge.

City of Lethbridge. (2021, December 17). *Reconciliation Lethbridge Advisory Committee Minutes*. City of Lethbridge.

City of Lethbridge. (2021a, June 21). *2022-2031 Capital improvement program*. City of Lethbridge.

City of Lethbridge. (2021b, September 20). *2021 Reconciliation Annual Report*. City of Lethbridge.

City of Lethbridge. (2022, February 18). *Reconciliation Lethbridge Advisory Committee minutes.* City of Lethbridge.

City of Vancouver. (n.d.). *Jericho Lands planning program*. City of Vancouver. https://shapeyourcity.ca/jericho-lands

City of Yellowknife, & Arctic Indigenous Wellness Foundation (AIWF). (2018, June 28). *Memorandum of understanding*. City of Yellowknife.

City of Yellowknife. (2017a, February 13). *Municipal services committee report: Monday, February 13, 2017 at 12:05 pm*. City of Yellowknife.

City of Yellowknife. (2017b, February 27). *Adopted council minutes: Monday, February 27, 2017 at 7:00pm*. City of Yellowknife.

City of Yellowknife. (2018a, April 23). *Municipal services committee report: Monday, April 23, 2018 at 12:05 pm*. City of Yellowknife.

City of Yellowknife. (2018b, April 30). *Adopted special council minutes: Monday, April 30, 2018 at 12:00 pm*. City of Yellowknife.

City of Yellowknife. (2018c, July 18). *Memorandum to committee*. City of Yellowknife.

City of Yellowknife. (2018d, November 26). *Governance and priorities committee report: Monday, November 26, 2018 at 12:05 pm*. City of Yellowknife.

City of Yellowknife. (2018e, November 27). *Special governance and priorities committee report: November 27, 29, December 3, 4, & 5, 2018 at 5:30 pm*. City of Yellowknife.

City of Yellowknife. (2018f, December 10). *Council agenda: Monday, December 10, 2018 at 7:00 pm*. City of Yellowknife.

City of Yellowknife. (2019a). *2019-2022 goals and objective*s. City of Yellowknife.

City of Yellowknife. (2019b, February 25). *Indigenous relations - An update: Presentation to the Governance and Priorities Committee.* City of Yellowknife.

City of Yellowknife. (2019c, September 19). *Governance and priorities committee agenda: Monday, September 23, 2019 at 12:05 pm*. City of Yellowknife.

City of Yellowknife. (2019d, September 23). *Adopted council minutes: Monday, September 23, 2019 at 7:00 pm.* City of Yellowknife.

City of Yellowknife. (2019e, September 23). *Governance and Priorities committee report: Monday, September 23, 2019 at 12:05 pm.* City of Yellowknife.

City of Yellowknife. (2019f, June). *Reconciliation: Starting the conversation.* City of Yellowknife.

City of Yellowknife. (2019g, October 15). *Council agenda: Tuesday, October 15, 2019 at 7:00 pm.* City of Yellowknife.

City of Yellowknife. (2020a, January 20). *Governance and priorities committee agenda.* City of Yellowknife.

City of Yellowknife. (2020b, October 19). *Governance and priorities committee agenda: Monday, October 19, 2020 at 12:05pm.* City of Yellowknife.

City of Yellowknife. (2021a, February 9). *Community advisory board on homelessness: February 9, 2021 at 9:00 am.* City of Yellowknife.

City of Yellowknife. (2021b, June). *Reconciliation framework draft.* City of Yellowknife.

City of Yellowknife. (2021c, July 26). *Governance and priorities committee report: Monday, July 26, 2021 at 12:05 pm.* City of Yellowknife.

Coalition of Muslim Women – KW. (2022, March 21). *More than 100 people attended the Spotlight on Anti-Racism Work in Our Region session held on Monday, March 21, part* [Status Update]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/CoalitionOfMuslimWomen.KW/photos/a.5187765781285207/5187703674624751

Coombes, B., Johnson, J. T., & Howitt, R. (2014). Indigenous geographies III: Methodological innovation and the unsettling of participatory research. *Progress in Human Geography*, 38(6), 845-854.

Cope, M. (2010). Coding qualitative data. In I. Hay (Ed.), Qualitative research methods in human geography (pp. 281 - 294). Don Mills: Oxford University Press.

Corntassel, J. (2008). Toward sustainable self-determination: Rethinking the contemporary Indigenous-rights discourse. Alternatives, 33(1), 105-132.

Corntassel, J. (2012). Re-envisioning resurgence: Indigenous pathways to decolonization and sustainable self-determination. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1).

Coulthard, G.S. (2007). Subjects of empire: Indigenous peoples and the 'politics of recognition' in Canada. *Contemporary Political Theory, 6*, 437–460.

Coulthard, G.S. (2013). *For our nations to live, capitalism must die.* Unsettling America, Decolonization in Theory and Practice. https://unsettlingamerica.wo rdpress.com/2013/11/05/for-our-nations-to-live-capitalism-must-die/.

Coulthard, G.S. (2014). *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition.* University of Minnesota Press.

CTV News Kitchener. (2021, December). *Land Back Camp hosts winter solstice event.* CTV News. https://kitchener.ctvnews.ca/video?clipId=2345514&binId=1.1147261&playlistPageNum=1

Davis, F. K. (2020, December 9). Kitchener Public Library - 85 Queen: What is Land Back? [Video]. *YouTube.* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Lhtj_xpTmFw

Davoudi, S. (2015). Planning as practice of knowing. *Planning Theory, 14*(3), 316-331.

Dillon Consulting Limited. 2018, November 19. City of Yellowknife: Trail enhancement and connectivity strategy. Dillon Consulting Limited.

Doan, P. (2020a, July 14). *Indigenous Land Back Camp lists demands in a petition.* City News. https://kitchener.citynews.ca/local-news/indigenous-land-back-camp-lists-demands-in-a-petition-2561263

Doan, P. (2020b, August 21). *Region facing criticism over reconciliation efforts.* City News. https://kitchener.citynews.ca/local-news/region-facing-criticism-over-reconciliation-efforts-2655905

Doan, P. (2020c, October 15). Kitchener councilors hit with piles of emails supporting Land Back camp. City News. https://kitchener.citynews.ca/local-news/kitchener-councillors-hit-with-piles-of-emails-supporting-land-back-camp-2793450

Dorozio, J. (2022, March 12). Historic Alberta building – a potential home for Indigenous hub – could be sold instead. CBC News. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/historic-bowman-building-lethbridge-1.6382186

Dorries, H. (2017). Planning as property: Uncovering the hidden racial logic of a municipal nuisance by-law. *Journal of Law and Social Policy, 27*, 72-93.

Dorries, H. (2019). "Welcome to Winnipeg": Making settler colonial urban space in "Canada's most racist city." In J. Tomiak, T. McCreary, D. Hugill, B. Henry, & H. Dorries, (Eds.), *Settler city limits: Indigenous resurgence and colonial violence in the urban prairie west (pp. 25-43).* University of Manitoba Press.

Dorries, H. (2022). What is planning without property? Relational practices of being and belonging. *Society and Space*, 40(2), 306-318.

Dorries, H. & Ruddick, S. (2018). Between Concept and Context: Reading Gilles Deleuze and Leanne Simpson in their In/commensurabilities. *Cultural Geographies*, 25(4), 619-635.

Dorries, H., & Harjo L. (2020). Beyond safety: Refusing colonial violence through Indigenous feminist planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 40(2), 210-219.

Dorries, H., Hugill, D. and J. Tomiak. (2019). Racial Capitalism and the Production of Settler Colonial Cities. *Geoforum*.

Downe-Wamboldt, B. (1992). Content analysis: method, applications, and issues. *Health care for Women International*, 13(3), 313-321.

Eduardo, B.S. (2001). *White supremacy and racism in the post-civil rights era*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.

EndPovertyEdmonton. (2021c, March 3). *Proposal for business case portion of strategy phase within ICWC development*. City of Edmonton.

EndPovertyEdmonton. (2016, May). *End poverty in a generation: A roadmaps to guide our journey*. City of Edmonton.

Fawcett, B, R., Walker, R., & Greene, J. (2015). Indigenizing city planning processes in Saskatoon, Canada. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 24(2), 158-175.

Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the 'Postsocialist' Condition*. New York: Routledge.

Fraser, N. (2016). Expropriation and exploitation in racialized capitalism: A reply to Michael Dawson. *Critical Historical Studies*, 3(1), 163–78.

Fraser, N., & Honneth, A. (2003). Introduction: Redistribution or recognition?. *In Fraser, N., Honneth, A., & Golb, J. (Eds.) Redistribution or recognition?: a political-philosophical exchange.* Verso.

Gaztambide-Fernandez, R. (2012). Decolonization and the pedagogy of solidarity. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 41–67.

Ghonaim, H. (2021, November 2). *Activists urge regional council to invest in local Indigenous community hub.* CBC News. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/kitchener-waterloo/waterloo-region-indigenous-community-hub-1.6233912?fbclid=IwAR3AKuirRGqX3-3ZASeUd3T5PiQiC0PC1TP_Xy6N5Nuvxe1lfQ5DDgB-sWw

Gouldhawke, M. (2020, September 10). 100 years of land struggle. *In The Land Back Issue*. Briarpatch. https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/100-years-of-land-struggle

Gray, R. R. (2022). Rematriation: Ts' msyen law, rights of relationality, and protocols of return. *Native American and Indigenous Studies*, 9(1), 1-27.

GRCA. (n.d.a). *O:se Kenhionhata:tie Land Back Camp*. Grand River Conservation Authority. https://www.grandriver.ca/en/outdoor-recreation/o-se-kenhionhata-tie-land-back-camp.aspx

GRCA. (n.d.b.). *Who we are*. Grand River Conservation Authority. https://www.grandriver.ca/en/who-we-are/Who-We-Are.aspx

Groleau, C. (2021, November 17). *Advocates hope Indigenous community hub will be part of public engagement on Charles Street Terminal*. CBC News. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/kitchener-waterloo/charles-street-terminal-indigenous-hub-bangishimo-johnston-1.6250658?fbclid=IwAR3n-vWX69OjmdDKu4HlzD9-ekiHMLNYpT2DxspNVqBobu4GB5dk3k4OTKk

Hammell, M. (2020, February 11). *Engage for change: Phase II what we heard report.* First Peoples Group

Harjo, L. (2019). *Spiral to the Stars: Mvskoke Tools of Futurity*. University of Arizona Press.

Harris, C. I. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard law review*, 106, 1707-1791.

Hart, M.A., Straka, S., & Rowe, G. (2017). Working across contexts: Practical considerations of doing Indigenist/anti-colonial research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 23(5), 332-342.

Hazelwood, J. (2020, January 9). *How cities in Waterloo region are responding to TRC Calls to Action*. CBC. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/kitchener-waterloo/trc-calls-to-action-waterloo-region-1.5419871

Heritz, J. (2018). Municipal-Indigenous relations in Saskatchewan: Getting started in Regina, Saskatoon and Prince Albert. *Canadian Public Administration*, 61(4), 616-640.

Hibbard, M., Lane, M. B., & Rasmussen, K. (2008). The split personality of planning indigenous peoples and planning for land and resource management. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 23(2), 136–151.

Holston, J. (2008) *Insurgent Citizenship*. Princeton University Press.

Hugill, D. (2017) What is a settler-colonial city? Geography Compass 11.5, 1–11.

Huigenbos, P., & Wiginton, C. (2020, March 3). *City of Kingston report to council: Report number 20-060.* City of Kingston.

Hunt, S., & Holmes, C. (2015). Everyday decolonization: Living a decolonizing queer politics. *Journal of lesbian studies*, 19(2), 154-172.

Huq, E. (2020). Seeing the insurgent in transformative planning practices. *Planning Theory*, 19(4), 371-391.

Hurdle, L. (2022, March 22). *City of Kingston information report to council: Report number 22-106.* City of Kingston.

Hurdle, L., & Wiginton, C. (2018, April 3). *City of Kingston report to council: Report number 18-091*. City of Kingston.

IKWC (Indigenous Knowledge and Wisdom Centre). (n.d.). *About us: Our story*. IKWC. https://www.ikwc.org/about/history/

IKWC, & City of Edmonton. (2019, December 17). *Letter of intent made between Indigenous Knowledge and Wisdom Centre Ltd. & City of Edmonton*. City of Edmonton.

Jackson, B. (2021, September 29). *'Land back means land back': Indigenous camp in search of a safer space in Waterloo Region*. Waterloo Chronicle. https://www.waterloochronicle.ca/news-story/10486751--land-back-means-land-back-indigenous-camp-in-search-of-a-safer-space-in-waterloo-region/?fbclid=IwAR3dY_eYe__onLvR41NNkaXA3g-hOAw0QPwDTwVZDN4Y6nXVBYYfr1HiFEc

Jojola, T. (2013). Indigenous planning: Towards a seven generations model. *In R. Walker, T. Jojola, and D. Natcher (Eds.) Reclaiming Indigenous Planning (pp. 457–72).* McGill- Queen's University Press.

King, T.L. (2019) *The Black Shoals: Offshore Formations of Black and Native Studies*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Kooner, J. (2020, December 20). *Land Back Camp will be retiring for Winter, as days get colder and COVID-19 cases rise.* City News. https://kitchener.citynews.ca/local-news/land-back-camp-will-be-retiring-for-winter-as-days-get-colder-and-covid-19-cases-rise-3200171

Lambert, S. (2022, April 22). *Former Hudson's Bay store in Winnipeg to be given to Indigenous group*. Financial Post. https://financialpost.com/news/retail-marketing/former-hudsons-bay-store-in-winnipeg-to-be-given-to-indigenous-group

Lane, M. B. (2006). The role of planning in achieving indigenous land justice and community goals. *Land use policy*, 23(4), 385-394.

Leroy, J. (2016). Black history in occupied territory: On the entanglements of slavery and settler colonialism. *Theory & Event*, *19*(4).

Lowe, L. (2015). *The Intimacies of Four Continents*. Duke University Press

Lowman, E., & Barker, A. (2015). *Settler: Identity and colonialism in 21st century Canada*. Black Point: Fernwood.

MacLean, C. (2022, April 24). *Transformation of historic downtown Winnipeg Bay building will be long road, experts say.* CBC News. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/winnipeg-bay-building-sco-redevelopment-1.6428275

Manasc Isaac. (2017a). *Kihciy Askiy sacred earth formal edc submission: Submission for development permit*. City of Edmonton.

Manasc Isaac. (2017b, November). *Site location for Kihciy Askiy (Sacred Earth) in Whitemud Park: Final report*. City of Edmonton.

Manasc Isaac. (2020, February 3). *Lethbridge Indigenous cultural centre: Feasibility study*. City of Lethbridge.

Manuel G., & Posluns, M. (1974). *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality*. Collier Macmillan Canada.

McClintock, N., (2018). Urban agriculture, racial capitalism, and resistance in the settler-colonial city. *Geography Compass*, e12373.

McElroy, J. (2021, October, 18). Jericho Lands proposal includes new homes for up to 18,000 people in Vancouver's West Side. CBC News. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/jericho-lands-vancouver-proposal-mst-canada-lands-1.6215923

McGoldrick, D. (2020, August 24). *Indigenous reconciliation action plan – The journey forward* [Staff Report]. City of Kitchener. https://www.kitchener.ca/en/resourcesGeneral/INS- 20-008-Indigenous-Reconciliation-Action-Plan---Final-002.pdf

McGill University. (2022) *Community-led research goverance: Envisioning the future through dialogue part 1*. Youtube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yTIUnRNDdE4&list=PLfMfJihLOASUGugqzcO8754Zb5u15fhLG&index=4

McGregor, D. (2018a). Indigenous research: Future directions. *In McGregor, D., Restolue, J., & Johnston, R. (Eds) Indigenous research: Theories, practices, and relationships (pp. 296-310)*. Canadian Scholars.

McGregor, D. (2018b). Reconciliation and environmental justice. *Journal of Global Ethic,* 14(2), 222-231.

McLeod, F., Viswanathan, L., Whitelaw, G.S., Macbeth, J., King, C., McCarthy, D.D., & Alexiuk, E. (2015). Finding common ground: A critical review of land use and resource management policies in Ontario, Canada and their intersection with First Nations. *The International Indigenous Policy Journal*, 6(1), 1-23.

Meiszner, P. (2021, October 18). *Jericho Lands: Two concepts released to public*. Urban YVR. https://www.urbanyvr.com/jericho-lands-planning-process-begins/

Melamed, J. (2015). Racial capitalism. *Critical Ethnic Studies*, 1 (1), 76–85.

Miljure, B. (2022, April 13). *Resident group calls for more consultation on First Nations plans for Jericho site.* CTV News. https://bc.ctvnews.ca/resident-group-calls-for-more-consultation-on-first-nations-plans-for-jericho-site-1.5858187

Mills, C.W. (2017). *Black rights/white wrongs: The critique of racial liberalism*. Oxford University Press.

Ministry of Attorney General and Responsible. (2021, November 22). *Indigenous residents move into new affordable housing in Vancouver.* Government of British Columbia. https://news.gov.bc.ca/releases/2021AG0175-002225

Miraftab, F. (2009). Insurgent planning: Situating radical planning in the global south. *Planning theory,* 8(1), 32-50.

Miraftab, F. (2017). Insurgent practices and decolonization of future (s). *In The Routledge handbook of planning theory (pp. 276-288).* Routledge.

Mohammed, M., Walker, R., Loring, P.A., & Macdougall, B. (2017). Perpetuation or remediation of structural violence toward Aboriginal peoples through city planning and policy processes – A choice to be made. *In F. Klodawsky, J. Siltanen, & C. Andrew (Eds.), Toward equity and inclusion in Canadian cities: Lessons from critical praxis-oriented research (pp. 281–305).* McGill-Queen's University Press.

Monture, P. (2010). *Land rights: A global solution for the Six Nations of the Grand River*. Six Nations Lands and Resource Department. http://www.sixnations.ca/SNGlobalSolutionsBookletFinal.pdf

Moore, J., Walker, R., & Skelton, I. (2011). Challenging the new Canadian myth: Colonialism, post-colonialism and urban aboriginal policy in Thompson and Brandon, Manitoba. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, 31(1), 17-42.

Morritt-Jacobs, C. (2022). '*It's a beautiful thing': Indigenous healing camp gets lifeline extension in N.W.T.* APTN. https://www.aptnnews.ca/national-news/its-a-beautiful-thing-indigenous-healing-camp-gets-lifeline-extension-in-n-w-t/.

Nejad, S., Walker, R., & Newhouse, D. (2020). Indigenous placemaking and the built environment: Toward transformative urban design. *Journal of Urban Design*, 25(4), 433-442.

Nejad, S., Walker, R., Macdougall, B., Yale, B., & Newhouse, D. (2019). "This is an Indigenous city; why don't we see it?" Indigenous urbanism and spatial production in Winnipeg. *The Canadian Geographer*, 63(3), 413-424.

O:se Kenhionhata:tie [@ose.kenhionhatatie] (2021a, August 21). *Miigwetch, Nia'wen Kinanaskomitin, Yaw'ko, Thank you to @itsalyssapelletier for sharing the fun of makeup with camp in a safe space* [Photograph]. Instagram. https://www.instagram.com/p/CS2xN4bgOgw/

O:se Kenhionhata:tie [@ose.kenhionhatatie] (2021b, August 19). *Miigwetch, Nia'wen, Kinanaskomitin, Yaw'ko, Thank you to @selamdebs for sharing her times with us and taking the time to help* [Photograph]. Instagram. https://www.instagram.com/p/CSxcnwnAVR6/

O:se Kenhionhata:tie [@ose.kenhionhatatie] (2021c, June 23). *Update Tanisi/Hello We would like to start off with thanking everyone for the amazing support of the zine. Kinanaskomitin/We are* [Photograph]. Instagram. https://www.instagram.com/p/CQeB6CFAaxj/

O:se Kenhionhata:tie [@ose.kenhionhatatie] (2021d, July 7). *Just another day dealing with racism at Land Back Camp. #osekenhionhatatie #landbackcamp #racism* [Photograph]. Instagram. https://www.instagram.com/p/CRCYO10AJ17/

O:se Kenhionhata:tie [@ose.kenhionhatatie] (2021f, July 17). *Beautiful photo by @nationsandvoices of an amazing evening. #landbackcamp* [Photograph]. Instagram. https://www.instagram.com/p/CRbjQdAADMg/

O:se Kenhionhata:tie. (2020a). *Support the Indigenous community KW*. Change.org. https://www.change.org/p/city-of-kitchener-support-the-indigenous-community-kw?utm_source=citynews%20kitchener&utm_campaign=citynews%20kitchener%3A%20outbound&utm_medium=referral

O:se Kenhionhata:tie. (2020b, December 20). *Dec 20th, 2020 press release from Land Back Camp* [Images attached] [Status Update]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/osekenhionhatatie/posts/231227675315747

O:se Kenhionhata:tie. (2021e, August 7). *Today is Day 1 of our pottery workshop. Nia:weh Miigwetch to the UWaterloo Faculty of Arts, CAFKA and Shawna Redskye* [Images attached] [Status Update]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/osekenhionhatatie/posts/385192249919288

O:se Kenhionhata:tie. (2021g, November 5). *Beautiful evening for singing and laughing around the sacred fire* [Images attached]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/osekenhionhatatie/posts/448026213635891

O:se Kenhionhata:tie. (2021h, November 4). *Land Back Camp has been donating food all summer to the Community Fridge KW. We believe in community supporting community* [Image attached]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/osekenhionhatatie/posts/447013223737190

O:se Kenhionhata:tie. (2021i, October 20). *Next week, we will be moving out of Laurel Creek Conservation Area. This has been a beautiful space along the* [Images attached]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/osekenhionhatatie/posts/436809868090859

O:se Kenhionhata:tie. (2021j, August 28). This weekend is traditional stick & poke with our campers. Nia:weh Miigwetch to Riley for spending the weekend with us [Image attached]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/osekenhionhatatie/posts/399722638466249

O:se Kenhionhata:tie. (2021k, August 24). *This past weekend was Part 2 of our pottery workshop. Nia:weh Miigwetch to Shawna Redskye, Logan McDonald, UW Faculty of* [Images attached]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/osekenhionhatatie/posts/396882272083619

O:se Kenhionhata:tie. (2021l, August 22). This morning was Part 1 of Wilderness/Survival 101 with Hannah. #OnTheLand [Images attached]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/osekenhionhatatie/posts/395662758872237

O:se Kenhionhata:tie. (2021m, August 11). *Thank you to Suzanne Charles Watson for sharing space with us today. They are the City of Kitchener's Director of* [Images attached]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/osekenhionhatatie/posts/388203062951540

O:se Kenhionhata:tie. (2021n, June 19). *Canoeing with André! The youth are paired with adults and they are going over safety first. And of course, they* [Images attached]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/osekenhionhatatie/posts/349881200117060

O:se Kenhionhata:tie. (2021o, February 15). O:se Kenhionhata:tie Respect Our Sacred Space. https://www.landbackcamp.com/zine

O:se Kenhionhata:tie. (2022a, January 11). *In the summer of 2021, O:se Kenhionhata:tie was led to believe by the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) that they* [Images attached] [Status Update]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/osekenhionhatatie/posts/492511492520696

O:se Kenhionhata:tie. (2022b, March 24). Please join us next week on Twitter Spaces as we partner with GroundUp WR to host an in depth conversation about Climate Reparations. Put the kettle on, you don't want to miss this chat! [Images attached]. [Status Update]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/osekenhionhatatie/posts/540163064422205

O:se Kenhionhata:tie. (n.d). *Two Spirit Social & Community Gathering* [Facebook Page]. https://www.facebook.com/events/404453154168716/?acontext=%7B%22event_action_history%22%3A[%7B%22extra_data%22%3A%22%22%2C%22mechanism%22%3A%22left_rail%22%2C%22surface%22%3A%22bookmark%22%7D%2C%7B%22extra_data%22%3A%22%22%2C%22mechanism%22%3A%22left_rail%22%2C%22surface%22%3A%22bookmark%22%7D%2C%7B%22extra_data%22%3A%22%22%2C%22mechanism%22%3A%22calendar_past_events_unit%22%2C%22surface%22%3A%22bookmark_calendar%22%7D]%2C%22ref_notif_type%22%3Anull%7D

O:se Kenhionhata:tie. [@ose.kenhionhatatie] (2020c, August 28). *Amazing crew of youth with artist Pamela Rojas in front of the tipi designed and painted by the youth, with* [Photograph]. Instagram. https://www.instagram.com/p/CEcOsHrg3YR/

O:se Kenhionhata:tie. 2022c. History. https://www.landbackcamp.com/history

O:se Kenionhata:tie. 2022d, April 26. Reconciliation is not a goal you achieve as a "Director of", especially in colonial government structures.. it's a process of. [Status Update]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/osekenhionhatatie/posts/pfbid02V4AqXEcZhhVCSKqjoVRJA1aarht XASzUWDGy9kL6LX864UsXbzGc24X6cQU6vykfl

O:se Kenionhata:tie. 2022e. *Projects: Workshops*. https://www.landbackcamp.com/project/workshops

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2014). *Racial formation in the United States*. Routledge.

Ontario Professional Planners Institute. (2019, June). *Indigenous perspectives in planning: Report of the Indigenous planning perspective task force*. OPPI. https://ontarioplanners.ca/OPPIAssets/Documents/OPPI/Indigenous-Planning-Perspectives-Task-Force-Report-FINAL.pdf

Pagliacolo, E. (2020, July 8). *The Indigenous Hub promises a brighter future*. Azure. https://www.azuremagazine.com/article/the-indigenous-hub-in-toronto-promises-a-brighter-future/

Palmater P., & Yesno R. (2022, March 28). *Transcript: Land Back: Indigenous perspectives.* Paikin, S. TVO. https://www.tvo.org/transcript/2692617

Panel on Research Ethics. (2018). TCPS 2 (2018) – Chapter 9: Research Involving the First Nations, Inuit and Métis Peoples of Canada. *Government of Canada*. https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/tcps2-eptc2_2018_chapter9-chapitre9.html

Panel on Research Ethics. (n.d.). Module 9: Research involving First Nations, Inuit & Métis peoples of Canada. *Government of Canada*. https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/research-recherche_module9.html

Pasternak, S., Metallic, N.W., Scobie, M., Pitawanankwat, B.O., Harper, M.J., & Thundersky, K. (2021, May). Cash back: A Yellowhead Institute red paper. *Yellowhead Institute*.

Peltier, C. (2018). An Application of two-eyed seeing: Indigenous research methods with participatory action research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 17, 1-12.

Peters, E. (1998). Subversive spaces: First Nations women and the city. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 16(6), 665-685.

Peters, E. (2012). *Urban aboriginal policy making in Canadian municipalities*. McGill-Queen's University Press.

Pickel, J. (2021, June 21). *'Reclaiming our land': Indigenous leaders join KW Land Back Camp in calls for permanent space*. City News Kitchener. https://kitchener.ctvnews.ca/reclaiming-our-land-indigenous-leaders-join-kw-land-back-camp-in-calls-for-permanent-space-1.5479991?fbclid=IwAR0M8gkDgnyOQ-eqG9awQh1PhFD7p6cxDWhJDPP6EUIvKo-gDCfp41Fs3SU

Porter, L. (2010). *Unlearning the colonial cultures of planning*. Routledge.

Porter, L. (2011). Informality, the commons and the paradoxes for planning: Concepts and debates for informality and planning. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 12(1): 115–120.

Porter, L. (2021). Planning solidarity? From silence to refusal. Porter, L., Roy, A., & Legacy, C. (eds). *Planning Theory & Practice*, 22(1), 111-138.

Porter, L., & Barry, J. (2015). Bounded recognition: Urban planning and the textual mediation of Indigenous rights in Canada and Australia. *Critical Policy Studies*, 9(1), 22-40.

Porter, L., & Barry, J. (2016). *Planning for coexistence? Recognizing Indigenous rights through land-use planning in Canada and Australia*. Routledge.

Porter, L., & Yiftachel, O. (2019). Urbanizing settler-colonial studies: Introduction to the special issue. *Settler Colonial Studies*, 9(2), 177-186.

Porter, L., Hurst, J., & Grandinetti, T. (2020). The politics of greening unceded lands in the settler city. *Australian Geographer*, 51(2), 221-238.

Porter, L., Matunga, H., Viswanathan, L., Patrick, L., Walker, R., Sandercock, L., Moraes, D., Frantz, J., Thompson-Fawcett, M., Riddle, C., & Jojola, T. (2017). Indigenous planning: From principles to practice/a revolutionary pedagogy of/for indigenous planning/settler-indigenous relationships as liminal spaces in planning education and practice/indigenist planning/what is the work of non-indigenous people in the service of a decolonizing agenda?/supporting indigenous planning in the city/film as a catalyst for Indigenous community development/being ourselves and seeing ourselves in the city: Enabling the conceptual space for indigenous urban planning/universities can empower the next generation of architects, planners, and landscape architects in Indigenous design and planning. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 18(4), 639-666.

Postovit, M. (2021, September 13*). A new Indigenous language space will be coming to Kingston soon*. Global News. https://globalnews.ca/news/8187287/new-indigenous-languages-space-kingston/

Prusak, S. Y., Walker, R., & Innes, R. (2016). Toward Indigenous planning? First Nation community planning in Saskatchewan, Canada. *Journal of planning education and research*, 36 (4), 440-450.

Rankin, K. N. (2010). Reflexivity and post-colonial critique: Toward an ethics of accountability in planning praxis. *Planning Theory*, *9*(3), 181-199.

Rifkind, M. (2013). Settler common sense. *Settler Colonial Studies*, 3(3-4), 322-340.

RiVAL 2020. *Library rematriation project*. RiVAl. http://www.joaap.org/issue11/newsletters/RIVAL.pdf

Robinson, C.J. (1983). *Black Marxism: The making of the Black radical tradition*. University of North Carolina Press.

Roy, A. (2006). Praxis in the time of empire. *Planning Theory*, 5(1): 7–29.

Roy, A. (2017). Dis/possessive collectivism: Property and personhood at city's end. *Geoforum*, 80, A1-A11.

Sandercock, L. (2004). Interface: Planning and Indigenous communities. *Planning Theory & Practice,* 5(1), 95–97.

Schulz, L. (2020, October 19). *Kitchener to establish Equity, Anti-Racism and Indigenous Initiatives team*. City News. https://kitchener.citynews.ca/local-news/kitchener-to-establish-equity-anti-racism-and-indigenous-initiatives-team-2805513

Schulz, L. (2021a, November 23). *Photographer remains unshaken by continued vandalism of 'On the Land' art exhibition*. CityNews. https://kitchener.citynews.ca/local-news/photographer-remains-unshaken-by-continued-vandalism-of-on-the-land-art-exhibition-4790019

Schulz, L. (2021b, November 28). *Residents protest clearing of housing encampment in Kitchener (update)*. CityNews. https://kitchener.citynews.ca/local-news/residents-protest-clearing-of-housing-encampment-in-kitchener-4806526?fbclid=IwAR1-G7cy5FA96GpbnaPySRAPkc82UzXPz7Or99A7IxtuOaooxFdJfWy4Mt4

Sharma, A., & Gupta, A. (2006). Introduction: Rethinking theories in the state in the age of globalization*. In Sharma, A., & Gupta, A. (Eds.) The Anthropology of the State: A reader*. Malden: Blackwell

Shetty, A. (2020a, August 20). *Area municipalities, GRCA developing Indigenous Reconciliation Action Plan (update)*. City News. https://kitchener.citynews.ca/local-news/area-municipalities-grca-developing-indigenous-reconciliation-action-plan-2652101

Shetty, A. (2020b, October 21). *Land Back Camp moves, calls on Waterloo to do more anti-racism work*. City News. https://kitchener.citynews.ca/local-news/land-back-camp-moves-calls-on-waterloo-to-do-more-anti-racism-work-2811789

Shetty, A. (2021, July 31). *Land Back Camp organizes event for LGBTQ, racialized community members.* CityNews. https://kitchener.citynews.ca/local-news/land-back-camp-organizes-event-for-lgbtq-racialized-community-members-4183885

Simpson, A. (2014). *Mohawk Interruptus. Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Simpson, L.B. (2008). Our elder brothers: The lifeblood of resurgence. *In L. Simpson (Ed.), Lighting the eighth fire: The liberation, resurgence, and protection of Indigenous nations, (pp. 73-87).* Arbeiter Ring Publishing

Simpson, L.B. (2011). *Dancing on Our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-creation, Resurgence and a New Emergence*. Arbeiter Ring Press.

Simpson, L.B. (2017). *As We Have Always Done*. University of Minnesota Press.

Smith, L. T., (2004). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Smoke, A. (2020b, November 11). *Land Back Camp moves from Victoria Park to Waterloo Park, calls on the City of Waterloo to take action*. Sabatino, A. D. The Cord. https://thecord.ca/land-back-camp-moves-from-victoria-park-to-waterloo-park-calls-on-the-city-of-waterloo-to-take-action/

Smoke, A. (2020b, October 20). *Stories from the Land Back Camp – Midtown Radio*. Midtown Radio. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vg0Reo6dcXk

Smoke, A. (2021, April 13). *Women's History in the Making: O:se Kenhionhata:tie Land Back Camp 2020* [Public Talk]. Ken Seiling Waterloo Region Museum.

Smoke, A. (Producer & Director), Bangishimo. (Producer & Director), & O'Neil, E (Director). (2021). *Stories from Land Back Camp: Reclaiming Indigiqueer Space.* (Available from

Smoke, A., & Bangishimo. (2021, April 23). *Earth Day is everyday for the First Peoples: A statement from Indigenous land defenders from O:se Kenhionhata:tie, also known as Land Back Camp*. Inside Waterloo. https://insidewaterloo.ca/earth-day-is-everyday-for-the-first-peoples/

Smoke, A., & Bangishimo. (2022, March 26). *Cultivating community: Reclaiming culture, space, & land*. UW Raise. Talk presented at UW Raise XChanges 2022: Cultivating Community.

Snelgrove, C., Dhamoon, R. K., & Corntassel, J. (2014). Unsettling settler colonialism: The discourse and politics of settlers, and solidarity with Indigenous nations. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, education & society*, 3(2), 1-32.

Spencer Environmental Management Services. (2017, October). *Kihciy Askiy (sacred earth) in Whitemud Park: environmental impact assessment final repor*t. Manasc Isaac Architects Ltd.

Stein, P. (2019, June 18*). National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls Final Report and Calls for Justice – Briefing Memo*. City of Lethbridge.

Stein, P. (2021a, February 10). *Briefing memo to Reconciliation Lethbridge Advisory Committee.* City of Lethbridge.

Stein, P. (2021b, June 10). *Briefing memo to Reconciliation Lethbridge Advisory Committee Agenda.* City of Lethbridge.

Stein, P. (2022, January). *Briefing memo to Reconciliation Lethbridge Advisory Committee*. City of Lethbridge.

Stranger, D. (2022, April 22). *Historic Hudson's Bay building in downtown Winnipeg transferred to Southern Chiefs' Organization*. APTN News. https://www.aptnnews.ca/national-news/historic-hudsons-bay-building-in-downtown-winnipeg-transferred-to-southern-chiefs-organization/

Sylliboy, J. R., Latimer, M., Marshall, A., & Macleod, E. (2021) Communities take the lead: exploring Indigenous health research practices through Two-Eyed Seeing & kinship, *International Journal of Circumpolar Health*, 80(1929755), 1-11.

Textile KW. (2021). O:se Kenhionhata:tie: Charles Street Terminal - Indigenous Community Hub. https://textilekw.ca/petitions/october-campaign?fbclid=IwAR3OQgh16h1BcrVaRvU0uFCnCcWhcEBpp1GanCu0GxNzzs-i6y3LZXkyiis

The National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls. (2017). *Our Women and Girls Are Sacred. Interim Report*. The National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls.

Thompson-Fawcett, M., & Riddle, C. (2017). Being ourselves and seeing ourselves in the city: Enabling the conceptual space for Indigenous urban planning. *Planning theory and practice*, 18(4), 659-664.

Thompson, C. (2020, October 19). *Kitchener councilors approve anti-racism plan*. Waterloo Region Record. https://www.newhamburgindependent.ca/news-story/10226569-kitchener-councillors-approve-anti-racism-plan/?fbclid=IwAR3Oipq7mV4bqLTiTLuK4wk42leoN67oKFKKnnzGdnK4jppZ2cecXdpsmYg#.X44qLS3eNR0.facebook

Tkaronto CIRCLE Lab. (n.d.). *Case studies in returning land*. Tkaronto CIRCLE Lab. https://www.tkarontocirclelab.com/case-studies-in-returning-land

Todd, Z., 2016. An Indigenous feminist's take on the ontological turn: 'Ontology' is just another word for colonialism. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 29(1), pp. 4-22.

Tomiak, J. (2016). Unsettling Ottawa: Settler colonialism, Indigenous resistance, and the politics of scale. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 25(1), 8-21.

Tomiak, J. (2017). Contesting the settler city: Indigenous self-determination, new urban reserves, and the neoliberalization of colonialism. *Antipode*, 49(4), 928-945.

Trapenberg Frick, K., Myers, D., Inch, A., Dorries, H., Manning-Thomas, J., Lung Amam, W., Sandoval, G. & A. Foss. (2018). Planning Interface: Strengthening Planning's   Effectiveness in a Hyper-Polarized World/Responding to the Conservative Common Sense of Opposition to Planning and Development in England/The Limits to Negotiation and the Promise of Refusal/Planning Contexts in a Hyper-Polarized World/A Right to Sanctuary: Supporting Immigrant Communities in an Era of Extreme Precarity/Planning and Climate Change: Opportunities and Challenges in a Politically Contested Environment/Speaking with the Middle 40% to Bridge the Political Divide for Mutual Gains in Planning Agreements. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 19 (4), 581-615.

(TRC) Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015a). *Honoring the truth, reconciling for the future: Summary of the final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. Winnipeg: Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. https://ehprnh2mwo3.exactdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Executive_Summary_English_Web.pdf

(TRC) Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015b). *Truth and Reconciliation Commision of Canada: Calls to actio*n. Winnipeg: Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. https://ehprnh2mwo3.exactdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Calls_to_Action_English2.pdf

Tuck, E. (2009a). Re-visioning action: Participatory action research and Indigenous theories of change. *The Urban Review*, *41*(1), 47-65.

Tuck, E. (2009b). Suspending damage: A letter to communities. *Harvard educational review*, 79(3), 409-428.

Tuck, E., & Gaztambide-Fernandez, R. A. (2013). Curriculum, replacement, and settler futurity. J*ournal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 29(1), 72.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society,* 1(1), 1-40.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2014a). R-words: Refusing research. *In D. Paris & M. T. Winn (Eds.), Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry with youth and communities (pp. 223–247).* SAGE.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2014b). Unbecoming claims: Pedagogies of refusal in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *20*(6), 811-818.

Tye, T. (2022, April 6). *New Kingston Indigenous language nest location to open in May*. Kingstonist. https://www.kingstonist.com/news/new-kingston-indigenous-languages-nest-location-to-open-in-may/

United Nations. (2007). United Nations Declaration on Indigenous peoples. *UN*. https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/2018/11/UNDRIP_E_web.pdf

Veracini, L. (2010). *Settler colonialism*. Houndmills.

Veracini, L., (2011). Introducing settler colonial studies. *Settler Colonial Studies*, 1 (1), 1–12.

Villella, S. (2021, November 24). *Rally in solidarity with Wet'suwet'en chiefs held in Uptown Waterloo*. CTV News Kitchener. https://kitchener.ctvnews.ca/rally-in-solidarity-with-wet-suwet-en-chiefs-held-in-uptown-waterloo-1.5679675?fbclid=IwAR02VYD-L3NGa60sJRDj1_4e--fL9YPcXT9uxSsE1fezal6tqbs8-fu4Cb4

Von Der Porten, S. (2012). Canadian Indigenous governance literature. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 8(1), 1-14.

Walker, R. (2017). Supporting Indigenous planning in the city. *Planning theory and practice*, 18(4), 653-656.

Walker, R., & Belanger, Y. (2013). Theorizing Indigenous planning. In Walker, R., Natcher, D., & Jojola, T. (Eds.). *Reclaiming Indigenous planning.* McGill-Queen's Press.

Watson, V. (2009). Seeing from the South: Refocusing urban planning on the globe's central urban issues. *Urban Studies*, 46(11), 2259-2275.

Watson, V. (2013). Planning and the 'stubborn realities' of global south-east cities: Some emerging ideas. *Planning Theory*, 12(1), 81-100.

Weber-Pillwax, C. (2001). What is Indigenous research?. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 25(2), 166-174.

Weins, C. (2021, July 31). *'It's a first for our community': Land Back Camp hosts Two Spirit Social at Laurel Creek Conservation Area.* CTV News Kitchener. https://kitchener.ctvnews.ca/it-s-a-first-for-our-community-land-back-camp-hosts-two-spirit-social-at-laurel-creek-conservation-area-1.5530768?fbclid=IwAR22_j-HxUmvOcSW4Q3GcMTNKN3GNf27F2iiVOh0UL-Y4vXjrkvFqPm-Ewo

Wensig, E., & Porter, L. (2016). Unsettling planning's paradigms: Towards a just accommodation of Indigenous rights and interests in Australian urban planning? *Australian Planner*, 53(2), 91-102.

Williams, R. A. (2020). From racial to reparative planning: Confronting the white side of planning. *Journal of Planning Education and* Research, 0739456X20946416.

Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Black Point: Fernwood.

Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native. *Journal of Genocide Research* 8 (4): 387–409.

Wolfe, P., (1999). *Settler colonialism and the transformation of anthropology: The politics and poetics of an ethnographic event*. Cassel London.

Wong, C. (2021, July 8). *Land Back Camp at Laurel Creek Conservation Area vandalized*. CTV News Kitchener. https://kitchener.ctvnews.ca/land-back-camp-at-laurel-creek-conservation-area-vandalized-1.5502286?fbclid=IwAR0wTeRQs_nAG8_--czGsm46ON-KDeHUtG2OnOVnPFdK1DUmUO5g5uOLKxE

Yesno, R. (2022a, April 27). *What does Indigenous Ownership of Hudson's Bay Winnipeg mean for reconciliation?*. Galloway, M. CBC The Current. https://www.cbc.ca/player/play/2027476035938

Yesno, R. (2022b, May 9). *Episode 14 – Land Back with Riley Yesno*. Second Transition Podcast. https://www.spreaker.com/user/voicedradio/episode-14-landback