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ABSTRACT

EXAMINING THE REINTRODUCTION OF INDIGENOUS CULTIVATION AND MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN STATE-LED PARKS AND PROTECTED AREAS IN BC

Samantha McGee
University of Guelph, 2017

Advisor: Dr. Jennifer Silver

This research examines the institutional and budgetary structures of Parks Canada and BC Parks and explores how they shape the planning, implementation, and outcomes of projects that reintroduce Indigenous cultivation and management practices within the boundaries of state-led parks and protected areas in British Columbia. Data includes key informant interviews, participant observation notes, and relevant legislation, policy, and public documents. Results show that reintroduction initiatives can challenge fortress conservation ideology, practice, and governance structures through an opposition to a human-nature dichotomy and the inclusion of a broader approach to incorporating the opinions and values of non-state and Indigenous actors. However, state control over access and use of natural resources continues to be reinforced by current policies and legislation that focuses on a narrow definition of ecological integrity. Structural changes at the highest level should be considered to institutionalize and adequately resource these practices as a formal mandate of state-led conservation.
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Chapter 1 Introduction and Literature review

Conservation is a human endeavour motivated by the objective of preserving culturally and ecologically valuable species, landscapes, and seascapes. The earliest Western understandings of and approaches to conservation were grounded in the notion that humans and nature are, and ought to be, understood as separate (Adams, 2003; Brockington, 2004; Büscher & Whande, 2007; Dearden, Rollins, and Needham., 2016; Katz, 1998; Loo, 2006; Shultis & Heffner, 2016; West, Igoe, & Brockington, 2006; Willems–Braun, 1997). Species, landscapes, and seascapes were thus valued as either resources for extraction and accumulation, or as things of aesthetic beauty; one way that the latter value was idealized and perpetuated was through the delineation of protected areas (Adams, 2003; West et al., 2006). However, the human-nature dichotomy and many acts undertaken in the name of conservation, ignore the lives, knowledge systems, cultural values, and practices of Indigenous peoples (Adams, 2003; Brockington, 2004; Dearden et al., 2016; Pellatt & Gedalof, 2014; Katz, 1998; West et al., 2006; Willems–Braun, 1997)

The first protected areas designated as National Parks were established in the late 1800s. Yosemite (1864) and Yellowstone (1872) National Parks in the United States, and Banff National Park in Canada (1885) are key examples (Adams, 2003; Langdon, Prosper, & Gagnon, 2010; Loo, 2006). These state-led parks, and many subsequent others, were created in order to preserve nature as a pristine wilderness, devoid of humans. Strict park boundaries were created and enforced, distinguishing these spaces from surrounding areas (Dearden et al., 2016; Katz 1998, West et al., 2006). Indigenous peoples who lived in and used those areas were viewed as detrimental to conservation and, in many cases, were forcibly removed from parks and/or told that they could no longer undertake harvest and management practices in them (Katz 1998,
Brockington, 2004; West et al., 2006). This history is a central reason why scholars argue that conservation ideology and protected area mandates can work to (re)confirm colonial control and power over both nature and Indigenous lives and knowledge systems (Katz, 1998; Sandlos, 2015; Willems–Braun, 1997).

Much more recently, a shift has been underway within mainstream conservation thinking, agencies and organizations such that greater interest in, and support for, the recognition and improved inclusion of Indigenous people in conservation exists (Brockington, 2004; Büscher & Whande, 2007; Hulme & Murphree, 1999). This ‘new protected area paradigm’ arrived in the early nineties, ushered in at least partially by reformed policies within the International Union for Conservation of Nature, also known as the IUCN. The IUCN now recommends the recognition of social, economic, and cultural rights of Indigenous peoples to their lands, territories, and natural resources. This includes respecting Indigenous knowledge and supporting its protection, as well as promoting Indigenous peoples’ participation in conservation activities through new protected area categories (IUCN Standard on Indigenous Peoples, 2016). The categories outlined by the IUCN are important because they have become the standard against which protected area management progress is measured. State-led conservation areas within Canada, such as those managed by Parks Canada and BC Parks, are categorized by the IUCN based on institutional structures and levels of protection. This does not necessarily determine how state agencies will manage these protected areas, but the IUCN’s recognition and promotion of Indigenous rights makes it more likely that countries, including Canada, will be persuaded to recognize and incorporate its guidelines.

The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP), adopted in September 2007, also set a strong international standard for the recognition and protection of
Indigenous peoples’ rights. Many of the articles outlined by UNDRIP relate to the rights of Indigenous people to be involved in the management and protection of conservation areas within Indigenous traditional territories and to have the right to maintain, protect, control, and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledges, and practices (UNDRIP, 2008). Some notable articles focus on the rights of Indigenous peoples to the continued access, use, and development of the lands, territories, and waters that they have traditionally owned, occupied, or acquired, and indicates that the state shall assist in ensuring this takes place (UNDRIP, 2008).

Declarations such as UNDRIP and conservation frameworks advocated by the IUCN create international momentum and high-level structural support for the inclusion of Indigenous people within existing conservation systems and helps to (re)define what conservation spaces can be. Based on the understanding of these international frameworks, and Constitutional and legal requirements regarding Indigenous Rights and Title, Federal and Provincial agencies in Canada are actively working to fund and create new programs and opportunities for Indigenous peoples within state-led conservation. For example, the Canadian Federal Government recently provided financial support for a nation-wide Indigenous guardian program that aims to support Indigenous land stewardship and relationship building between nations and the Crown. There is also building rhetoric around the notion of ‘reconciliation’ and some specific nation-wide initiatives that seek to acknowledge and address past injustices imposed in the name of conservation. However, it remains unclear whether new budgetary allotments and reconciliation objectives are sufficiently supported in a legislative and policy (i.e., structural) sense at the Provincial and Federal levels (Egan, 2012; Rynard, 2000; Tucker & Rose-Redwood, 2015).

1.1 Fortress Conservation and Colonialism
Fortress models of conservation, also often referred to as ‘fences and fines’ or ‘command and control’ are conservation areas that often contain three key features; strict governance authority, limiting conservation practices, and dichotomous ideologies (Adams, 2003; Brockington, 2004; Büscher & Whande, 2007; Hulme & Murphree, 1999). An indicator of strict governance authority is a park that has strong management by the state with strong top-down rules about natural resource use and development within the boundaries of a protected area. Likewise, fortress conservation has a focus on the creation and preservation of strict park boundaries with little to no involvement from non-state actors as well as limited local or Indigenous community involvement in the park use, management, and decision-making or any other type of conservation practice (Adams, 2003; Brockington, 2004; Büscher & Whande, 2007; Stevens, 2015c; West et al., 2006). This is an example of limiting conservation practices that indicate the persistence of fortress conservation. Moreover, limiting conservation practices can also be considered a physical outcome of the last indicator of fortress conservation, a human-nature dichotomy from which fortress conservation ideology is built. This dichotomy has been informed by settler colonial thinking regarding the capability of certain groups of people, and appropriateness of certain knowledge systems, in preserving nature (Neumann, 2004; Stevens, 2015a).

Colonialism is relevant to consider in the context of state-led conservation in Canada because Canada’s earliest history began with European settlement and legal and political structures that continue to impact Indigenous peoples’ lives. Even before Canadian Confederation, and long after its establishment, pieces of legislation have been passed with the intent, both direct and indirect, of assimilating Canadian Indigenous people (Gunn, 2006). Parks Canada, as an agent of the Canadian Federal Government, has been criticized in this regard and
especially in terms of Indigenous dispossession (Sandlos, 2008, 2015; Shultis & Heffner, 2016). One of the primary ways Parks Canada has perpetuated colonial relations is through the promotion of a dichotomous human-nature relationship and the insistence on a ‘pristine’ nature as the gold standard of conservation. This not only excludes Indigenous use and management and erases their history in shaping these ecologies, but also is in direct contrast to the more relational understandings of humans and nature common to Indigenous worldviews (Sandlos, 2008; Shultis & Heffner, 2016). This dichotomy is a key feature of fortress conservation ideologies and is indicative of Canada’s long history of fortress models of conservation.

However, over the last 20-30 years, Parks Canada and Provincial conservation agencies have sought to acknowledge and better include Indigenous perspectives in protected area planning and management in order to remain both environmentally and socially relevant (Guénette & Alder, 2007; Langdon et al., 2010; Rutherford, Haider, & Stronghill, 2015; Stevens, 2015c; Thomlinson & Crouch, 2012; Timko & Satterfield, 2008; Turner & Bitonti, 2011). Collaborative arrangements between Indigenous communities and a park, the conceptualizing of Indigenous communities as stakeholders or partners in conservation, and the inclusion of Indigenous knowledge (IK) and traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) within park management have thus become more common (Ayers, Dearden, & Rollins, 2012; Berkes, 2000; Langdon et al., 2010; Stevens, 2015c; Thomlinson & Crouch, 2012; Timko & Satterfield, 2008; Watson, 2013).

Parks Canada’s and BC Parks push to remain relevant is additionally motivated by emerging types of protected areas, such as tribal parks, private parks, and non-governmental operated protected areas, that are seen as more collaborative and equitable in the inclusion of Indigenous and local communities (Murray & King, 2012; Rutherford et al., 2015; Stevens, 2015c; Thomlinson & Crouch, 2012; Timko & Satterfield, 2008; Watson, 2013).
2015b; Turner & Bitonti, 2011). However, more participatory institutional arrangements and efforts to collect and incorporate IK and/or TEK in conservation research, planning, and decision-making by state institutions that are meant to combat fortress conservation have been criticized because it is often the case that Western knowledge remains the priority and that the legitimacy of the state to determine conservation objectives and evaluate ‘successes’ goes unquestioned (Adams, 2003; Coombes, 2007; King, 2004; Lemos & Agrawal, 2006; Meek, Lauren Lovecraft, Varjopuro, Dowsley, & Dale, 2011; Singleton, 2009; Stephenson, Berkes, Turner, & Dick, 2014; Watson, 2013). The preference for state authority and science has made it difficult for many conservation areas to move beyond fortress conservation in a holistic way.

Within this context, conservation institutions, Parks Canada and BC Parks, are experimenting with initiatives that reintroduce Indigenous cultivation, harvest, and management practices within park management (Augustine & Dearden, 2014; Woodley, 2010). These ‘reintroduction initiatives’, as I define them in this thesis, have a focus on bringing people back onto landscapes and seascapes that are both culturally and environmentally significant with the objective of managing and restoring ecological integrity. These projects include the active management and use of natural resources within park areas and the restoration of culturally and ecologically important species and ecosystems (Augustine & Dearden, 2014; Rutherford et al., 2015; Woodley, 2010). This definition is appropriate and relevant to BC because of the unceded and untreatied nature of much of the province, and because it opens opportunities to consider the ways in which state-led conservation may be evolving in response to unresolved Indigenous Rights and Title in BC and beyond.

Reintroduction initiatives can include, but are not limited to: camas bulb cultivation and harvesting, fish weir restoration and/or use, clam garden restoration and management, prescribed
burning, and restoration of culturally important species and ecosystems such as salmon stream restoration (Parks Canada Agency 2013; Parks Canada Agency, 2010a; Parks Canada Agency, 2010c, Parks Canada Agency, 2016). Examining the extent to which reintroduction initiatives may (or may not) shift beyond fortress conservation is important because they may increase Indigenous community involvement in park use, management, and decision-making and can include more flexible rules about natural resource use and development. Increased community involvement actively on the ground works as one way to oppose traditional human-nature dichotomies present within fortress conservation. Furthermore, reintroduction initiatives are sometimes suggested as different compared to the mere inclusion of IK and TEK because they operationalize Indigenous knowledge and techniques within conservation practice. However, questions remain about how the overarching legislative and budgetary frameworks of these agencies work to enable and constrain such initiatives, influence their history and day to day practices, and in turn, shape the impacts that they may have. With these questions in mind, this project is determined to understand the number of projects and how they are being implemented across the province by staff and managers of state-led conversation institutions and the ability that these projects have to combat fortress conservation through the rejection of a human-nature dichotomy.

The aim of this thesis is to explore the ways that reintroduction initiatives may move beyond fortress conservation by examining the institutional structures and budgetary frameworks of Parks Canada and BC Parks and exploring how they shape the planning, implementation, and outcomes of specific initiatives in British Columbia. The following objectives have been completed and will be reported on later in this thesis:
1. Establish a focused list of Parks Canada and BC Parks projects that reintegrate and/or reconstruct Indigenous harvest sites (e.g., clam gardens) and management practices (e.g., controlled burning) within state-led parks and protected areas in BC.

2. Document key institutional and budgetary structures that shape cultural reintroduction and restoration projects and evaluate key opportunities and challenges that they present.

3. Examine the lessons learned by park staff and make recommendations for the future potential of projects within state-led parks and protected areas more broadly.

This choice to focus specifically on BC was motivated by the presence of a number of reintroduction initiatives in the Province and by the fact that little is known about internal agency processes and institutional frameworks that support and shape initiatives and how they are navigated ‘on the ground’ by parks staff and managers. Four specific initiatives within the following Federal areas feature centrally: Gulf Islands National Park Reserve; Pacific Rim National Park Reserve; Gwaii Haanas National Park Reserve, and Fort Rodd Hill National Historic Site. Political ecology, as explored next, informed the analytical lens that I employed to understand and evaluate these projects. Furthermore, Gulf Islands National Park Reserve and its specific reintroduction initiative will be used as a case study of focus within the analysis of this thesis. At the provincial level, parks within the Skeena and Vancouver Island regions were the focus.

It is important to acknowledge that the inclusion of Indigenous perspectives is outside of the scope of this project and that this research does not speak for Indigenous partners and participants who are involved in reintroduction projects and/or the strategies that they may or may not employ to address or push back against fortress conservation. Rather, the research seeks to explore how state-led conservation institutions recognize and work to reconcile criticisms
leveled against fortress conservation, as well as document the perspectives and experiences of staff within these institutions. Understanding internal budget and policy structures in particular, and exploring how they shape reintroduction initiatives, is critical to ensuring that the same sorts of constraints, outlooks and outcomes predominate under fortress conservation do not simply get reproduced once again.

1.2 Literature Review

1.2.1 Political Ecology of Conservation

Political ecology is a field of critical research that focuses on human-environment linkages and understandings of the relationships between economics, politics, and nature (Bennett & Roth, 2015; Bryant, 1998; Robbins, 2006, 2012). Political ecologists are particularly attentive to power relations, control, and barriers that prevent local people’s access and rights to land and natural resources. This is in direct contrast to ‘apolitical ecology’ that often takes a deductive approach to research in its understanding of nature and conservation and does not focus on human-environment relations within nature and conservation spaces (Robbins, 2012).

Political ecology is an appropriate lens for conservation social science research as it focuses on how human-environment interactions are shaped by power (Bennett & Roth, 2015). Blaikie (1985, pg39) outlines the importance of political ecology in conservation research by stating, “…conservation policy is about land use, access, and control, and therefore a political-economic analysis is required to explain why policies fail. Conservation policies are highly political and the question of who pays, who benefits, and who loses is an essential one in evaluating their success or failure”. Not only is the question of who wins and who loses important within understanding conservation policies through a political ecology lens, but also how winners and losers are impacted, which I would argue is critical for examining the
reintroduction of Indigenous cultivation and management practices within state-led parks and protected areas.

In many ways, literature in political ecology has focused its gaze on the Global South, including marginalization, politicized access to natural resources, and the ways in which conservation politics impact rural communities and the people who live there (Bennett & Roth, 2015; Bryant & Wilson, 1998; McCarthy, 2002; Robbins, 2006, 2012; Stone, 2004). This is often done through analysing small-scale cases to help understand actor-institution-nature interactions on the ground, and relating these back to legislative and policy structures (Robbins, 2012). However, this focus on the Global South has been critiqued by scholars who suggest that similar research can and should be undertaken in the Global North as well (McCarthy 2002, Robbins 2006, 2012; Schroeder, St. Martin, & Albert, 2006). Over the last 20 years, political ecology scholarship has begun to include research within the Global North. My research builds on this foundation to further examine structural and political issues that are internal to state-led conservation and the agencies responsible for it.

A political ecology lens is appropriate for research that aims to understand the persistence and effects of traditional fortress conservation models and ideologies within state-led conservation in Canada even as ‘new’ approaches, rhetoric, and initiatives emerge. Specifically, it encourages simultaneous attention to how institutional structures and practices shape and constrain initiatives and how they help to explain the ways that initiatives ‘roll out’ in specific places and engage Indigenous communities on the ground (Pinkerton & Silver, 2011; Sandlos, 2001, 2008; Willems–Braun, 1997). This cross-scalar approach is common within political ecology research requiring scholars to examine local decision-making within a larger context. In the case of my project, this means examining how legislative and budgetary frameworks within
Parks Canada and BC Parks shape initiatives and how these institutional structures help to explain the emergence and implementation of initiatives by staff and managers.

**1.2.2 Institutional Analysis in Political Ecology**

Within political ecology literature there are a sub-set of scholars that study institutions and how they are managed through rules, norms, and systematic control. These political ecologists study many different types of institutions and institutional structures. However, in the case of this research, the focus is on the legislative, policy, and budgetary structures of state conservation agencies specifically (e.g., BC Parks and Parks Canada). State institutions are in place in order to create policies that balance multiple interests and, in theory, make decisions that can provide the greatest benefit for the largest number of people. As a result, state conservation agencies both materially and discursively (re)shape human-environment relationships, including access use, and control over natural resources, landscapes, and seascapes (Berkes, 2007; Corson et al., 2014; Neumann, 2004; Robbins, 1998; Wilshusen, Brechin, Fortwangler, & West, 2002).

Investigating state conservation agencies alongside local cases helps identify underlying power imbalances that may exist as a result of these institutional structures, both between different local actors as well as between local communities and institutions (Bryant, 1998; Nadasdy, 2003; Robbins, 2006). This matters when discussing the equitability of legislative and policy structures and the moral implications of inequitable institutional structures (Brockington, 2004; Neumann, 2004; West et al., 2006). Practically, this type of examination can be helpful for making recommendations for policy-makers in order to improve and re-shape existing legislative and policy structures to benefit local people and institutions.
Analyzing how conservation policy materially and discursively shapes the values placed on conservation spaces can be helpful in determining the equitability of these institutional structures. These structures affect the ways in which people interact with park spaces and the meanings and experiences people associate with parks (Büscher & Whande, 2007; Corson et al., 2014; Locke & Dearden, 2005; West et al., 2006). Furthermore, scholars argue that international frameworks and agendas have recently worked to define and re-define what protected areas are by incorporating a wider range of values into these frameworks (Büscher & Whande, 2007; Corson et al., 2014; Locke & Dearden, 2005; Stevens, 2015a; Wilshusen et al., 2002). For example, in hopes of increasing the total amount of protected areas globally, the Convention on Biological Diversity is broadening what is considered a ‘protected area’ through collaboration with the IUCN’s categorizations already mentioned (Corson et al., 2014). This enables protected areas to do more than just conserve biodiversity within a traditional context and can help provide broader ecological and social benefits, even if that was not the initial intention (Büscher & Whande, 2007; Corson et al., 2014).

State-led conservation policies shape opportunities and openings for Indigenous people to assert Rights and Title within conservation areas. Even when working collaboratively between Indigenous people and the state, processes in place often only appear to increase Indigenous self-determination (Mollett, 2015; Nursey-Bray & Jacobson, 2014; Sarkar & Montoya, 2011; Timko & Satterfield, 2008; Willow, 2016). Nadasdy (2003) argues that instead of working to improve power, decision-making, and the ability of Indigenous people to claim rights, collaborative arrangements often work to slowly replace Indigenous ways of knowing and acting with those that support the control of the state (Conz, 2015; Nursey-Bray & Rist, 2009; Singleton, 2009; Willow, 2016). For example, Thornton (2015) compared subsistence use of
natural resources in older versus newer parks in Alaska and found that although repatriation to restore Indigenous management roles in parks was occurring, the progress was slow and did not work to combat fortress conservation ideologies. Instead, work being done entrenched the responsibility of the state as deciding where Indigenous subsistence use could and could not occur, limiting Indigenous self-determination (Thornton, 2015). These findings open up questions about the daily interactions and practices of park staff and managers and whether these interactions align with institutional structures in place that reinforce state management or if disconnects exist at the local level between policy and practice.

Looking at how state-led conservation agencies and their overarching structures are enabling or constraining the reintroduction of Indigenous cultivation and management practices is important for examining the ways in which these agencies are including Indigenous people within conservation and evaluating the equitability of projects and relationships. Furthermore, examining the relationship between legislative and policy structures and reintroduction projects helps determine whether these initiatives work towards a recognition of the colonial practices that have taken place to exclude Indigenous people from state-led conservation areas. Therefore, this research addresses whether park management structures and imbalances within park management are reinforced hierarchically or if barriers to access are broken down as a result of the introduction of these projects (Bridge & Perreault, 2006; Bryant, 1998; Corson et al., 2014; Meek et al., 2011; Neumann, 2004; Singleton, 2009; Stevens, 2015a; Wilshusen, Brechin, Fortwangler, & West, 2002). This is crucial for determining whether-or-not state-led conservation agencies are separating themselves from fortress models of conservation.

1.2.3 Literature Review Summary
Through this literature review I have outlined the need to examine how state-led conservation agencies are reintroducing and reconstructing Indigenous cultivation and management practices within BC, Canada. Political ecology is well placed as a lens to examine these reintroductions because it politicises conservation policy and practices to determine who benefits and who loses from existing institutional structures (Bennett & Roth, 2015; Blaikie, 1985). Furthermore, I have demonstrated that a political ecology lens helps to elucidate how different groups of people may be asymmetrically affected by conservation policy by including a structure-local analysis and argued that this type of information can be beneficial to policy-makers and conservationists. Linking local and structural analyses is crucial for understanding dominant narratives within conservation, the ways in which conservation spaces are (re)constructed, and whether conservation policy works to support or reject human-nature dichotomies in conservation.

Finally, outlining the ways that institutional structures and policies have impacted conservation projects and practices in the past is demonstrates the utility of my approach to researching reintroduction of Indigenous cultivation and management practices within BC. By identifying past trends in structure-practice relations within conversation I can better understand the processes at play within new collaborative models of conservation and evaluate their equitability and their ability to move past fortress conservation models. It creates a strong framework in understanding how Indigenous people have been disproportionately affected by conservation policy in the past and understand how current attempts to move beyond centralized control of conservation by the state are constrained and enabled in different ways by legislative and policy structures in place (Conz, 2015; Sandlos, 2001, 2015; T. F. Thornton, 2015; Timko & Satterfield, 2008).
1.3 Thesis Outline

The overarching argument of this thesis is that Federal and Provincial legislative, policy, and budgetary structures constrain the potential of the reintroduction of Indigenous cultivation and management initiatives in some important ways. While positive place-based relationships are being built and opportunities opened through the initiatives in my study, my findings suggest that there is a risk that their full potential may not be reached and/or that they may not be fully sustained over time. Moreover, wider implementation across both Provincial and Federal Agencies may not flourish because of the neocolonial legislative and budgetary structures that I identify.

There are four chapters to follow. Chapter 2 outlines the methodological approach of this research including an overview of the study design, a detailed description of the study area and specific case study analyzed in this research, and the data collection and data analysis techniques used throughout the research process.

Chapter 3 is the first of two results chapters. I will first detail current institutional, legislative, and budgetary structures from Parks Canada and BC Parks that shape how the reintroduction and restoration of Indigenous cultivation and management practices are included within protected areas. This includes my discussion of the Federal and Provincial Park(s) Acts, their priority documents, guidelines, budgetary structures, and management documents in terms of the inclusion of Indigenous cultivation and management practices, as well as describing the importance of the delineation of new park designations of Park Reserve and Conservancy within Parks Canada and BC Parks. Chapter 4, the second results chapter, focuses on the completion of objective 3, examining the motivations, challenges and lessons learned by parks staff and managers in initiating the reintroduction and restoration of Indigenous cultivation and
management practices. This chapter will also discuss in detail the results of the case study of the clam garden reconstruction project at Gulf Islands National Park Reserve (GINPR).

Finally, chapter 5 includes my discussion and conclusion to this thesis. I will first discuss how the legislative and budgetary structures in place at Parks Canada and BC Parks are continuing to shape practices on the ground through a reinforcement of fortress conservation and colonial ideologies, limiting the capacity of parks staff and managers to effectively and efficiently reintroduce Indigenous cultivation and management practices. I will conclude the thesis by going over my project’s limitations, future research opportunities, and identifying some recommendations of the ways that reintroduction initiatives can be improved by building these practices into the overall management of park areas and questioning the social and ecological relevance of state-led conservation and its limitations.

1.4 Overview of Contributions

This thesis contributes practically by outlining where within BC reintroduction initiatives are currently occurring, and identifying the barriers to their further implementation by state-led conservation agencies. Examining how legislative, policy, and budgetary structures are enabling and constraining the reintroduction of Indigenous cultivation and management practices outlines to policy makers and conservation practitioners the benefits of these projects, and the ways in which policy could change to further include Indigenous management practices in conservation and integrate these initiatives within the management of park spaces, rather than including them as temporary projects. This information is timely for Canadian conservation institutions because of court decisions and the publishing of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) report on the treatment of Canadian Indigenous people by the Canadian Government (TRC, 2015).
Furthermore, state-led conservation institutions in Canada have expressed the need to remain both environmentally and socially relevant within the management of park areas to ensure a sustainable future of the state park system within Canada. As such outlining the ways that human dimensions of conservation can be further integrated within state-led conservation is beneficial for increasing the relevance of these institutions.

My research contributes to scholarship that examines the role of the state within conservation and explores how to move beyond fortress conservation ideologies, practices and governance authority models in more collaborative ways. Furthermore, reintroduction initiatives challenge what conservation can be and how it can work within existing institutional structures. There is the potential, therefore, to challenge fortress conservation ideology, practice, and governance structures through an opposition to a human-nature dichotomy and the inclusion of a broader approach to incorporating the opinions and values of non-state and Indigenous actors.

However, state control over access and use of natural resources within conservation areas continues to be reinforced by current policies and legislation that focuses on a narrow definition of ecological integrity and protection of biological diversity. This contributes to political ecology scholarship by understanding how institutional structure affects local practices, and how access, use, and control over natural resources continues to be influenced by power dynamics between the state and local communities. The possibility of reintroduction initiatives to reject fortress conservation indicators in spite of current constraints within institutional structures contributes to the understanding of how new approaches to conservation are emerging within state-led conservation and supports existing scholarship within political ecology.
Chapter 2 Methods

British Columbia is an appropriate place to study conservation more broadly, and Indigenous cultivation and management practices within state-led parks and protected areas specifically, because it is a place that has been idealized as a ‘pristine wilderness’ (Braun, 2002; Clapp, 2004; Cronon, 1996; Loo, 2006). Moreover, the majority of the province is unceded by Indigenous people who were forcibly removed from conservation sites and resettled on reservations, restricting their movement and the use of their cultural practices within their traditional territories (Clapp, 2004; Loo, 2006; Harris, 2008; West et al., 2006). As such, and in line with their constitutional rights, many Indigenous communities advocate for increased involvement in the management and decision-making of their traditional territories. This may help to explain why in recent years there has been an increase in innovative ways to involve Indigenous peoples in conservation in BC (Augustine & Dearden, 2014; Murray & King, 2012; Rutherford et al., 2015; Turner & Bitonti, 2011).

Many protected areas in BC fall under the jurisdiction of either the Provincial or Federal Government. At the Federal level, state-led parks are operated by the Parks Canada agency. At the Provincial level, parks are managed under the Ministry of Environment through the BC Parks agency. Each agency categorizes parks and protected areas differently and in accordance with specific policies and legislative frameworks. For instance, the Canada National Parks Act, BC Parks Act, Environment and Land Use Act, Heritage Conservation Act, and the Protected Areas of British Columbia Act all lay out distinct mandates, responsibilities and procedures associated with conservation governance that parks follow. Both agencies separate parks and protected areas into different designations based on agency motivations for protection and management of the area (See table 1). This influences the protected area’s organization and future policies.
Between the two agencies, BC contains 1,050 different parks and protected areas covering 14,850,260 hectares (See Table 1 and Figure 1). This accounts for over fifteen percent of the province’s total land area. This is a significant amount of land, and considering the unceded status of much of the land in the province, this can pose challenges in relationships between local Indigenous people and state conservation agencies. However, relationship building is necessary in order to address the problematic history of state-led conservation in the province and the increasing demand for conservation spaces to include Indigenous partners in the management and decision-making of state-led park spaces.

Table 1. National and Provincial breakdowns of types of designations, number of protected areas, and total area in hectares for each.\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BC Parks</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class A Provincial Parks</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>10,510,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B Provincial Parks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class C Provincial Parks</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Reserves</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>160,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Land Act designations</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>383,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservancies</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2,998,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Areas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>14,063,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of relevance (ratio of Conservancies)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2,998,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of total land areas in BC to Conservancy land in BC</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks Canada</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A National Parks</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25,717,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B National Park Reserves</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6,975,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Marine protected areas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,285,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) (BC Parks, 2016; Parks Canada, 2016)
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D National Historic Sites</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>N/A²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,502.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Total</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>33,982,402.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size of my research</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>351,700 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Land Area of BC</td>
<td></td>
<td>94,473,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parks Canada managed areas in BC</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>787,000 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Reserves to total parks</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20% of Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size to total Parks in BC</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>44.7% of Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of total land areas in BC to Reserve land in BC</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. National and Provincial parks and protected areas of British Columbia.

² I have listed the total area of National Historic Sites of Canada to be unavailable because some sites are within the boundaries of other Parks Canada designated areas and most are very small, even single buildings, making it difficult to find concrete measurements of their total area. In order to make sure misrepresentation of conservation areas does not occur I chose to exclude a total value from the table.
The remainder of this chapter will cover five topics. First, I will describe the research approach chosen for this research to address my research aim and objectives. Second, I will discuss the methodological design used for this research. Within this section I will also describe the study area chosen for the case study analysis, GINPR, including an overview of the clam garden restoration project itself. Third I will explain the data collection techniques used for this research, including sampling structure of secondary literature, interview, and participant observation data. Fourth, I will outline the data analysis approach used for this research. Lastly, I will address the methodological limitations of this research and consider research reflexivity.

2.1 Research Approach

I took a multi-methods qualitative research approach to data collection and analysis. Specifically, I employed semi-structured interviews, participant observation, secondary literature collection, and examined the Gulf Islands National Park Reserve (GINPR) clam garden initiative as an illustrative case study. An inductive approach to data collection was taken with empirical evidence working to develop more abstract concepts and theoretical relationships (Neuman, 2014; Newing, Eagle, Puri, & Watson, 2010). Standard grounded theory, a form of inductive research, was used in the analysis process. Grounded theory focuses on constructing theory through data analysis rather than applying existing theory to the data, which is more typical in traditional positivist research. I used all data collection methods concurrently throughout the research process to help triangulate data. I began data analysis during the data collection stage to help gather information on different themes at different scales and continued analysis after the completion of data collection (Newing et al., 2010).

I chose these qualitative data collection and analysis methods because they are valuable to conceptualize new theory, help to categorize data, and because data analysis can begin
throughout the data collection process (Neuman, 2014). Simultaneously conducting data collection and analysis helps to ensure saturation of the data and remain adaptable to ensure a robust methodological approach. This is helpful for understanding the degree to which state conservation is moving away from fortress conservation ideologies.

2.2 Methodological Design

I designed and executed three objectives in order to examine the institutional and budgetary structures of Parks Canada and BC Parks and explore how they shape the planning, implementation, and outcomes of projects meant to reintroduce Indigenous management practices inside state-led protected areas within the province of BC. These objectives were pursued through an iterative process that helped to inductively examine how policies enabled and/or constrained conservation practice. First, I created a list identifying the current projects that exist within the province and identified the parks that they occur in. Second, I systematically examined key institutional and budgetary structures that shape cultural reintroduction and restoration projects through secondary literature review. Third, I documented and explored the motivations, challenges, and lessons learned by parks staff working on these projects. In order to complete this third objective, I conducted interviews with managers and staff working on various Parks Canada and BC Parks projects and undertook participant observation at GINPR. In addition to interviews at GINPR, participant observation was revealing of daily practices involved in the clam garden initiative and allowed me to better appreciate and understand the motivations and challenges of project implementation.

2.2.1 Study Area & Case Overview

In order to further understand how the reintroduction and restoration of Indigenous cultivation and management practices is occurring within BC, I chose to include one case study
within the research. The inclusion of a case study as part of the methodology is useful for understanding in more detail one specific case at a smaller scale and examining its features in an intensive way (Neuman, 2014; Newing et al., 2010). This is useful for understanding what is happening within an area or with specific actors, in a single moment in time, capturing multiple differing perspectives and helping to understand the details of cause-effect relationships taking place on the ground. This information can then be used to gain a broader theoretical understanding of the research topic, linking abstract ideas to concrete examples and generalize across larger scales (Neuman, 2014; Newing et al., 2010). However, because case studies often focus on a single moment it is limited in its ability to see how issues change over time and therefore it is recommended to include this approach along with other methodologies.

One case of the reintroduction and restoration of Indigenous cultivation and management practice that has gained significant attention is the reintroduction project occurring in GINPR (Augustine & Dearden, 2014). Within GINPR, park staff and Indigenous leaders are engaging in the restoration of cultural landforms known as ‘clam gardens’ (Parks Canada, 2015). I chose this project as the case study of focus for a detailed analysis into how reintroduction projects work within state-led parks and protected areas. Participant observation and semi-structured interviews were the main sources of data collected for the completion of case study analysis.

I chose GINPR as the site of case study analysis because of the accessibility of this park and its project and the existing relationships I have with GINPR staff. Furthermore, the clam garden restoration project being implemented in GINPR is the most developed and publicised case currently in existence within the province. Therefore the ability to analyze this project as a case study is helpful for predicting how other projects may change and develop over time and make larger scaled generalizations about how policies and budgetary frameworks are affecting
all reintroduction projects in the province. The amount of detail I was able to collect through participant observation note-taking allowed for a more comprehensive collection of the data compared to interview data alone, and this type of detail and understanding would not be possible without the inclusion of a case study analysis.

GINPR is located between southern Vancouver Island and mainland BC on the southern Gulf Islands located within the Salish Sea (See Figure 2) (Parks Canada, 2010; Shapiro, Leung, Denny, & Journeay, 2005). This park was established in May 2003 through agreements made between the Provincial and Federal Governments to combine Crown, Provincial, and private land together (Parks Canada, 2010). Since then, Parks Canada has committed to agreements in management and consultation of the Park Reserve with Seycum First Nation, Hul’qumi’num Treaty Group, and the Sencot’en Alliance (CPAWS, 2009). Nineteen First Nations claim land areas within the Park Reserve as part of their traditional territory in different capacities with ten nations actively participating in the planning and implementation of the clam garden restoration project specifically. The park itself is highly fragmented, spreading over multiple islands and the surrounding marine areas, covering a total land area of approximately 36 km² and a total marine area of 26 km², a significant portion of the smallest ecoregion in Canada, the Strait of Georgia Lowlands (Shapiro et al., 2005). Planning is underway to potentially establish a marine protected area around the park covering 1,400km², broadening Parks Canada’s management of the marine areas between the Park Reserve lands.
Figure 2. Map showing the location and extent of Gulf Islands National Park Reserve. Areas highlighted in white indicate the southern Gulf Islands, while areas highlighted in green within the inset are GINPR designated areas.

Clam gardens, the focus seascape for research in GINPR, are cultural landforms built by coastal First Nations, and are found most often on the Northwest coast of North America (Augustine & Dearden, 2014; Deur, Dick, Recalma-Clutesi, & Turner, 2015). They consist of rock wall terraces built up along the low tide line of the beach (Groesbeck, Rowell, Lepofsky, & Salomon, 2014). This rock wall causes the slope of the shore to become shallower which
elongates the beach and creates larger ideal habitats for multiple shellfish species. Furthermore, rock walls also protect shellfish from rough tidal waters and predators, once established on these elongated beaches (See Figure 3) (Lepofsky et al., 2015).

**Figure 3.** Clam Garden Profile. This image (taken from Augustine & Dearden 2014, p. 308) shows a profile view of what a built clam garden looks like. Emphasis is on the build-up of the rock wall along the low-tide line and the elongation of the beach profile for greater shellfish establishment.

These managed beaches are also thought to stabilize the soft sediment beds of the coastline, limiting coastal erosion and helping to increase shellfish productivity (Groesbeck et al., 2014). Groesbeck et al. (2014) identified that shellfish growing in these clam gardens were found in higher densities compared to non-walled beaches and had larger biomasses compared to the same type of shellfish growing on unaltered beaches. Furthermore, Deur et al. (2015) discovered that the presence and abundance of clams within these managed gardens also supported ecosystem health and abundance at higher trophic levels.
Beyond their ecological importance, clam gardens are also an important social and cultural landform to Coastal First Nations. They are a historical landmark of Indigenous presence, use and management of coastal areas along the northwest coast of North America (Lepofsky et al., 2015). Through archeological testing, some clam gardens have been identified as being built as early as 2000-3000 years ago (Groesbeck et al., 2014; Lepofsky & Caldwell, 2013; Lepofsky et al., 2015). As such, they have been used as a subsistence food source by Indigenous communities for thousands of years as well. However, the importance of clam gardens as a subsistence food source has been widely underrated by researchers who studied Indigenous peoples along the west coast (Deur et al., 2015; T. Thornton, Deur, & Kitka, 2015). This took place because of biases ethnographers had towards salmon and large game as more important Indigenous food sources and because of a lack of understanding in gendered divisions of labour within Indigenous communities.

I conducted seven interviews with individuals working on the clam garden case and collected participant observation notes within this Park Reserve. The inclusion of these datasets creates a unique opportunity to be able to speak in detail about the current status and structure of the clam garden restoration project. I participated alongside Parks Canada staff involved in the clam garden restoration project in the physical reconstruction of clam gardens to collect in-depth and detailed data on how this initiative works on the ground and the possibility of making recommendations to other current and future projects within the province.

Researching this case as part of the data collection process was important for understanding the practice of reintroducing Indigenous cultivation and management practices by state-led conservation agencies, understanding how policies and legislative frameworks affect the reintroduction of these practices, and identifying possible future opportunities of best
practices in initiating these projects. Without the inclusion of a case study analysis it would have been difficult to fully understand how reintroduction projects are being implemented within state-led parks and protected areas in BC.

2.3 Data Collection

2.3.1 Initiative List and Secondary Literature

I created the focused initiative list through an examination of publicly available document sources used as secondary literature analysis. These documents included park management plans or master plans, guiding documents regarding preferred management practices and relationship building with Indigenous people, documents outlining ecological management of parks and protected areas, and finally documents that outlined the funding frameworks in place for these projects within the agencies. This was helpful in identifying what types of projects currently exist within the province and where they are occurring. Furthermore, it helped determine who is involved in these projects, both generally through the listed departments and position titles mentioned, as well as specifically the individuals I could contact regarding these projects. This information helped to guide the creation of an interview contact list and helped establish the sampling structure and scale. When park and protected area websites, park management documents, or master plans indicated that a reintroduction project was occurring or that one could possibly be occurring, I collected contact information for managers or staff members employed at those parks. I attempted to make contact with staff from all parks and protected areas in the province that had a possible project occurring until a final tally of confirmed projects was made through confirmation by parks staff and managers. Interview participants were then recruited from this tally. These documents were also used during analysis because they helped to contextualize, and in some cases legitimize, interviewee’s statements, while also helping to
understand the relationship between on the ground practice and the policy and institutional structures.

It became apparent through the development of the guiding initiative list that the majority of the projects identified in both Parks Canada and BC Parks were taking place within protected areas that had non-traditional designations. The two main non-traditional designations were National Park Reserves and Conservancies. At this stage it was necessary to further understand why and how these reintroduction projects were being implemented in these designations rather than the more traditional designations of National Parks and Class A Parks. At this stage, I thematically analyzed policy and legislative frameworks in place within the Federal and Provincial Government and their conservation agencies. I continued to thematically analyze secondary literature as a result, in order to understand the Acts, policies, management guidelines, and funding structures in place that worked to influence projects within these designations. Continuing to examine secondary literature was crucial to understanding the implementation process of reintroduction projects and became an integral part of the data analysis process that occurred for interview and participant observation data.

I used purposive sampling to collect Parks Canada and BC Parks legislative, policy, and management documents. During the creation of the initiative list for objective one, purposive sampling was beneficial for identifying all of the parks and protected areas currently reintroducing Indigenous cultivation and management practices as well as sorting through conservation areas that seemed promising for possible projects (Neuman, 2014). When I could not find any more parks that were reintroducing or reconstructing Indigenous cultivation or management practices then I knew I had reached saturation (Neuman, 2014). Creating a comprehensive list covering Federal and Provincial levels of Government allowed for
comparative analysis to occur throughout the research process (Clifford, French, & Valentine, 2010). Analyzing how each level of Government chooses to include Indigenous peoples in conservation management can be helpful in understanding disconnects in approaches and goals between the Provincial and Federal Government and bring to light possible opportunities to more equitably include Indigenous people in parks and protected area management, as well as greater capacity building between the two levels of Government (Clifford et al., 2010).

2.3.2 Semi-structured interviews

I conducted semi-structured interviews to identify general trends across the different projects occurring within BC and evaluate how policies and legislature identified were being applied across different parks and protected areas of interest. In order to confidently understand how policy is reflected through practice it was necessary to understand the motivations and perspectives of the staff working on these projects. This contributed to the examination of how these policies are being implemented and the motivations and challenges in reintroducing Indigenous practices based on policies in place.

Semi-structured interviews were appropriate for this research as they allow for two-way conversations to take place and an openness to the unexpected where the researcher can ask follow-up questions and further the discussion on a specific topic (Newing et al., 2010) This is important because it can provide a more detailed background and in-depth account of each participant’s views and motivations (Newing et al., 2010). This is a crucial strength for this project as I conducted interviews with park managers and staff who hold expert knowledge regarding cultural reintroduction projects in the parks and protected areas where they are employed. Semi-structured interviews are less formal than structured surveys and allows for more elaboration on answers by both interviewees and myself as the researcher which works
well for my smaller sample size. However, interviews were more structured than informal conversation to allow for efficiency in the research process and to ensure conversation remained on topic. I conducted a total of 18 interviews with 19 individuals working across the province in the fields of resource conservation, planning and policy, and archaeology. The majority of these individuals worked across the Federal Parks Canada agency and Provincial BC Parks agency, but some also were employed in municipal resource conservation, and other institutions (See table 2).

Table 2. Interview sample by organization or institution and field of expertise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Resource conservation</th>
<th>Planning and Policy</th>
<th>Archaeology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks Canada</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Parks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Institution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I chose interview participants through a mixed approach of purposive and snowball sampling techniques (Newing et al., 2010). I chose purposive sampling because in the initial stages of research and planning I knew of a few key informants I would like to interview and so sought them out directly through connections at the Parks Canada Indigenous Affairs Secretariat and GINPR. Also, through the creation of the initiative list during objective one of the research, I identified names of managers or staff working on these projects and I sought them out directly to interview them regarding their capacity in the projects. After these initial interviews were completed I used traditional snowball sampling techniques to further establish my sampling list. In interviews I asked participants for recommendations of individuals or parks that they thought I
should contact regarding possible involvement in Indigenous reintroduction and restoration projects. I used these recommendations to further establish connections and conduct interviews. Purposive sampling techniques were appropriate given the fact that the research was initiated in collaboration with Parks Canada staff members. Furthermore, as a new researcher this was helpful for initiating the data collection process (Newing et al., 2010). Snowball sampling was then used in order to broaden the collection of interview data in order to get a diverse sample of projects across coastal BC and understand the perspectives of staff and managers involved in reintroduction projects (Newing et al., 2010).

Determining saturation for interview data was based not only on the number and distribution of interviewees that were involved but also on the amount, breadth, and depth of the information collected in interviews. Since I was contacting key informants from Parks Canada and BC Parks involved in the restoration and/or reintroduction of Indigenous cultivation and management practices, the goal was to interview at least one individual from each park or protected area where a reintroduction was occurring. Saturation was achieved when I could not identify any new projects at other parks or protected areas in the province. However, Saturation was achieved for Parks Canada, but as I was only able to secure three interviews with employees of BC Parks, saturation was not reached. However, it is important to note that some similar themes emerged from multiple interviewees from Parks Canada and BC Parks. I was able to compare and contrast the data collected in interviews to form a consensus and identify patterns within the data.

Interviews were approximately 45 minutes to 1.5 hours in length. I took notes throughout the interviews and recorded the audio from them for easy transcription to ensure that no information was lost through note taking alone (Newing et al., 2010). I used notes as an outline
to index key points during interviews for easy reviewing of audio recordings later, and I also used notes to copy down important phrases and verbatim quotes for use during data analysis and writing. Audio recordings were used as a way to confirm notes taken and to understand the tone of the interview (Newing et al., 2010).

To guide the interview process, I compiled a set of questions in the form of an interview guide in order to cover key topics and themes within the interviews. This acted as a checklist and helped in wording the questions themselves (Newing et al., 2010). The recommended focus for a one hour interview is five to six general topics total or multiple questions broken down more specifically. This was the guideline I followed during the interview process with an average total of 33 questions asked (Newing et al., 2010). Questions focused on understanding the status of project(s) being administered in the park and the work interviewees are doing in their professional capacity to make these projects successful. Questions centered on the rationale for reintroducing or restoring Indigenous practice, the positive outcomes these practices have brought to date, their potential to contribute to conservation mandates, both social and ecological, and any logistical or legislative challenges involved in their initiation and/or management (See Appendix A). In order to continue to examine how reintroduction projects were being initiated within state-led parks, more detailed data was required alongside semi-structured interviews in order to understand more specifically how projects worked on the ground. This led to my engagement with participant observation data collection and my examination of one specific case study.

2.3.3 Participant Observation

I used participant observation in order to understand in more depth how state policies are being applied within conservation and restoration work. To gain this in-depth knowledge, I
participated in the clam garden restoration project occurring at Gulf Islands National Park Reserve (GINPR) and used this participant observation data as part of a case study analysis of GINPR, discussed in more detail below. I chose this case because it is currently the most publicized and developed case within the province. Understanding how it works on the ground is beneficial for making recommendations to GINPR and other parks, while also adding to a theoretical understanding of how these projects are implemented and why. This understanding contributes to the overall analysis of how, and in what ways, policies and institutional structures are currently constraining reintroduction initiatives within state-led parks and protected areas in BC.

Participant observation involved taking notes about informal conversations and actions of people at a field site as well as actively participating in the restoration and monitoring activities occurring at GINPR. I participated in multiple activities occurring as part of GINPR’s clam garden restoration project while in the field (See table 3). This variety of activities helped me to understand how each component of the restoration project works and how each activity comes together to create a holistic project, giving this research in depth details regarding how the project is implemented on the ground.

Table 3. Participant observation sampling. Breakdown of the types of activities I participated in as part of the participant observation portion of the research process, the location and dates in which these activities occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates (2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bivalve Monitoring</td>
<td>Various southern Gulf Islands</td>
<td>June 4(^{th})-6(^{th})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Culture Camps</td>
<td>Fulford Harbour</td>
<td>June 7(^{th}) &amp; 8(^{th})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clam Garden Restoration</td>
<td>Russel Island</td>
<td>July 3(^{rd}) &amp; 5(^{th})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant observation notes helped me to understand challenges and successes related to reintroduction initiatives in BC (Neuman, 2014). Notes were descriptive in nature, focusing on what was done each day while out in the field, the demographics of participants, and the actual activities involved in the process of monitoring and restoring the clam gardens and clam beaches. Participant observation was appropriate for analyzing the reintroduction of Indigenous cultivation and management practices because it allows for in-depth evaluation of practices on the ground and helps me as a researcher to better understand the processes at play, by actively participating in the restoration. Throughout the participant observation note taking process it must be acknowledged that I was observing both Parks staff as well as Indigenous people working on the project. As such, I had to be aware of pre-existing relationships or possible conflicts that may exist between parties to ensure that I did not make assumptions or exploit participants in any way (Newing et al., 2010; Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw, 1995).

2.4 Data analysis

After the completion of interview and participant observation, data analysis was necessary. I completed one round of less restricted open descriptive coding first, followed by two iterations of analytic coding. The first round of coding consisted of reading through interview and participant observation datasets and coding key words, sentences, or sections each time a new or interesting theme was brought up relating to how and why reintroduction projects were occurring within the province and any connection of the secondary literature that were made. In the second round of coding, I focused on identifying nuances and themes throughout interviews and participant observation datasets more specifically, understanding how opinions in interviews connected to each other and to participant observation notes. I then used these themes to draw
conclusions about how legislative and policy documents outlined in secondary literature are enabling or constraining the reintroduction of Indigenous cultivation and management practices.

Open coding and analytic coding was facilitated through the use of the software program NVivo. This allowed for more structured organization of datasets and specific coded data that was later used in the writing process. Coding your data is advantageous to create a hierarchical system of importance to information and codes can be created before, during, and after multiple iterations of analysis (Newing et al., 2010). The use of secondary literature, mentioned above, also helped triangulate my data within existing literature and contextualize conservation practice within current policy frameworks surrounding BC Parks and Parks Canada. As a result, this literature became essential as part of data collection and data analysis throughout the research process.

All interview data was analyzed the same way whether it was specific to the GINPR case or not. Participant observation data from the GINPR case then helped to contextualize GINPR interview data within the case study specifically. This was beneficial for understanding the connections and disconnects between structure and local, supporting the political ecology approach taken in this research. Through my ability to triangulate GINPR interview, participant observation and secondary literature data I was able to draw deeper conclusions about the degree to which Parks Canada is moving beyond fortress conservation and the barriers in place that could be preventing this from happening in a more equitable way. The use of this case is beneficial for understanding the current role of the state in reintroduction projects, and helped to question the state’s role within conservation by illustrating the continuation of colonial practice occurring within the agency.
2.5 Reflexivity and Study Limitations

As a settler scholar researching aspects of Indigenous-settler relations through state-led conservation in a Canadian context, I am aware of the impact that settler society, including academic researchers and scholarship, has had (and, in many respects, continues to have) on Indigenous communities (Shaw, Herman, & Dobbs, 2006). As such, I am not attempting to do research ‘on’ Indigenous people, but rather research how relationship building between the state and Indigenous communities is occurring through conservation work, aiming to understand what motivates and shapes state interest in reintroduction initiatives and how they are unfolding ‘on the ground’. I did not interview Indigenous community members regarding their perceptions of Indigenous reintroduction and/or restoration projects. As such, I do not know whether Indigenous partners involved think they were successful or equitable, or whether they believe these projects can work to further reconciliation and relationship building between Indigenous people and the state. I make this disclaimer in order to clarify that I am not speaking for Indigenous community members and that my research has a limited Indigenous perspective. I suggest that future studies include the perceptions of these projects from an indigenous perspective as well to fully understand project success and implementation.

As a settler scholar who supports the inclusion of Indigenous people within conservation management, I had to be aware of my own opinions and positionality regarding the complex issues I was researching throughout data collection. This was also true during participant observation note taking. I was observing and not discussing the project stages directly with individuals participating in the clam garden restoration project, therefore I was limited to my own interpretation of the implementation process (Emerson et al., 1995). By being aware of
these challenges prior to the data collection process I was able to limit their diffusion into the research process.

A key practical challenge during the fieldwork for this project was that it took place during the summer visitor and field season for park staff members. This made acquiring interviews and recruiting new participants difficult at times as staff members were off grid or away for long periods of time. This coupled with the fact that data collection of interviews and participant observation notes took place over two months only, means that I can only speak in detail about the parks and protected areas I visited and interviewed staff members. Finally, I was able to conduct more interviews with Parks Canada employees than I was with individuals who work for BC Parks. While a greater sample from BC Parks would have been ideal, this agency is at an earlier stage of developing and implementing reintroduction initiatives than is Parks Canada. Interview data at the Provincial and Federal level were collected and analyzed in the same way, but because of the stage that BC Parks was at interviews tended to take a ‘higher-level’ view on reintroduction initiatives (i.e., focusing on the concept, ideas within the agency and early efforts within conservancies specifically). A second case study, at the Provincial level, may have been helpful for comparison with the GINPR clam garden restoration project and this could be pursued in a future project.
Chapter 3 Legislative Organization & Influence

This chapter contains my analysis of publicly available Parks Canada and BC Parks documents that outline key institutional and budgetary structures. The goal of this chapter is to demonstrate how state-led conservation institution’s policy and budgetary structures are shaping the implementation of reintroduction initiatives within Parks Canada and BC Parks in the province of BC. In the first section, I will specifically discuss Parks Canada and BC Parks Acts and legislation and how the organization of these Acts influences how Indigenous cultivation and management practices are reintroduced. In this section I will also discuss the significance of different park designations where projects occur most often. Second, I will outline Parks Canada and BC Parks overarching management documents used to guide protected area management processes. Third, I will describe state institutional documents that outline how Indigenous people are being included in the management of state led parks and protected areas in the province. Fourth, I will explain the budgetary context that shapes the implementation of Indigenous cultivation and management practices. Lastly, I will outline the initiatives within the study sample and describe the management plans/master plans these protected areas have published.

3.1 Acts and Legislation

3.1.1 Parks Canada: Canada National Parks Act

The Canada National Parks Act protects and outlines the management and regulations of Canada’s National Parks, National Park Reserves, and National Historic Sites. The purpose of the Act is to protect Canadian National Parks and protected areas for the benefit, education, and enjoyment of Canadians and to be maintained and made use of unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations (Canada National Park Act, 2000). The Act grants Government officials regulatory control over the protection of flora, fauna, and landscapes within Parks Canada.
governed areas, and outlines guidelines for natural resource harvesting when settled land claim agreements exist within Parks Canada protected areas. Where land claim agreements have been made for the protection of traditional renewable resource harvesting activities, regulations can be made in order to ensure those activities continue.

In order to meet its obligations under the Act, Parks Canada is responsible for maintaining and restoring ecological integrity within park areas. Ecological integrity is defined as, “a condition that is determined to be characteristic of its natural region and likely to persist, including abiotic components and the composition and abundance of native species and biological communities, rates of change and supporting processes” (Canada National Park Act, 2000 pg. 7). In accordance with the Act and this definition of ecological integrity, restoration and protection relates to ‘natural’ resources and ‘natural’ processes. This is presented as the first priority of Parks Canada when considering all aspects of park management (Canada National Parks Act, 2000). This focus on natural resources and natural processes can be limiting in terms of cultural features and their importance, however, and is one reason why Indigenous people and their practices have traditionally been excluded from park management (Loo, 2006; West et al., 2006).

Although Parks Canada can establish regulations to ensure traditional practices are permitted, these practices must be undertaken following specific guidelines and with staff oversight. For instance, these regulations can be made when settled land claims agreements exist regarding a park area or when Aboriginal people have existing Aboriginal or Treaty Rights to traditional renewable resource harvesting activities within a park. However, Aboriginal resource harvesting rights would have to be recognized by the Government in order for this to take place and in some National Parks and Park Reserves Parks Canada can establish contingency
regulations for traditional renewable resource harvesting. These regulations could specify what traditional renewable harvesting activities are, the amount of harvesting that can take place, where within park areas harvesting can take place, designating specific categories of people to engage in harvesting activities while banning others, and prohibiting the use of renewable resources harvested in parks for non-traditional purposes. This restricts how resource harvesting takes place and who is in charge of the decision-making process, and overall it stands to limit the types of traditional resource harvesting activities that can be practiced by Indigenous peoples within National Parks and protected area spaces. By setting a narrow definition of ecological integrity, the Canada National Parks Act prioritizes particular types of projects and permits, which in turn means that Indigenous cultivation and management practices are introduced under very particular circumstances and with a great deal of oversight.

There are multiple types of protected area designations outlined under the Canada National Parks Act. The specific designation of a protected area determines how these areas are structured and shapes the work that is done on the ground. The three designations of focus for this research are National Parks, National Park Reserves, and National Historic Sites. In the case of the study sample, three of the four Parks Canada led projects examined in this research are occurring within the National Park Reserve designation. This park designation originated as an amendment to the Park Act in 1974. The goal of National Park Reserves is to recognize outstanding land claims within park areas by at least one Indigenous community (Canada National Parks Act, 2000). This designation allows for conservation work by Parks Canada staff members to continue within the park boundaries while land claims are negotiated between Indigenous people and the Government of Canada. In most cases, Indigenous communities with pending land claims to a park area engage in some form of working relationship with Parks Canada to be
involved in the management of their traditional territories. National Park Reserves focus on working in collaboration with Indigenous people in the absence of settled treaty or land claims. It can work as a way to ‘agree to disagree’ about Rights and Title claims within a park area, but allows Parks Canada to manage the areas as a National Park in the meantime.

National Parks already established within Parks Canada, such as Yoho or Banff, must also legally consult with local Indigenous people with claims to the area, but this process of moving forward collaboratively often differs from a Park Reserve as there is not always the same acknowledgement of Indigenous traditional territory. Furthermore, lands within National Parks are acknowledged by Parks Canada as ceded and belonging to the agency. National Park Reserves often have established traditional knowledge working groups, formal harvesting agreements and project working groups in order to include Indigenous partners in park management. However, in National Parks, this formal structure of collaboration is not necessarily in place. The National Park Reserve designation can also work as an interim status during times of uncertainty in ownership, management, and decision-making, and can be altered based on the results of treaty settlement and land claims agreements. For example, parks in northern Canada have changed from National Park Reserves to National Parks based on the clarifications of settlements between the Federal Government and Indigenous peoples (See Table 4 for section summary) (Parks Canada Kluane Management Plan, 2010).

3.1.2 BC Parks: BC Park Act

The purpose of the BC Park Act (1996) is to preserve the natural resources, wildlife, and associated habitats, as well as regulate and control human activities, exploitation, and development within Provincial protected areas in BC. This includes guiding the management and administration of all matters that concern Parks, Conservancies, and Recreation Areas within the
province (BC Parks Act, 1996 pg. 3). Classed Parks and Conservancies are two main categories of protected area designations within BC Parks. Class A Parks are designated to be “dedicated to the preservation of their natural environments for the inspiration, use, and enjoyment of the public” (BC Park Act, 1996 pg. 5). In contrast, Conservancies are designated “for the protection and maintenance of their biological diversity and natural environments, for the preservation and maintenance of social, ceremonial, and cultural uses of Indigenous people, for protection and maintenance of their recreational values, and to ensure that development or use of their natural resources occurs in a sustainable manner” (BC Park Act, 1996 pg. 5).

There is a key difference in the explicit language used to define these types of protected areas. For instance, Class A Parks focus on preservation and control of the natural environment with no inclusion of natural resource use or cultural significance in its definition. Conversely, Conservancies do not include ecological preservation per se as a main focus but choose to outline ecological maintenance and protection of cultural values and practices as important reasons for their designation. This means that Conservancies are more compatible with low impact economic and extraction opportunities by Indigenous people. Within the BC Parks Act, the definition of the Conservancy designation explicitly states that sustainable use and harvesting by Indigenous peoples can occur, as well as leaving open the possibility for small economic development opportunities (BC Parks Act, 1996; Protected Areas of BC Act, 2000). Overall, the BC Park Act can be quite limiting for Indigenous people in asserting their rights within Class A Provincial Parks but Conservancies offer more flexibility.

This Conservancy designation was established in 2006 as an amendment to the BC Park Act (1996) and was enacted as part of a political push by the province to increase the total protected area from two to twenty percent (BC Parks, 1996; Rutherford et al., 2015; Turner &
Bitonti, 2011). However, the province is subject to many and sometimes competing land claims by Indigenous people. The addition of the Conservancy designation allows for conservation of these unique areas while also acknowledging land claims and working with Indigenous people to protect these areas. The final establishment of a Conservancy is the result of Land and Resource Protocol Agreements and Strategic Land Use Planning Agreements between the province and a First Nation on a government-to-government basis. Conservancies can be designated as part of treaty settlement packages or in the absence of a treaty through assertion of Aboriginal rights. This means that Indigenous people and the province are working together to protect these areas, giving Indigenous people more decision-making power in selecting locations for Conservancy designation, based on their needs and interests. There are currently 156 Conservancies within the province compared to the 643 traditional Class A, B, and C Parks managed under BC Parks, with most located along the north coast. The Conservancies of focus for this research are located within the Skeena and West Coast Vancouver Island regions.

In terms of relations with Indigenous people, BC Parks can enter into an agreement with an Indigenous community regarding Parks, Conservancies, and Recreation Areas in the province. The agreements are based on the protection of Indigenous communities’ ability to exercise Indigenous rights, as well as having access to protected areas for social, ceremonial, and cultural purposes (BC Parks Act, 1996). The Act is explicit in distinguishing these arrangements between the province and Indigenous people as separate from treaties or land claims agreements.

BC Parks also has the power to prohibit or regulate the exploitation, development, extraction, or use of natural resources in a park, Conservancy, or recreation area. This includes hunting, trapping, angling, or otherwise disturbing any animal, fish, or bird. As part of this regulation, BC Parks can also set the number, age, and sex of animals that can be taken within
Provincial protected areas and the duration of time that they can be hunted. Individuals may also require special licences, park use permits, or resource use permits in order to take natural resources from any of these protected area designations (BC Park Act, 1996). However, it is unclear whether BC Parks-Indigenous agreements that are meant to ensure the social, ceremonial, and cultural use of natural resources are exceptions to regulations of extraction of natural resources, or whether Indigenous people would require permits in order to assert these aboriginal rights within BC Parks areas (See Table 4 for Section summary).

**Table 4.** Table summarizing key findings that describe Parks Canada and BC Parks Acts, legislation, and designations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act</th>
<th>Act Purpose</th>
<th>Designations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks Canada</td>
<td>Canada National Park Act</td>
<td>National Parks:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the benefit, education, and enjoyment of Canadians maintained and made</td>
<td>- Follows directly from the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>use of unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations</td>
<td>- May or may not recognize outstanding land claims, could be settled or no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>acknowledgment of outstanding claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ecological integrity: Condition that is determined to be characteristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of its natural region and likely to persist, including abiotic components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and the composition and abundance of native species and biological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>communities, rates of change and supporting processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Parks</td>
<td>BC Park Act</td>
<td>National Park Reserves:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preserve natural resources, wildlife, and associated habitats, as well as</td>
<td>- Recognition of outstanding land claims (‘agree-to-disagree’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regulate and control human activities, exploitation, and development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class A parks:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Preservation of natural environment for the inspiration, use, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>enjoyment of the public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conservancies:
Protection and maintenance of:
- Biological diversity and natural environments,
- Social, ceremonial, and cultural uses by Indigenous people,
- Recreational values,
- To ensure that development or use of natural resources occurs in a sustainable manner

3.2 Overarching Policy Documents

3.2.1 Parks Canada

Every few years, Parks Canada publishes a report that outlines the agency’s plans and priorities for the next two years. The most recent version of this document, Report on Plans and Priorities Parks Canada Agency 2016-2017, has a focus on the agency’s ability to improve and continue to display Canadian natural and cultural features to the public, establish new National Parks and Heritage Sites, and continue to improve and support Parks Canada’s ecological integrity mandate. Parks Canada’s vision for the agency states “Canada’s treasured natural and historic places will be a living legacy, connecting hearts and minds to a stronger, deeper understanding of the very essence of Canada” (Report on Plans and Priorities Parks Canada Agency 2016-2017, 2016 pg. 6). A goal of Parks Canada is to have a representative sample of Canada’s natural regions through the national park system. Currently, the agency represents thirty of Canada’s thirty-nine terrestrial regions and five of the total twenty-nine marine regions. This vision is consistent with Parks Canada’s definition of ecological integrity. However, as previously mentioned, the definition is problematic based on the limited inclusion of Indigenous peoples and their practices.
In terms of the inclusion of Indigenous people within overarching policy documents, Parks Canada lists strengthening Indigenous relationships as a key priority and states that certain strategies and skills need to be implemented throughout the agency to help guide this process. These strategies include; implementing ‘Promising Pathways: a Resource Guide for Strengthening Engagement and Relationships with Indigenous Peoples’, reviewing policies to reflect nation-to-nation relationships built on a recognition of rights, respect, cooperation and partnership, improving the support and implementation of modern treaty obligations within heritage places, and developing a training plan for awareness of Indigenous issues. Parks Canada states their commitment to implementing the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and using it as a way to address the Calls to Action posted in the Truth and Reconciliation commission (TRC) report, working towards reconciliation. None of these goals discuss the inclusion of Indigenous cultivation and management practices as a strategy to help build relationships between Parks Canada and Indigenous partners and instead focuses on more hands-off approaches to working with Indigenous peoples and building relationships. Recognition of Indigenous rights should include an active promotion of Indigenous access and use of traditional territories within National Parks and protected areas. As currently stated, policies outlined by Parks Canada could be further limiting the discussion of Indigenous rights within park areas because Indigenous decision-making and active management practices is limited.

Parks Canada’s plans and priorities report discusses the Conservation and Restoration Program (an ecological restoration funding program also known as CORE) and suggests that through this program, Parks Canada can support the Canadian Government’s priority for a clean
The environment and protection of species at risk, restoring Canada’s reputation of environmental stewardship.

The portrayal of this program is important because all of the Federal reintroduction initiatives examined in this research were funded through the CORE funding program, (which will be discussed in more detail later). Ecological restoration through the CORE program is viewed as also possibly having a large socio-cultural component to its implementation. However, the focus remains on how this restoration meets the mandate for ecological integrity. Any socio-cultural benefit a project may bring is seen as an added bonus to the completion of ecological restoration. This again prioritizes ecological importance of Canadian protected areas over these areas’ cultural significance to Indigenous people. Valuing ecological integrity over cultural significance is a persistent quality of fortress conservation and is evidence that Canadian state-led conservation institutions are re-entrenching fortress ideologies within conservation practice. When the report discusses cultural resources, the focus is on heritage site protection and cultural resource protection, including limiting environmental processes that could threaten these resources. The Heritage Conservation Act (1996), for example, may be limiting the degree to which Indigenous cultivation and management projects can occur. This act focuses on strictly protecting culturally significant areas. This can be beneficial for their continued existence but is also restrictive to active management and restoration of Indigenous archeological heritage sites. The strict protection of Indigenous cultural resources works to freeze Indigenous culture in the past, leaving no room for the growth of culture and limits the acceptance of cultivation and management practice as a culturally and ecologically significant activity.

Within Parks Canada’s Principles and Guidelines for Ecological Restoration (2008) there is a more explicit recognition of Indigenous ecological management practices as important to the
restoration and management of Parks Canada’s protected areas. The document recognizes the longstanding reliance of certain ecosystems on the inclusion of Indigenous people to ensure the continued ecological integrity of those ecosystems. As such, Parks Canada states within these restoration guidelines that for ecological restoration to be effective and engaging, it should be informed by western ecological and social science as well as traditional ways of knowing and relating to the land (Principles and Guideline for Ecological Restoration, 2008). However, since Parks Canada’s inclusion of western ecological sciences focuses on a strict definition of ecological integrity, their ability to truly incorporate Indigenous cultivation and management practices within park management is limited. In fact, within these same guidelines, it was also outlined that only in some cases should Indigenous management practices be included. Overall, the restoration guidelines focus on the implementation and monitoring of ecological restoration based on traditional scientific method and the use of measurable outcomes. The vagueness and lack of support for Indigenous use and management within National Park spaces creates concern regarding whether these practices can occur, how they can occur, where they can occur, and the amount of structural agency support they will get in implementing these practices; regardless of whether they are temporary projects or implemented into the overall management of National Parks and National Park Reserves (See Table 5 for section summary).

3.2.2 BC Parks

In 2015, BC Parks published an annual report outlining the accomplishments and future goals for protected areas within the province. The document focuses on how BC Parks has and will continue to extend its areas of protection, how they will work more collaboratively with other governments and non-government agencies, and improve outreach communication to visitors. One of the key ways BC Parks describes how they will continue to improve in the
management of protected areas is through focusing on the proactive stewardship of ecological integrity and cultural heritage (BC Parks Annual Report, 2015). BC Parks defines ecological integrity as occurring when an “area or network of areas supports natural ecosystem composition, structure, and function, and a capacity for self-renewal” (BC Parks Annual Report, 2015 pg. 10). Within BC Park’s conservation policy there is a recognition that protected areas within the agency will be managed as complete ecological units, which is consistent with their definition of ecological integrity (BC Parks Conservation Policy, 2014). This understanding of ecological integrity is very similar to Parks Canada’s definition and is also restricting the inclusion of Indigenous cultivation and management practices within the management of park areas.

BC Parks does support the use of ecological restoration within its protected areas as a way to assist in the recovery of an ecosystem or species of concern that has been damaged through human activity. However, there is reluctance from BC Parks to allow ‘habitat manipulation’ to occur unless it is beneficial to ecological integrity or to preserve the social, ceremonial, and cultural uses of Indigenous people (BC Parks, 2014). Even in these cases there are limitations to manipulation, citing that encouragement of larger wildlife populations for consumptive purposes will not occur unless stated in approved management plans. These guidelines are restrictive and it is unclear how they may affect Indigenous people with claims to park areas throughout the different designations in the agency. Furthermore, BC Park’s definition of ecological integrity leaves very little room for human involvement and focuses on letting ecosystems recover without human influence as much as possible. This disregards the long standing history of use and management by Indigenous communities and their influence in conserving the ecological
integrity of landscapes, which rely on continued use, disturbance and management by humans

(See Table 5 for section summary).

**Table 5.** Summary table overviewing key findings regarding broad policy documents published by Parks Canada and BC Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks Canada</th>
<th>Ecological Restoration</th>
<th>Consequences for Reintroduction Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Canada’s treasured natural and historic places will be a living legacy, connecting hearts and minds to a stronger, deeper understanding of the very essence of Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support and improve ecological integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strengthen Indigenous relationships through:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nation-to-nation relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Recognition of rights, respect cooperation and partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improving/supporting modern treaty obligations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Through CORE program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social benefits considered secondary to ecological in restoration work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Heritage site protection and cultural resource protection only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reintroduction and restoration of Indigenous cultivation and management practices not supported through Parks Canada broad policy documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Vagueness throughout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not a lot of explicit structural support for reintroduction projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Parks</td>
<td>- Extending areas of protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Working collaboratively with state and non-state organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improve outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improve management of PAs through stewardship of ecological integrity and cultural heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Through supporting ecological integrity: Area or network of areas that supports natural ecosystem composition, structure, and function, and has a capacity for self-renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- BC Parks definition of ecological integrity disregards history of use and management by Indigenous people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hands off approach to ecological management therefore little structural support for reintroduction initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Indigenous Inclusion Documents

3.3.1 Parks Canada

Aside from legislative documents that more strictly outline the requirements and regulations of Canada’s National Parks and National Park Reserves, Parks Canada publishes guiding documents that communicate their goals for working with Indigenous people. The two main documents of focus for Parks Canada are ‘Promising Pathways’ (2014), and ‘The Land is our Teacher’ (2015). Promising Pathways is a guidebook for working with Indigenous people that is meant for Parks Canada staff members to use and implement within the protected areas in which they are employed. The document outlines a timeline for relationship building between Indigenous people and Parks Canada and the many ways in which this can be accomplished, both formal and informal. The document uses a lot of flowery language to describe how best to initiate, grow, and steward the relationship building process with Indigenous communities that the agency partners with. The document outlines that in order to be successful, partnership between Indigenous people and Parks Canada must be accessible, respectful, knowledge-based, and supportive.

Promising Pathways also includes a section on tools and resources for Parks staff to use during the process of consultation and relationship building. This section contains checklists and questions that can be used at each stage of the relationship building process and outlines different guides based on the type of initiative being undertaken within the park with Indigenous communities. This can be beneficial for making sure that policies are in place that ensure a consistent process of consultation and collaboration, but also may be limited because this checklist could generalize the goals and knowledge of Indigenous partners. The ability of this guide to be applied to all Aboriginal people working with the agency across Canada is
problematic for understanding the unique connections Indigenous partners have with their traditional territories and the motivations they have for working with Parks Canada.

The second document, The Land is our Teacher, focuses on how Indigenous knowledge can be included within the management of a park as part of relationship building with Indigenous communities. It outlines stories of the successful inclusion of traditional knowledge across the agency. The document also mentions that Parks Canada has a priority to reintroduce Indigenous practices and harvesting within the management of its protected areas. However, almost none of the success stories include any active cultivation and management practices. Instead, the focus seemed to be on the ability of Parks Canada to present Indigenous knowledge as part of Canada’s history and create a stronger visitor experience. Similar to Promising Pathways, this document gives guidelines and tips for parks team members wanting to initiate projects that would include Indigenous traditional knowledge. Guidelines outline how trust, respect, and sharing is important when working with Indigenous traditional knowledge holders and that through caring, sharing, and joint action between Parks Canada and Indigenous traditional knowledge holders, a transformative relationship can occur. Parks Canada’s hope is that through this renewed relationship; the history of exclusion of Indigenous peoples from parks can be addressed, helping to reconnect nature and culture to work towards reconciliation. This language is again quite flowery and vague in order to be generally applied to all projects across the country. At this time, it is unclear how this process would work in practice based on the structure outlined in this document.

These two documents are evidence that at least in principle Parks Canada is attempting to build relationships with Indigenous partners. However, these documents lacked any explanation of concrete actions that should be taken in order to improve the equitability and decision-making
power of Indigenous partners or how to promote and improve access and use of Indigenous traditional territories within National Parks or National Park Reserves. This risks further tokenising the involvement of Indigenous people within state-led parks through the relationship building process, presenting Indigenous people and culture to the public as historic artifacts of Canada rather than communities with rights to park areas and stewards of the environment (See Table 6 for section summary).

3.3.2 BC Parks

Within BC Parks, there are no management documents dedicated to guiding the relationship building process between BC Parks and Indigenous people. However, within the Provincial Government more broadly, there is documentation of a commitment to relationship building between the province and Indigenous people. This ‘New Relationship’ (BC Government, 2005), has a goal of recognizing the vision of Indigenous people in strengthening their communities through eliminating the gap present in the standard of living between Indigenous people and other British Columbians, as well as revitalizing and preserving Indigenous culture and language (BC Government, 2005). Important in this case, this set of guidelines promotes the exercising of Aboriginal rights over land and resources through a pursuit of economic development and an acknowledgment that the Province and its resources should be managed in a sustainable way, reflecting Indigenous laws, knowledge, and values. The Province states that it will facilitate this through developing institutional and policy structures that include government-to-government agreements regarding land use planning, management, tenure, resource revenue, benefit sharing, and establishing funding opportunities and working groups to facilitate this process. This could be interpreted as support for the inclusion of Indigenous cultivation and management practices throughout the province, including within BC Parks.
BC Parks agency is accountable to this New Relationship as a department within the Provincial Government that represents the policies and structures outlined by The Province. This New Relationship is seen as contributing to the creation of the Conservancy designation which was established one year after Provincial support for this New Relationship was announced (Turner & Bitonti, 2011). However, it is not clear whether this renewed relationship commitment would be limited to the Conservancy designation only or if it could be applied within other designations as well. This lack of documentation and vagueness of the role of Indigenous people within BC Parks is problematic for the ability of Provincial state-led conservation to move beyond fortress conservation processes and equitably include Indigenous people in park and protected area management.

Currently, within a traditional Class A Park, the degree to which Indigenous people can be involved varies. In many cases, Indigenous people must apply for park use permits in order to actively engage in hunting and cultivation practices within the park. The degree of decision-making that communities have in managing park spaces is minimal and dependent on the capacity of individual parks and the Indigenous community involved. Conversely, many of BC Parks overall management and policy documents include reference to the respect and protection of cultural features located within Provincial protected areas, regardless of designation. However, there is a lack of clarity within the BC Parks mandates as to how Indigenous people can be involved within the sustainable and _active_ management of park spaces. This vagueness may be limiting opportunities for Indigenous people to assert aboriginal rights recognized federally and within the ‘New Relationship’ outlined by the Provincial Government.

Within the Conservancy designation, collaborative management agreements and land use planning agreements are made with local Indigenous people with claims to the area in the
establishment of these protected areas. These institutional structures limit ambiguity, helping to more explicitly support the inclusion of Indigenous cultivation and management practices within Conservancies. This creates more opportunities for Indigenous people to have increased management and control over their traditional territories through active management. However, as BC Parks works to define and establish Conservancies within the province, the agency may also be limiting the extent of where Indigenous people can actively engage in conservation management.

For instance, actively promoting Conservancies as spaces where cultivation and management practices of Indigenous people can occur, while failing to do this within the Class A Park designation because of its focus on preserving and restoring ecological integrity, continues the same problematic conservation ideologies that have existed within the province through fortress conservation. Defining that Indigenous peoples’ practices are acceptable in conservancies but not in Class A Parks works to define these practices as negatively impacting ecological integrity, bounding Indigenous people into specific categories and continuing colonial processes. This limits Indigenous self-determination, re-enforces the state as responsible for deciding how natural resources should be managed, and presents Class A Provincial Parks as ‘better’ at preserving ecological integrity than conservancies (See Table 6 for section summary).
Table 6. Table summarizing key findings from Parks Canada and BC Parks documents that describe the inclusion of Indigenous people within state-led park system and management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document of Focus</th>
<th>Document Priorities</th>
<th>Consequences for Reintroduction Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Promising Pathways| - Parks Canada-Indigenous relationship building  
| The Land is our Teacher | - Accessible partnerships based on respect, shared knowledge, and support  
|                   | - Inclusion of IK in park management through presentation as Canadian history  
|                   | - Checklists as guides in working with communities | - Soft language used throughout  
|                   |                     | - Too general to understand nuance between Indigenous people and parks  
|                   |                     | - Lack concrete steps to include Indigenous people in active management  |
| BC Parks          |                     |                                           |
| ‘New Relationship’ (Provincially led) | - Eliminating gap in standard of living  
|                   | - Revitalizing and preserving Indigenous culture and language  
|                   | - Promotes exercise of Aboriginal rights  
|                   | - Government-to-government agreements regarding land use planning, management, tenure, resource revenue, benefit sharing  
|                   | - Establishing funding opportunities and working groups | - Lack of documentation at BC Parks scale of how new relationship applied  
|                   |                     | - Vagueness in discussion of active management  
|                   |                     | - Class A Parks park use permits needed for Indigenous hunting and cultivation  
|                   |                     | - Conservancies have collaborative management agreements, structure explicitly supporting inclusion of Indigenous cultivation and management practices  
|                   |                     | - Still limiting because re-enforces state as decision maker regarding natural resource management  |
3.4 Funding Frameworks

3.4.1 Parks Canada

All of the projects implemented within Parks Canada that were examined in this research were funded under the Conservation and Restoration funding bracket of the agency (CORE for short). Any park or protected area within the agency across Canada can apply for this funding via a project proposal that outlines project directives and goals. This proposal should outline how the project fits into the mandates and goals of Parks Canada as a whole. If selected, project funding lasts for approximately five years and is meant to cover any costs incurred in initiating the project, including employment of project managers. This nationally organized pocket of funding means that project managers are competing against each other in order to receive funding, even if multiple worthy applications are submitted each year.

The CORE funding program, originally named Action on the Ground, had a focus on protecting and improving the ecological integrity of Canada’s National Parks (Parks Canada, 2005, 2008, 2013). Three reports have been published by Parks Canada that outline Action on the Ground projects that have been awarded funding. The majority of projects focused on supporting Parks Canada’s ecological integrity mandate through species and landscape restoration, species at risk protection and restoration, invasive species removal, and long term monitoring of ecologically important features and species within Parks Canada (Parks Canada, 2005, 2008, 2013).

Although Action on the Ground reports discussed the social benefits of projects, this was often of minimal importance and was secondary to ecological outcomes. Some examples of ‘social’ projects included; promoting positive educational visitor experiences, the use of citizen science in ecological projects, the influence projects had on the perception of nature by visitors,
and improving the relationships and experiences that visitors and Indigenous people alike have with park spaces. Based on the information in these documents, the influence and relationship between Indigenous people and these ecological restoration projects was minimal. The use of traditional ecological knowledge to inform science and relationship building between Nations is mentioned as a valued benefit, but always as secondary to a project’s ecological implications (Parks Canada, 2005, 2008, and 2013).

It is not clear when exactly Action on the Ground was renamed to reflect the current CORE program, but sometime between 2013 and 2016 the language of these ecological restoration projects changed to express projects as conservation and restoration projects. However, the goals for these projects has remained the same with a continued focus on active ecological restoration supporting Parks Canada mandates of ecological integrity, species at risk protection, ecosystem resilience, and control of invasive species (Parks Canada, 2016). The CORE program is touted as the most diverse and progressive program in the agency’s history, through its use of best practices ecologically, as well as socially through engaging with key Canadian audiences and demonstrating exceptional visitor experience (Parks Canada, 2016).

However, because of the temporary nature of these projects and limited pot of competitive funding available, this program is not designed to support long-term initiatives or staff positions. Projects such as the clam garden restoration at GINPR and other Indigenous reintroduction and restoration projects must apply to this funding even though the guidelines for approval do not always fit the motivation(s) and goals for implementing these initiatives. Furthermore, forcing reintroduction initiatives to compete against other projects that only focus on ecological factors, and therefore more easily fit into the requirements of the program, could limit the further integration of reintroduction initiatives. Socially and ecologically driven initiatives are equated
through the application process because there is no structure or funding program in place that explicitly supports the reintroduction or restoration of Indigenous cultivation and management practices within Parks Canada. Overall, the terms of reference and structure of CORE may limit reintroduction initiative implementation and Indigenous active management within National Parks and protected areas (See Table 7 for section summary).

3.4.2 BC Parks

The funding for the reintroduction or restoration of Indigenous cultivation and management practices within the BC Parks agency is dependent on the designation of the protected area where the project is occurring. Within BC Parks, there is limited funding available to be able to implement projects within the management structures of Parks, Conservancies and Recreation Areas. Throughout the province, even the management of trails, restoration, and maintenance of park areas are determined through a contract bidding process. Organizations, both private and non-profit, bid on the opportunity to restore trails and ecological features within the park area and BC Parks managers assign contracts to their chosen organization. It is often a matter of who can accomplish project goals in the most effective and efficient way possible in order for BC Parks to save money. In this way it is beneficial for BC Parks to work with local Indigenous communities within Conservancies because there is added interest in protecting and restoring the landscapes of their traditional territories and it helps to meet the overall ecological and social/cultural goals of the area, potentially without much added cost for BC Parks. Unfortunately, this also means that the capacity of BC Parks to reintroduce and restore Indigenous cultivation and management practices is minimal and it is unclear whether this is a commitment that BC Parks is willing to invest in based on existing financial struggles.
Within Class A Parks, Indigenous management practices would likely have to be implemented through a park use permit, meaning funding would not come from BC Parks but from the permit holder(s) themselves (BC Parks Act, 1996). This would mean individual communities or organizations would be responsible for the funding and access to these projects. At the Conservancy designation, the ability to implement Indigenous cultivation and management practices is built into the purpose of an area’s designation. This means that individuals from the partnering Indigenous communities are at liberty to practice those activities anytime within the Conservancy on their own accord without BC Parks staff supervision. Again in this case, those individuals would be responsible for any costs incurred in reconstructing or restoring Indigenous cultivation and management practices within the Conservancy. However, the opportunity for additional funding from BC Parks would likely exist because of the framework of collaborative management in place between the province and partnering Indigenous communities (See Table 7 for section summary).

**Table 7.** Table summarizing key findings describing how funding is structured within Parks Canada and BC Parks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Funding Program in Place</strong></th>
<th><strong>Funding Program Structure</strong></th>
<th><strong>Consequences for Reintroduction Initiatives</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks Canada</td>
<td>-Granted five years of funding</td>
<td>-Social benefits are secondary and not Indigenous focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Staff compete for one pocket of funding</td>
<td>-Funding temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Proposals must show project goals, directives and how they meet agency mandates</td>
<td>-Focus on ecological integrity mandate may limit reintroduction projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Staff forced to compete meaning reintroduction projects and strictly ecological projects equated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Reintroduction projects less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
likely to receive funding because harder to fit into funding proposal structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BC Parks</th>
<th>Bidding process</th>
<th>Park permits</th>
<th>Collaborative management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Organizations bid to maintain trails, and restore parks areas to help save money</td>
<td>-Class A Parks require permits for extractive use, therefore funding and access responsibility of permit holder(s)</td>
<td>- Possibility for further funding through collaborative management structure of Conservancies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Uncertainty regarding commitment to restoration of Indigenous cultivation and management practices</td>
<td>-Indigenous communities at liberty to practice traditional activities within Conservancies on their own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Protected Area Management Documents

3.5.1 Parks Canada

There are currently four Parks Canada National Park Reserves or National Heritage Sites that are reintroducing or reintegrating Indigenous cultivation and management practices within the park, all of which are coastal. These are: Gulf Islands National Park Reserve, Pacific Rim National Park Reserve, Gwaii Haanas National Park Reserve, and Fort Rodd Hill National Historic Site. As such, all were included within this research (See Table 8).

Table 8. Current Federal parks reintroducing or restoring Indigenous cultivation and management practice in BC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Initiative Name</th>
<th>Reintroduction Type</th>
<th>Indigenous Partners</th>
<th>Conservation Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Islands National Park Reserve</td>
<td>Clam Garden Restoration project</td>
<td>Clam Garden Restoration</td>
<td>Hul’qumi’num and WSANEC</td>
<td>Cultural landform protection and ecological integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Rim National</td>
<td>Kennedy Lake watershed restoration</td>
<td>Stream Restoration</td>
<td>Maa-nulth treaty group,</td>
<td>Ecological integrity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Across the parks examined in this research, there was similarity in the language used within park management documents. Most had a goal of cooperative management and relationship building with relevant Indigenous communities as well as a strong stance on the maintenance and restoration of ecological integrity. The ways in which parks chose to describe how ecological integrity would be maintained and restored depended on the park itself. For example, in order to restore ecological integrity, GINPR stated that there would need to be a focus on connecting land, water, and people (Parks Canada GINPR State of Park Report, 2010). They further went on to discuss how the reintroduction of Indigenous active management and transboundary conservation work would help them to meet their ecological integrity goals. This is indicative of a more holistic approach to ecological integrity that includes human dimensions within the management of park spaces. In contrast, the management document for Pacific Rim National Park Reserve outlined a specific list of ecological indicators that would help to better evaluate ecological integrity within the Park Reserve rather than including any social aspects. This included monitoring and restoring of forest, lake, wetland, stream, and intertidal ecosystems (Parks Canada Pacific Rim, 2010).
In terms of Indigenous involvement in these protected areas, all had a stated goal of working collaboratively with Indigenous people on resource management and ecological integrity, as well as working to resolve Rights and Title claims, treaty implementation, and protecting and presenting Indigenous cultural heritage within their protected areas. For instance, GINPR has a goal of ensuring that Coast Salish people feel they have a strong connection, both physically and symbolically, to the Park Reserve lands and waters and that communities are aware of the opportunities for traditional activities that can occur within the Park Reserve and to facilitate the regular meeting of elders and youth within the Park Reserve to share knowledge with each other (Parks Canada GINPR Draft Management Plan, 2013 pg. 12). Likewise, Gwaii Haanas National Park Reserve includes in its structure the Archipelago Management Board that contains equal membership of Parks Canada and Haida Nation representatives in order to make management decisions within the Park Reserve. Gwaii Haanas has also established the Watchmen Program to help Haida members be involved in the management of the Park Reserve and employment opportunities with Parks Canada for Haida members is also available (Archipelago Management Board, 2007; Government of Canada & Council of the Haida Nation, 2010; Government of Canada, 1993).

Overall, park management documents reflected the ideologies and priorities outlined within structural and policy documents of the Parks Canada agency and focused on aligning within the Canada National Parks Act and agency mandates of ecological integrity, cultural heritage protection, education, and visitor experience. State of the park reports and management plans were more specific in the inclusion of Indigenous partners and the motivations for increasing and improving the involvement of Indigenous communities within park management. However, the different approaches taken to do this varied depending on the park itself, leading to
the conclusion that the reintroduction of Indigenous cultivation and management practices is highly dependent upon the relationships between Indigenous community members and staff and managers within Parks Canada on the ground (See Table 9 for section summary)

3.5.2 BC Parks

Through analyzing master plans and management documents published by BC Parks, and the ways that cultural and ecological features were discussed in those documents, I identified multiple possible protected areas as potential sites for the reintroduction of Indigenous cultivation and management practices. All were operating under the Conservancy designation. However, as will be discussed in the next chapter, interviews with staff suggest that the agency is still in the developing stages of reintroducing Indigenous cultivation and management practices compared to the Federal level. At this time, Conservancies across the province are the most likely places where the reintroduction or restoration of Indigenous cultivation and management practices will occur.

The goals and guidelines outlined by traditional Class A Provincial Parks that I examined differed a lot from each other depending on the location and size of the area. The majority of Class A Parks had a focus on the protection and maintenance of the unique terrestrial and marine ecosystems and species at risk within the park. Many outlined both settler and Indigenous heritage interpretation as important in order to provide unique recreation opportunities. In terms of ecological management, the goal was often to remain adaptive while working to improve ecological integrity, mitigate the growing impacts of climate change, and manage invasive species. Overall, management documents were limited in their discussion of social and cultural factors in parks and had a much larger focus on ecological management and the enhancement of recreational opportunities.
The discussion of Indigenous involvement in Class A Park management documents focused on consultation and relationship building with Indigenous people throughout park management planning as well as the acknowledgment that park areas are within the traditional territories of local Indigenous people and contain Indigenous archaeological sites. In working with Indigenous people in the actual management of park areas, management documents were limited and only referred to the ability of Indigenous people to continue to practice Aboriginal rights within the park, but did not discuss how these rights would be enabled by BC Parks or the process that would be necessary for Indigenous people to assert rights. None of the management documents examined discussed collaborative engagement with Indigenous people as an approach to ecological management of park areas, nor was the use of Indigenous cultivation and management practices mentioned as an approach that would provide both social and ecological benefits.

Within Conservancy master plans and management documents it was apparent that the priorities of these protected areas focused more on the inclusion of Indigenous people within decision-making and management compared to Class A Parks. The goal of Conservancies was often to protect the access and use of landscapes important to Indigenous people, both historic and present day. The creation of Conservancies was a result of land use plans or land and resource management processes and Conservancy documents stated that collaborative management between the province and Indigenous people was a priority. Similar to Class A Parks, Conservancies promoted the protection of terrestrial and marine habitats as well as the species at risk within Conservancy spaces. The difference between these two designations however, was that the chosen species of focus often coincided with a cultural significance to local Indigenous people. Furthermore, management documents explicitly stated goals of
providing sustainable economic opportunities through recreation purposes or aquaculture as well as the protection of areas used by Indigenous people for continued social, ceremonial, and cultural use. It is evident that human presence is seen as integral within these ecosystems and that the ecological importance of these areas is equally important to its cultural significance, especially the protection of archeological sites (See Table 9 for section summary).

**Table 9.** Table summarizing key findings regarding protected area management documents for Parks Canada and BC Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks Canada</th>
<th>Management Document Goals</th>
<th>Consequences for Reintroduction Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Cooperative management and relationship building with Indigenous communities</strong></td>
<td>-Cultivation and management practice inclusion dependent on the park itself and relationships that exist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-Maintenance and restoration of ecological integrity</strong></td>
<td>-How ecological integrity was described depended on park itself, therefore varied in compatibility with reintroduction taking place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Working to resolve Rights and Title claims, treaty implementation, protecting and presenting Indigenous cultural heritage</strong></td>
<td>-Goals implemented in both formal and informal ways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BC Parks</th>
<th>Management Document Goals</th>
<th>Consequences for Reintroduction Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class A Parks</strong></td>
<td>-Focus on ecological management through ecological integrity and recreational opportunities</td>
<td>-Most likely compatible within Conservancy designation and structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-limited social and cultural influence discussed</td>
<td>-Structure of land use plans and land and resource management processes in Conservancies create more opportunities for indigenous people be involved in active management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Inclusion of Indigenous people through consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Limited discussion of how BC Parks will enable the assertion of Aboriginal rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Conservancies | -Protecting access and use of landscapes important to Indigenous people  
|              | -Providing sustainable economic opportunities |

### 3.6 Findings Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to examine Parks Canada and BC Parks documents that outline relevant institutional, legislative, and budgetary structures and describe the ways that these structures influence and shape reintroduction initiatives. A summary table outlining this chapter’s findings can be found in Table 10.

The creation of new designations at the Federal and Provincial level has a significant influence on how Indigenous people are involved in state-led conservation in the province and helps to shape the how park management take place as a result. This is also true for the implementation of reintroduction initiatives with the majority occurring within National Park Reserves at the Federal level and Conservancies at the Provincial level. Parks Canada and BC Parks Act(s) state that their focus is the protection and management of ecologically significant areas and natural resources as well as maintaining and restoring ecological integrity. Overarching policy documents similarly stated that a stewardship of ecological integrity was a priority in the management and protection of protected areas but also outlined the importance of working more collaboratively with Indigenous partners along with state and non-state organizations. However, both agencies described social factors as secondary to the ecological implications involved in the restoration and management of park areas. There was no explicit support for the implementation of reintroduction initiatives within the Park Act(s) or overarching policy documents and policies
often took more “hands off” approaches. Specific park management documents from Parks Canada described the importance of maintaining ecological integrity, working collaboratively with Indigenous partners and working to resolve Rights and Title claims within park areas. Likewise, documents from Class A Provincial parks continued to discuss the importance of ecological integrity along with recreational opportunities and the inclusion of Indigenous people though consultation. In contrast, within Conservancies, the priorities of management plans was often more focused on Indigenous people, the use of the protected area by Indigenous community members and the ability of small economic opportunities to occur with the boundaries of the Conservancy.

My analysis of documents that described how Indigenous people should be involved in park management at the federal level focused on building relationships between Parks Canada and Indigenous partners based on respect, accessibility, and shared knowledge in order to manage parks. Provincially, there is no BC Parks document that outlines the inclusion of Indigenous people however, within Class A Parks, park use permits would be needed in order to implement extractive practices within park boundaries. In contrast, the support for collaborative management in Conservancies means that Indigenous partners are able to undertake Aboriginal practices within its boundaries and there is more explicit support of Indigenous cultivation and management practices within Conservancy

Parks Canada and BC Parks budgetary structures that shape how reintroduction initiatives are implemented focused on ecological restoration as a priority. At the Federal level, the competitive CORE funding program is granted to a park in order to implement restoration projects with most successful programs focusing on restoration and preservation of ecological integrity rather than social or cultural restoration. At the Provincial level, there is limited funding
available, with most management of protected areas occurring through a bidding process. For extractive use of natural resources within Class A Parks, park use permits are needed but within Conservancies, there is a greater likelihood that additional funding could be allocated to practice Indigenous cultivation and management practice based on the existing framework of collaborative management. These findings indicate that National Park Reserves and Conservancies are the two designations where reintroduction initiatives are more likely to occur, but that a focus on ecological integrity within legislative, policy, and budgetary structures is shaping and in many ways constraining the further implementation of these practices within park management.

Table 10. Summary of chapter 3 findings. Table summarizing the key findings from this chapter discussing the different designations of focus for this research, the purpose of these designations, each one’s approach to the inclusion of Indigenous people, and the budgetary structure of each type of park or protected area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designations</th>
<th>Purpose for Designation</th>
<th>Approach to Indigenous Inclusion</th>
<th>Funding Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park</td>
<td>For the protection to ecological integrity, education, and strong visitor experience</td>
<td>Context Specific, Variety, most commonly through duty to consult with Indigenous people</td>
<td>worked in through CORE ecological restoration program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park Reserve</td>
<td>All stated priorities of national park as well as an amendment to Canadian National Park Act that acknowledges existence of land claims</td>
<td>Memorandums of understanding, working groups and traditional harvesting planning, collaborative management (formal and informal)</td>
<td>Worked in through CORE ecological restoration program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Parks</td>
<td>Class A Provincial Park</td>
<td>For the preservation of natural environment for inspiration, use and enjoyment of public</td>
<td>Agreements with province for exercise of Aboriginal rights for social, ceremonial, and cultural purposes, Resource use permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservancy</td>
<td>Amendment to BC Park Act protection of biological diversity but also preservation of social, ceremonial and cultural uses of Indigenous people Natural resource use in sustainable manner</td>
<td>Cultivation and harvesting built into purpose of protection, opportunities for economic development Resource use permits</td>
<td>Collaborative management agreement between Indigenous people and province Park use Permit Minimal internal funding available Bidding Process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4 Structural Impacts on Practice & Case Study Analysis

This chapter will discuss my analysis of notes written during participant observation in GINPR undertaken between May-July, 2016 and interviews with both Parks Canada and BC Parks staff. The objective of analysis was to identify and explore motivations, challenges, and lessons learned in initiatives that reintroduce Indigenous cultivation, harvest, and management practices as identified by interviewees. This is useful in combination with the previous chapter because it helps to understand ‘on the ground’ experiences and, perhaps, identify disconnects between current legislative and budgetary policy and efforts being made on the ground by Parks Canada and BC Parks staff and the degree to which this contributes to, or challenges fortress conservation ideologies.

I begin by first discussing the motivations and challenges of integrating these practices within current legislative and policy structures, both logistically and structurally. Second, I will describe the influence protected area designations have on the integration of reintroduction projects. Third, I will describe the ‘lessons learned’ as communicated by interview participants. Lastly, I will describe the GINPR clam garden restoration project in more detail, focusing on how the structural and logistical challenges and motivations are demonstrated within the Park Reserve’s project. It is useful to consider one case in more detail to gain a new depth of information about how reintroduction projects work in practice and to be able to make recommendations and generalizations across other projects being implemented or future projects that may be initiated. The GINPR clam garden restoration project is valuable in particular as a case study because it has gained significant publicity and is further along in its development than any other project in the province.
4.1 Motivations and Challenges

4.1.1 Motivations

In contrast to policies and budgetary documents within Parks Canada and BC Parks which focused on the promotion and protection of ecological integrity, interviewees expressed many ecological and social motivations behind the pursuit and initiation of the reintroduction initiatives within the parks and protected areas where they are employed. The most prevalent social motivation was to facilitate the reconnection of Indigenous people with land and seascapes within their traditional territories and help bring youth and elders together in knowledge sharing and teaching about traditional ecological management, alongside positivist western science. Funding and permits are needed to initiate and sustain reintroduction initiatives and this presents a clear barrier to the greater interaction of Indigenous people with land and seascapes, especially Indigenous youth. Park boundaries separate communities from their traditional territories and, if opportunities to engage in harvest, cultivation, and management activities in the park are tied to officially permitted reintroduction initiatives, transport, equipment, and staffing costs add up. Interviewees stated the importance of being able to help catalyze this reconnection through project initiation and protection and restoration of these important traditional spaces and features.

Reintroduction initiatives were also mentioned as possibly contributing to the protection of Indigenous traditional food systems and the ability of Indigenous communities to maintain food sovereignty. This was mentioned by only a few interviewees as a motivation for establishing these projects within protected areas. However, more than 75% of interviewees believed that the reintroduction of traditional Indigenous practices would help to restore the health of these areas and therefore help parks and protected areas meet their mandates for protection of cultural heritage as well as ecological integrity. Interviewees believed reintroduction initiatives supported
ecological integrity mandates through their ability to protect and restore at risk species and ecosystems, restoring their ecological health. This connection of ecological and social benefits and motivation was exemplified by one Parks Canada staff member who stated:

“through the restoration project one of the big things that we are trying to do is essentially a lot of our beaches are not as healthy as they need to be and so we need to improve their ecological health, and a lot of our cultural systems are not as healthy anymore either […] so what we are trying to do is improve cultural connections […] to places and improve ecological health by bringing people back into these systems that required people to be part of them” (Interview B2).

A few interviewees identified that it is important to shift beyond just knowledge extraction to creating opportunities wherein Indigenous people use and implement their management practices. This idea of reintroducing Indigenous management practices is a shift from common conservation practice, which often focuses on the use of Indigenous knowledge in order to support traditional western scientific practices. This is important in thinking about knowledge co-production between Indigenous people and parks staff and managers to help to build Indigenous culture into the future rather than freeze that knowledge in the past and limit its ability to evolve over time.

4.1.2 Challenges

Although interviewees were very excited to discuss how reintroduction initiatives helped them to meet park mandates, create opportunities to build relationships with Indigenous partners, and improve the overall health of park areas, staff and managers also mentioned the challenges in initiating these projects. The most common logistical challenge discussed in interviews was a lack of funding to be able to implement reintroduction projects to the scale and extent they believed necessary to create benefits. Operating on shoestring budgets was often discussed, with access to equipment, transportation, and resources a continual source of frustration and limitation.
in planning. At the Federal level, all four projects examined are funded through the CORE funding program rather than the project being built into the management plans of the Park Reserve. If Parks Canada staff are granted the funding, they have five years in order to implement their projects, including staffing, monitoring, experimental design, and data collection as needed. Approximately 75% of Parks Canada interviewees were thankful for even getting five years of funding in order to implement projects. However, many believed that this was not enough time to implement any long-term monitoring to ensure the future continuation of the project. Staff and managers have to constantly look for new funds either through the agency, or apply for grants outside of the agency through partnering with other organizations. This presents a challenge for the inclusion of strong ecological monitoring and limits the ability of staff and managers to adapt and grow projects further.

The most prominent structural challenge indicated by interviewees was the struggle to balance the objectives and commitments of the initiatives with the interests and priorities identified by Indigenous partners and participants. Parks staff and managers often have to work as mediators between Indigenous communities and the state, trying to find ways to more holistically include Indigenous management practices while simultaneously ensuring that these projects do not disagree with the Park(s) Act, mandates or guidelines from the Federal and Provincial Governments. Park staff and managers also mentioned that there is a challenge in implementing reintroduction projects because of the diminished weight their preferred decisions have within the institutional hierarchy of state-led conservation. For instance, as an agency of the Canadian Federal Government, Parks Canada cannot separate itself from the viewpoints of the state. This has created challenges in implementing these reintroduction projects because the broader issue of Rights and Title is left at least partially unanswered in parks wherein there is no
or only partial coverage under modern-day treaties. Where Indigenous land claims exist and overlap with each other there is no clarity from the state on how to handle possible conflicts in Parks Canada management on the ground. For example, as one Parks Canada employee stated,

“The fundamental stumbling block is, how does the Federal Government recognize assertion of Rights and Title in areas where there’s extreme amounts of overlap. So you know if we’re just dealing with just one First Nations saying, or even one language group or one cultural group […] it would probably be a bit more straightforward but because there’s two different groups that assert Rights and Title and there’s been no clarity provided by the Federal Government on those assertions, that has been really challenging.” (Interview B1).

Furthermore, staff and managers often found it challenging to try to fit projects into the mandates of the park or work to interpret the Park(s) Act in ways that could be helpful to the protected area and for Indigenous community partners. Many believed it was important to follow the Park(s) Act and the guidelines and legislation supported by the Federal and Provincial Governments, and tried to incorporate those views within project proposals. However, these challenges between policy and practice was also often seen as a struggle for park staff members and organizations. This was indicated by one Federal parks employee, who said,

“we look at projects like this that are fairly you know, scientifically based or deductionist reasoning to it, now when you want to sort of include holistic knowledge to that and have deliverables it is very challenging on how you incorporate that and I think the staff here [GINPR] do a good job in bringing it in but when it still comes down to proposals and also showing results how the validation of traditional knowledge we are still trying to put into a western scientific paradigm and that becomes very challenging” (Interview B7).

This interview quote not only describes how working within the mandates of parks can be challenging but also how Indigenous knowledge is still required to be validated by western science in order to be valuable based on the budgetary and policy structures in place within state-led parks.
Another structural limitation was the promotion of state-led parks as pristine wilderness. In some park documents and websites, park spaces are portrayed and promoted to the public as areas of pristine wilderness landscapes. Although Parks Canada and BC Parks agencies are active participants in this portrayal, many staff members did not believe that parks and protected areas should be promoted as pristine wilderness. Many park staff members found this perception of park spaces as a great challenge in implementing reintroduction projects because project implementation directly counters pristineness and separation of humans from nature. Staff and managers often have to actively promote the inclusion of people on the landscape trying to prove to the public the importance of humans in the landscape while also contradicting state-led parks promotional and policy materials that promote pristineness. Parks employees often expressed frustration with this. For example,

“while our thought is changing and our intent is changing these Acts and regulations have not, so sometimes we need to change, come up with ways to deal with that either, like taking parts of the park out or like with our project, thinking about you know, working relationships on the ground, and hopefully over time that those Acts and regulations will evolve too. Those are always the things that seem to change, Acts and regulations do not usually drive change they just kind of entrench the idea so when those things evolve over time then they kind of catch up to some of our thinking”(Interview B1).

As a result of these logistical and structural challenges, parks staff and managers need to be able to adapt and shift their approaches to implementation in order to support both community partners and their agencies. Data revealed that in a few Parks Canada cases, in order to remain adaptable and work within the structures in place, reintroduction projects are being implemented both inside and outside of park boundaries. This transboundary work occurred to the largest extent within GINPR and Pacific Rim National Park Reserve and coincided with an increased
decentralization of work with Parks Canada working more with outside partnering organizations or communities.

According to interviewees, this transboundary work is occurring for two reasons. The first is that the focus of a project is based on ecological boundaries such as watershed scales, rather than based on the political boundaries of the park. The second reason why transboundary conservation often takes place is because areas outside of the park’s boundaries were identified by Indigenous partners as both culturally and ecologically important, with a motivation to restore and manage those areas specifically. The inclusion of transboundary work also means that community and organization partners can be further included within a project, increasing possible funding opportunities through external grants and partnerships and the overall longevity of the initiative. In these cases, transboundary work was necessary because there was limited structural and financial support within the Parks Canada Agency to implement these projects within park management. However, transboundary work has also created new challenges due to regulations and permits necessary for doing work outside of the park boundaries.

In the two cases where transboundary work is being done, it also coincided with a decentralization of work on and responsibility to the project to partnering organizations or to Indigenous communities themselves. Interviewees felt this decentralization helped them further their relationships with Indigenous people by proxy of other partnering organizations who included Indigenous communities within the structures of their organizations and increased possible funding opportunities. Staff believed they were finding new ways to work within the overarching structures of their agencies and create further opportunities to include Indigenous partners within conservation. A decentralization of work for reintroduction projects also leaves open the possibility for projects to continue after the five year funding window offered through
the Parks Canada CORE funding program because outside organizations can apply for funding packages outside of the Parks Canada framework, opening up a greater number of grants available to these projects. Parks staff and managers’ ability to adapt to structural challenges presented to them can be viewed as a demonstration of a ‘break-down’ of fortress conservation because of their ability to influence conservation outside of park boundaries.

However, this decentralization also has negative implications. The shift of duty from agency workers to outside organizations and community members may only be shifting work load and responsibility onto communities and organizations with limited capacity, without any of the benefits of shared decision-making and power sharing. A lack of structural support within agencies for this decentralization means that parks staff and managers working on these projects are forced to troubleshoot as best they can to help accomplish goals, promote mandates outlined within the legislative structures of conservation agencies, and work to include Indigenous practices more equitably and holistically. Furthermore, it can be argued that state-led conservation staff and managers working collaboratively outside of park boundaries is a strengthening of fortress conservation as well since Parks policies and regulations are influencing what practices are implemented on the ground.

4.2 Designations

Building from the structural challenges outlined in the previous section and the explanation of protected area designations within chapter three, I chose to further analyze these newer designations to better understand their impact on reintroduction initiative implementation and parks staff and managers opinions of them. Interviews with park staff and managers revealed that park designations have a large impact on the capacity of staff to collaboratively reintroduce and restore Indigenous management practices within the projects examined in this research.
Interviewees reflected that under the designation of National Park Reserve or Conservancy, there is a greater opportunity to implement projects that involve the active management, reintroduction, or restoration of Indigenous cultivation and management practices within the parks and protected areas in which they were employed. More than 50% of interviewees described the creation of these new designations as beneficial for the implementation of Indigenous cultivation and management practices and their ability to improve state-Indigenous relations, working as one way to include human dimensions of conservation into park practice and management. In a comparison of National Parks and National Park Reserves, one interviewee discussed how,

“…National Park Reserves enable things to happen where we don’t have the certainty of treaties to tell us what our partners have a right to do. It gets a little bit trickier in some of the older parks because the legislative framework is a bit different, but even in those cases there’s still ability to do certain things but the tools may not be quite what they need to be” (Interview E1).

This is indicative of the differences in structure within these two Federal park designations and their compatibility with Indigenous cultivation and management practices, especially in the absence of a treaty.

At the Federal level, a few interviewees stated that the establishment of National Park Reserves works as a way to recognize the problematic history of traditional state-led conservation and influences future relationships between the state and Indigenous peoples. For instance, some interviewees believed that the establishment of a National Park would never happen again unless it was first a National Park Reserve. This was seen as a positive development in moving beyond fortress conservation and acknowledging the unceded nature of the province. Likewise, one interviewee reflected that the creation of the National Park Reserve designation allowed for more resources to be allocated towards social change and relationship
building with Indigenous people, and helped to change perceptions of what can and should occur within a national park system, both within the agency and to the broader public. For example, one Parks Canada employee mentioned “[the Reserve designation] has a fairly substantial impact on the operations of how we work with First Nations and how these kinds of projects happen or kind of like the importance of these kinds of projects” (Interview B2).

However, interviewees also believed that projects and conservation practice that is more attentive to human dimensions of conservation is happening more quickly than the rate in which legislation can currently change to reflect the practical work of parks staff and managers. Although reintroduction projects can have positive effects within existing policy structures, staff also have to work around regulations and policies to fit the needs of both community partners and the objectives and mandates of the agency, which could be limiting a reintroduction project’s full potential. This restricts the ability of Parks Canada staff and managers to make change because they are limited by the slow bureaucratic pace of legislation and policy structures within state-led conservation.

At the Provincial level, one interviewee believed that the establishment of a protected area under the Conservancy designation helped create a stronger level of trust between local Indigenous people and the state because there is not the same kind of negative history that is associated with traditional Class A Parks. This individual also believed that there has been an increased willingness to share knowledge with BC Parks through the creation and management of Conservancies, therefore increasing the effectiveness of management of conservation areas. For example, Indigenous people were consulted regarding the creation of Conservancies, helping decide the boundaries and focus of protected areas as well as identifying areas and species of interest to communities for protection as well as use. All interviewees from BC Parks stated that
through the Conservancy designation, they were able to meet the protected areas’ broader mandates because the ability to harvest by Indigenous people is built directly into the structure for the protected area and the designation itself.

In contrast, within Class A Parks, permits are necessary in order to do the same types of activities based on the structure of a Class A Park. The main difference in structure between these two designations is that at the Class A level it is about deciding what an allowable activity is, whereas at the Conservancy level, these activities are part of the purpose of the areas protection. In both designations, BC Parks would have final control over what harvesting levels will be and can limit harvesting if species are critically endangered. According to all interviewees from BC Parks, this explicitly stated structural difference allows for more fluidity for Indigenous people to engage within the park system and was seen as beneficial for more collaborative and equitable conservation practice.

4.3 Lessons learned

There are a few key lessons that interviewees identified as important in the implementation of the projects they worked on. At the Federal level, 75% of interviewees reflected that the first step to effective and efficient project implementation was the early involvement of Indigenous partners in the planning stages of the project. Staff who identified that their projects included Indigenous partners from the early stages also viewed their projects as more successful in the implementation and management of these reintroductions than those who included Indigenous people later on in the process of implementing the project. Most interviewees believed it was important that Indigenous people be involved in projects from the beginning and some stated that this was something they would focus on more if they could do the project over again. For instance one interviewee stated:
“... we get funding for a project and then we go up to the nations and say: what do you think and how would you like to be involved, and we have already made the decision by that point about what we are going to do, what we are going to focus our money on, what we are going to ask for, what our objectives are and then we bring in the nations at that point. It is not an effective way to engage First Nations in management and restoration, so I think that is why the project [GINPR] is so successful, it is because it is born out of communities as opposed to something we have developed” (Interview B1).

This is indicative of an understanding of how Indigenous people have been involved in park projects in the past and how they are working to improve that relationship and share in the planning and decision-making of individual projects within the park.

Beyond the specific timeline of the involvement of Indigenous communities, another significant step in implementing reintroduction initiatives was the degree to which Indigenous people were involved in the planning and active management of the projects. For example, the creation of knowledge working groups or management boards was often used as a strategy for working collaboratively with local Indigenous communities. These boards are used to help identify sites of interest, decide how Indigenous practices will be used in the management of these sites, and help decide courses of action for projects based on decisions from these working groups. These boards decide what traditional knowledge will be shared with Parks Canada staff members and there can be multiple boards based on the number of Indigenous communities involved in the park and the project more specifically. The existence of traditional knowledge working groups or project management boards often meant that projects were further along in their projected goals and implementation of the projects and interviewees felt that these boards helped projects remain inclusive and adaptive to change. On the other hand, projects that focus on consultation without formal management or projects boards often had regrets and wished there was more thorough involvement of Indigenous people in their projects.
From an ecological perspective, the majority of interviewees at the Federal level expressed the need for further monitoring programs to see how these projects continue to impact the ecological health of park ecosystems and identify changes that need to be made to management or to help legitimize the management practices that are currently in place. In some projects, this monitoring is built into the timeline of the project. However, this monitoring often ends, at least empirically, when the project comes to an end after the five year funding window from CORE. Parks staff believed they could still see anecdotally the benefits or impacts that these projects were having on park areas but without long term monitoring it may be difficult to continue to prove the worth of these projects at a higher level to sustain funding and resources necessary to maintain them. This is indicative of the existing budgetary and policy structures limiting the implementation of projects and a reluctance from state-led conservation agencies to fully support the implementation and legitimacy of Indigenous cultivation and management practices.

4.4 GINPR case study

This section will discuss in more detail the case study for this research, the clam garden restoration project happening at GINPR. This case will be used to exemplify how structural and logistical challenges are effecting the reintroduction of Indigenous cultivation and management practices and shaping how reintroduction initiatives are implemented on the ground. I chose to further analyze this project based on the increased degree of detail of data that was collected in interviews and participant observation note taking, and because of the degree of publicity this project has received. GINPR is an interesting case in terms of the reintroduction and reintegration of Indigenous cultivation and management practices. The park is fairly new to the agency, established in 2003, and as such the steps taken during the creation of the park are different than many others in the province and are indicative of this shift in conservation towards
including humans more equitability in conservation processes and working past fortress conservation models.

The clam garden restoration is funded through the CORE funding bracket from Parks Canada and the funding lasts for five years. This funding is meant to cover all costs involved in implementing the project, getting partners involved, and paying Parks Canada staff members working on the project. Currently, the project has been extended for another three years through additional funding allocation from external funding sources and the project has made the addition of an urchin transplanting and monitoring component to help in beach management. It was mentioned by multiple interviewees, even outside of GINPR staff, that the success of this project was based on the work and dedication of specific GINPR staff members. Multiple times, interviewees stated that if it was not for X individual working so hard that the project would not have been such a success.

Alongside the active clam garden restoration and wall rebuilding taking place which is a major component of the reintroduction initiative, the use of science and culture camps for Indigenous and non-Indigenous youth has been implemented. These camps occur over the summer months with Hul’qumi’num and SENCOTEN community members and focus on teaching youth about clam garden spaces as important cultural landscapes and archaeological features but also as important ecological features to the intertidal area of coastal BC. This is taught by partnering researchers, archaeologists, and Parks Canada scientists as well as by Indigenous community elders and knowledge holders.

There is already some evidence that suggests that walled clam beaches contain bivalves of higher density and higher abundance as well as increased abundance of other marine species and
species from higher trophic levels (Groesbeck et al. 2014). If research from this initiative continues to support this trend, then this would validate the further restoration and active management of clam gardens along the northwest coast. Proving that these cultivation and management practices are ecologically important for these beaches is crucial for supporting the inclusion of Indigenous practice within coastal conservation. Not only is the idea of active management important for this case but also for the reintroduction of caring for clam garden spaces. The continuation of caring for culturally and ecologically important landforms is important for thinking about relationship building with Indigenous people and supporting the continuation of ecological ‘care’ as the continuation of Indigenous practice and culture.

Currently, the project is working in collaboration with a larger ongoing long-term monitoring project happening in the park that focuses on bivalves. The bivalve monitoring project consists of sampling on eight different beaches across GINPR every three years. Quadrats are dug on the beaches and any live clams found within the quadrat are collected to be weighed, measured, and identified by species type. The clams are then put back into the same hole that they were collected from and covered to be monitored in future years. During the time line of the clam garden project, the two clam garden sites being restored will be sampled in the same ways to compare health and productively between walled and non-walled beaches. Understanding the abundance, density, and diversity of bivalves distributed across individual beaches as well as comprehensively understanding this across all the beaches being sampled helps to better understand the overall health of the beaches and how that health may be changing from year to year. Along with quadrat dig sites, sediment samples are collected from the beaches to understand how aeration and sediment type may also be affecting beach health on both walled
and unaltered beaches. Shoreline profiling is also occurring here to understand sediment movement on beaches, especially along walled clam beds.

The clam garden project is being presented and implemented as an experiment to both Parks Canada and the public. Along with the active rebuilding of the two clam garden walls and the monitoring mentioned previously, two non-walled beaches have been included within the experiment as control sites to understand the differences in management strategies between walled and non-walled clam beaches. This can help with the understanding of clam garden landforms as well as how to best manage coastal park areas. Approaching this case as an experiment helps establish the adaptability necessary for active management of clam garden spaces but also for continued relationship building with Indigenous communities. Likewise, framing this reintroduction initiative within a traditional scientific methodological approach may be helping the project receive funds through the CORE funding program because it helps the project fit more easily into this framework. Knowledge working groups for the projects help guide the management of the clam gardens, allowing for continued evaluation of project design and collaboration between Parks Canada and Indigenous people. Furthermore, collecting strong ecological data through this experiment could help in proving that Indigenous traditional management practices are ecologically important for the conservation of Park areas. This data would help support the theory that this active management helps protect against coastal erosion, biodiversity health and abundance, and prove that traditional practices are equally placed next to positivist scientific frameworks.

However, this project still deals with the struggles of limited funding through the CORE program run by Parks Canada and there are possible issues surrounding the experimental nature of the project. Posing the restoration project as an experiment may limit its ability to be
implemented further within the management of the Park Reserve. Experimentation can be very temporary in nature so it could, if future funding limitations forced this into play, make it much easier to stop the restoration project all together because of its implementation as an experiment rather than being built into the overall management of the Park Reserve. The project’s background in strong ecological science and monitoring means that it fits into the requirements for CORE funding better than if the project focussed only on traditional knowledge practices as the scientific basis. This is beneficial for receiving additional funding, but this also means that Indigenous knowledge must be legitimized by western scientific knowledge and is not considered equal to this knowledge. This is one way that the structure of Parks Canada constrains and controls the types of projects being implemented within the agency because of the strictness of its funding capabilities and limitations based on knowledge acceptance.

Furthermore, the clam garden restoration is occurring through transboundary work inside and outside of the park boundaries. There are two clam gardens of focus for the project, one of which is inside the park, the other, just outside of the parks reserve’s boundaries. This is beneficial as both sites are fairly accessible by boat, making engagement with Indigenous community members easier to establish and stretching the limited financial capacity of Parks Canada to engage in this project. The majority of interviewees from GINPR stated that this transboundary work was beneficial because it helped them to remain adaptable to the needs of their Indigenous community partners and focus on a more holistic approach to conservation and ecosystem management, rather than focusing only on areas within the boundaries of the Park Reserve. Yet, this transboundary restoration work also creates challenges for GINPR as the jurisdiction of the clam garden site outside of the park boundaries changes from federal to provincial. The site located within park boundaries is completely under the jurisdiction of Parks
Canada and as a result, can be restored and managed based on Parks Canada rules, regulations, and policies, whereas the site outside of the park is subject to scrutiny from additional state agencies.

However, the clam garden located outside of the park boundaries is subject to Provincial permitting through the British Columbia Archaeological branch. The site becomes the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government therefore triggering the involvement of the BC Archaeology branch. This branch works to protect archaeological sites in the province, including clam gardens. However, as a result, the branch disagrees with the active management and restoration of clam gardens. This is a barrier to implementing the restoration project. Not only does this slow the project process down, it can also create larger issues of limiting the progression and growth of Indigenous culture and practices. Freezing clam garden beaches as unalterable archaeological features limits the amount of active management that can be done by Indigenous people even through active use and management of clam gardens is crucial to their health. These transboundary challenges are indicative of the ways that institutional structures are shaping how the reintroduction of Indigenous cultivation and management practices takes place and limits the further implementation of these projects within a state-led conservation framework.

4.5 Findings Summary

The goal of this chapter was to describe the motivations, challenges, and lessons learned by parks staff and managers in engaging in reintroduction initiatives exemplifying how institutional structures are shaping how Indigenous cultivation and management practices are implemented within Parks Canada and BC Parks. This chapter also contained in more detail, the case study for this research, the clam garden restoration initiative in GINPR. Interviewees described one of the
main social motivations of engaging in reintroduction initiatives was to facilitate the
reconnection of Indigenous people to traditional territories located inside park boundaries.
Reintroduction initiatives were seen as having social benefits through the protection of cultural
heritage but also ecological benefits by supporting mandates of ecological integrity through
engaging in Indigenous cultivation and management activities within the park.

Parks staff and managers identified limited funding as a barrier to the further
implementation of reintroduction projects because funding through the CORE program lasts only
five years. The ability to include long term monitoring within this timeframe was challenging for
interviewees to pursue and this connected back to the structural limitations that exist within
policy and budgetary frameworks of Parks Canada and BC Parks. As agents of the Federal and
Provincial Governments, interviewees described the difficulty in working to meet the needs of
Indigenous community partners while also ensuring that reintroduction initiatives did not
disagree with acts, mandates, or policy guidelines put in place by the Government. Furthermore,
the issue of Rights and Title claims is left at least partially unanswered across the province,
making it difficult for parks staff and managers to work collaboratively and mitigate possible
conflict without any guidance in place from the institutions in which they are employed.

The implementation of reintroduction initiatives within newer designations and the
benefits that these created was something that interviewees discussed in detail. Staff and
managers believed that the designations of National Park Reserve and Conservancy allowed for
more resources to be allocated to social change and relationship building with Indigenous people,
helping to move state-led conservation agencies away from fortress conservation ideologies and
working to slowly address the negative history in place within traditional park systems.
However, some interviewees expressed that projects and practices that are more attentive to
human dimensions of conservation are developing more quickly than the rate that institutional policy can change to reflect this work, even within these new designations.

A lesson reflected on by interviewees was the need to include Indigenous partners early on in the planning and decision-making process of reintroduction projects in order to be more collaborative and overall successful in project implementation. Furthermore, staff and managers outlined how the inclusion of knowledge working grounds and project management boards was beneficial for increasing the involvement of Indigenous partners throughout project implementation and facilitating Indigenous decision-making authority within initiatives.

The clam garden restoration project in GINPR, was used as a case study to further exemplify how logistical and structural challenges shape how reintroduction initiatives are implemented on the ground. This case was found to have many of the same logistical and structural challenges outlined above and staff and managers were motivated to implement this project to create both social and ecological benefits. The project itself works in collaboration with a long-term bivalve monitoring project occurring within the Park Reserve and is being structured and presented as an experiment. Doing so enables the adaptability necessary to actively manage clam garden spaces and also helps the project receive funding through the CORE program. The use of traditional scientific method allows the project to more easily fit into the funding program in place and will also help support the use of traditional management practices as ecological restoration and support for ecological integrity.
Chapter 5 Discussion and Conclusion

The aim of this research was to assess the ability that reintroduction initiatives have to move beyond fortress conservation, specifically the ways in which protected areas tend to be grounded in dichotomous ideologies about humans and nature, prioritize particular conservation practices, and enforce a top-down governance structure. To achieve this aim, I executed three objectives. First, I created a list of Parks Canada and BC Parks projects that reintegrate and/or reconstruct Indigenous cultivation and management practices within state-led parks and protected areas in BC. Second, I documented key institutional and budgetary structures that shape reintroduction initiatives and evaluated key opportunities and challenges that they present. Finally, I examined the lessons learned by park staff to make recommendations for the future potential of projects within state-led parks and protected areas more broadly.

Overall, findings show that policy and budgetary structures shape the reintroduction of Indigenous cultivation and management practices, and, over the long term, may place limits on the number, longevity, and staffing of reintroduction initiatives within BC. Thus, while positive place-based relationships seem to be growing and opportunities opening up through the initiatives in my study, there is a risk that the full potential of reintroduction initiatives may not be reached and/or that they may not be fully sustained. Limitations and challenges experienced on the ground can, and should, be interpreted in terms of neocolonial understandings and ingrained approaches to protected areas and conservation more broadly.

5.1 Discussion

Reintroduction initiatives seem to be occurring more often within the National Park Reserve and Conservancy designations. As described in chapter 4, interviewees expressed many motivations for the initiation of specific projects. Most spoke to the importance of the inclusion
of people within conservation work, and several noted that healthy ‘eco-cultural’ landscapes are integral to the success of park mandates. A number of interviewees discussed how humans must be included within the landscape to ensure ecological health and protection, and have recognized the significance of Indigenous ecological management in shaping and protecting the ecological health of park areas prior to European settlement. In this sense, reintroduction initiatives can be said to combat fortress conservation by beginning to (re)define what can and should be included within state-led conservation, change how actors interact with park spaces, and, perhaps over time, transform the meanings people associate with protected areas over time (Büscher & Whande, 2007; Hulme & Murphree, 1999). Reintroduction initiatives may address some past critiques of the inclusion of IK and TEK because they operationalize IK and Indigenous practices (Augustine & Dearden, 2014; King, 2004; Meek et al., 2011; Sandlos, 2015). Moreover, since National Park Reserves acknowledge existing land claims and Conservancies are protected for use and engagement of Indigenous practice and possible economic opportunities, there may be more room for Indigenous interpretations and assertions of Rights and Title.

However, reintroduction initiatives are subject to notable structural budgetary and policy constraints and staff and managers pursue projects within particular frameworks and funding cycles. Moreover, rather than addressing colonial history head on and ceding authority to Indigenous communities or leaders, reintroduction initiatives create sanctioned spaces and times for the incorporation of people and activities. This depoliticizes issues of colonialism, dispossession and social inequity (Nadasdy, 2007; Sandlos, 2015; T. F. Thornton, 2015). Fortress conservation is re-entrenched in an important sense because state governance authority continues to be emphasized over other institutions, actors, and ways of knowing.
Including or permitting Indigenous cultivation and management practices within newer protected area designations and not in others can reinforce the idea that those practices are not acceptable or appropriate within traditional National Parks or Class A Provincial Parks. To recap, Parks Canada defines ecological integrity as, “a condition that is determined to be characteristic of its natural region and likely to persist, including abiotic components and the composition and abundance of native species and biological communities, rates of change and supporting processes”, while BC Parks definition states ecological integrity as an “area or network of areas [that] supports natural ecosystem composition, structure, and function, and a capacity for self-renewal” (BC Parks Act, 1996; Canada National Park Act, 2000). Both definitions actively avoid the inclusion of human influence as being a part of or complementary to the maintenance and restoration of ecological integrity. Parks Canada’s and BC Parks’ commitment to maintaining these strict definitions of ecological integrity contributes to the continuation of a human-nature dichotomy common in fortress conservation and limits the ability of reintroduction initiatives to meet their full potential as both ecologically and socially beneficial.

Relatedly, there was variation in the definition of ecological integrity between individual park management documents, with some definitions more compatible with Indigenous cultivation and management practices than others. This lack of consistency across different protected areas within the same agency shows that there may actually be the potential to transform the de facto definition of ecological integrity over time, re-defining from the ground up what practices are acceptable within state-led protected areas. However, because Parks Canada and BC Parks overarching definitions of ecological integrity are so restrictive, structural constraints on staff and managers exist as they work within the framework of agencies and work
to address the objectives and concerns of community partners. For instance, the CORE funding program’s focus on ecological integrity as well as its short timeline means that the ability to sustain and expand comprehensive programs that include both social and ecological indicators and long-term monitoring is limited. Furthermore, proposals to the CORE funding program must outline how projects will meet Parks Canada’s mandate and definition of ecological integrity.

In addition to building in social objectives and indicators, another way that park staff and managers seem to be adapting to policies and budgetary structures is by developing initiatives that straddle park boundaries and introduce new players into park research and restoration. However, project development takes time and is based on the ability of staff and managers to build trust with partnering communities and to thoroughly incorporate Indigenous worldviews and environmental management styles. This is not always possible because of time, budget, and personnel constraints (Mollett, 2015; Nursey-Bray & Jacobson, 2014; Sarkar & Montoya, 2011; Timko & Satterfield, 2008; Willow, 2016). The struggle between policy and practice is a common focus by scholars in political ecology and scholarship suggests that conflict can continue to arise even when more humanized approaches to conservation are enacted (Bryant, 1998; Corson et al., 2014; Meek et al., 2011; Mollett, 2015; Neumann, 2004; Sarkar & Montoya, 2011; Singleton, 2009).

Ultimately, while reintroduction initiatives have exciting potential to introduce Indigenous practices within state-led conservation areas and counterbalance fortress conservation outlooks, legislative, policy, and budgetary structures reinforce the notion of a human-nature dichotomy and legitimize state control over access and use of natural resources within British Columbia. High-level definitions of ecological integrity and short-term, competitive funding pools mean that reintroduction initiatives are sought and implemented as individual projects, and are not built
into long-term management plans. Revisiting narrow definitions of ecological integrity may be one of the most important ‘next steps’ to take because they appear to be central to shaping what is and what is not considered for Federal funding and within park-based priority-making processes. These findings are consistent with literature from political ecology, examines present-day conservation initiatives in terms of fortress conservation, and reveals how well studying high level institutional structures and documents is complimented with researching and observing how managers and staff navigate opportunities and constraints ‘on the ground’.

5.2 Limitations

As discussed in Chapter 2, Methods, the time I had to collect data was limited to two months during the Summer of 2016. This made acquiring interviews difficult at times, especially because my field season overlapped with the field seasons of parks staff and managers. Furthermore, as a single researcher collecting data for this project I was limited to my own interpretation of the data, themes that emerged throughout the data analysis process, and the importance I placed on certain events or answers in interviews. Therefore, there is the possibility that my positionality as a female settler scholar percolated into data collection, analysis, and the interpretation process for this research. However, the inclusion of legislative and policy document review as part of my methodological approach helps to limit misrepresentation and biased interpretation of data collected from interviews and participant observation as much as possible. I am also limited in my ability to speak in a great amount of detail about the specific projects happening within BC Parks compared to Parks Canada. A small sample size at the Provincial level restricts my ability to make wide generalizations across BC Parks as an agency as interviewees roles in BC parks focused in specific regions of the province or were more managerial in nature.
This research critically examined policy and budgetary structures internal to (colonial) state agencies and documented perspectives and experiences of managers and staff employed within specific protected areas. Time and financial constraints, as well as my own positionality as a settler scholar, limited the degree to which it was possible and appropriate to add an additional element to my study design: interviewing or surveying Indigenous staff and/or community members involved in reintroduction initiatives. This research does not speak for Indigenous partners and participants regarding reintroduction initiatives and the potential that they may or may not present Indigenous peoples and communities to push back against fortress conservation. This is an extremely important direction for future research; Indigenous partners and participants no doubt have other sets of motivations, experiences, and preferences for the future of reintroduction initiatives and it will be important to understand and address these moving forward.

Nonetheless, it remains important to examine and evaluate state-led initiatives against agencies’ stated motivations and goals. Because my research focuses on how legislative, policy, and budgetary frameworks shape, enable, and constrain the reintroduction of Indigenous cultivation and management practices, the findings are well-suited to identify shortcomings and contradictions. In turn, these can appropriately inform criticisms of state-led conservation and suggestions for the future of reintroduction initiatives (again, against agency goals). It would however, be inaccurate and inappropriate to assume that the findings speak for Indigenous partners and participants and/or that they necessarily align with accolades or criticisms that Indigenous organizations or individuals might offer regarding the initiatives.
5.3 Conclusion

The earliest Western understandings of and approaches to conservation were grounded in the notion that humans and nature are and should be conceptualized as separate (Adams, 2003; Brockington, 2004; Dearden, Rollins, and Needham, 2016; Katz, 1998; Loo, 2006; Shultis & Heffner, 2016; West, Igoe, & Brockington, 2006; Willems–Braun, 1997). As a result, traditional state-led protected areas were created in order to preserve nature as a pristine wilderness, devoid of humans (Dearden et al., 2016; Katz 1998, West et al., 2006). More recently there has been a shift within conservation thinking that involves a recognition and support for the inclusion of humans, especially Indigenous people, within protected area management (Locke & Dearden, 2005; Stevens, 2015a, 2015b). Over the past 20-30 years, Parks Canada and Provincial conservation agencies have sought to better include Indigenous perspectives in protected area planning and management but have been criticized because Western knowledge has remained the standard for legitimizing conservation and decision-making by the state (Adams, 2003; Coombes, 2007; Guénette & Alder, 2007; King, 2004; Langdon et al., 2010; Rutherford et al., 2015; Stevens, 2015c; Thomlinson & Crouch, 2012; Timko & Satterfield, 2008; Turner & Bitonti, 2011; Watson, 2013). Recently, initiatives that reintroduce Indigenous cultivation, harvest, and management practices within park management have emerged. For this project I chose to focus on a set being implemented within British Columbia.

The aim of this thesis was to assess the potential that reintroduction initiatives may present to move beyond fortress conservation by examining the institutional and budgetary structures of Parks Canada and BC Parks, exploring how they shape the planning, implementation, and outcomes of projects meant to reintroduce Indigenous cultivation and management practices inside state-led protected areas within the province of British Columbia. There are currently four
Parks Canada protected areas reintroducing Indigenous cultivation and management practices within BC. These are Gulf Islands National Park Reserve, Pacific Rim National Park Reserve, Gwaii Haanas National Park Reserve, and Fort Rodd Hill National Historic Site. At the Provincial level, BC Parks protected areas established under the designation of Conservancy are the most likely to be reintroducing Indigenous cultivation and management practices. Results indicate that institutional structures within Parks Canada and BC Parks shape the implementation of reintroduction initiatives. Narrow definitions of ecological integrity within state-led conservation -- a common feature of fortress conservation -- were found to be particularly powerful.

Indeed, overarching policy documents and funding competitions had a focus on ecological integrity, with social and cultural indicators often considered secondary to ecological indicators. The inclusion of Indigenous people at the Federal and Provincial level was vague, often using sweeping and positive language to describe relationship building with Indigenous people. All Parks Canada reintroduction projects that I examined were funded through the CORE program, giving parks staff and managers only five years to complete a reintroduction project. Likewise, within BC Parks there is limited funding for reintroduction initiatives as most monitoring and maintenance work is facilitated through a bidding process by outside organizations. Results from interviews indicate that many staff and managers are motivated to reintroduce Indigenous cultivation and management practices to facilitate the reconnection of Indigenous people to traditional territories. This indicates that awareness for the social dynamics and human dimensions of conservation may be high among staff and managers; more so than is reflected in high-level documents and directives. Logistical challenges described by interviewees focused on the limited funding programs in place for implementing reintroduction initiatives and noted that
current policies and definitions tend to shy away from questions of Indigenous Rights and Title. Staff and managers work to adapt initiatives and their approaches in an effort to maintain key relationships with Indigenous leaders, follow appropriate protocols, and ensure that projects have enough funding to continue.

The case study for this research, the clam garden restoration project at GINPR, both reintroduces Indigenous peoples and practices into a state-led protected area and has been set up an ecological experiment to query intertidal ecology and geomorphology. Interviewees believed that this dual-pronged approach helped them to receive funding through the CORE program because it more easily fit into this funding program by showing the ecological benefits of Indigenous cultivation and management practices. At the same time, staff and managers could work to facilitate socio-cultural benefits to Indigenous partners. However, structuring this project as an experiment also had limitations as it meant that Indigenous cultivation and management practices are in some senses legitimized by western science and competitive funding models.

5.3.1 Recommendations & Contributions

Some recommendations and contributions emerge from this project. First, I recommend that political ecology scholars continue to research how institutional structure affects local practices in the Global North to understand how power relations impact access to and use of natural resources within a conservation setting. Further research on similar cases would be helpful for gaining further insight to how legislative, policy and budgetary structures shape conservation on the ground within state-led parks and protected areas. Likewise, a similar research objective and design could be used to explore private parks, tribal parks, and NGO based conservation institutions to understand how their structures influence conservation initiatives that partner with Indigenous peoples and communities. Finally, policy and funding
structures at Provincial and Federal levels should be formally assessed in Canada (and other colonial countries) for how they may or may not support the decolonization of state-led conservation.

This thesis contributes to existing literature within political ecology that focuses on how institutional structures impact local practices and how existing power dynamics shape access, use and control over natural resources. Specifically, it critically evaluates the ongoing role of the state in conservation and analysing what conservation can look like within state-led conservation institutions as well as within broader conservation practice more generally. As new types of protected areas emerge, such as tribal parks, private parks, and non-governmental run protected areas, the value of different conservation approaches will continue to be explored, and, as my research suggests, institutional structures will play a role in how protected areas emerge and unfold on the ground. Identifying how current legislative, policy, and budgetary frameworks are constraining the implementation of Indigenous cultivation and management practices can help to make more informed changes for improved policy implementation. This can improve the effectiveness and equitability of current projects and help to develop future projects that may be implemented.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Interview Guide

Interview Guide

Participant alpha-numeric code:

INTRODUCTION

1. How long have you worked for/with this protected area and what is the title of your position? Work(ed) in other protected areas?

2. What are your key roles and/or responsibilities as part of your position?

3. What are the three most important objectives and/or mandates (environmental, social, and/or economic) that the protected area you work for is responsible for?

4. In terms of relations with local First Nations, does your protected area pursue a formal or informal vision or set of ‘best practices’? Prompts: First National advisory board or management board? Consultation? Worked into general public consultation?

ABOUT THE REINTRODUCTION INITIATIVE

5. My research is focused on projects within state-led conservation areas that are reintroducing active and physical cultivation and management practices by First Nations people (e.g., clam gardens, camas cultivation). I am interested in _______________ initiative within your park and would like to ask you some questions about how it emerged and how it works. What is your role in this initiative and how long have you been involved with it?

6. Does this initiative involve cultivation and/or management practice(s)? If so, what ones?

7. What was the impetus for this project and how did it evolve (including funding, on-the-ground activity, and management)

   a. Originally, what was the motivation in initiating this project and who led its proposal (Parks, First Nations?)
b. How has this motivation to continue this project changed throughout its implementation? Has involvement increased as momentum builds?

c. What feedback from the public (either positive or negative) have you received in initiating this project? Was there resistance to its initiation?

8. How long has the initiative(s) been going on? (if multiple, a timeline for both)

9. Where do the cultivation and management activities occur and how often?

10. Are First Nations partners and/or collaborators involved in visioning and managing this project? If yes, which Nations and how long have they been involved?

11. In what ways are First Nations partners involved? Through on the ground participation? On decision making/management boards, education and outreach, knowledge implemented in science?

12. How has the involvement of First Nations partners changed since its initiation? Prompt: Many different roles or stagnant role?

13. How is the involvement of First Nations partners in this initiative being portrayed to the public, if it is openly being promoted or discussed?

14. What makes this initiative different and unique in terms of collaboration with First Nations compared to formerly used approaches to management such as formal co-management agreements or others?

15. What are the goals that your protected area has for this project over the next 5 years? Over the next 15 years?

**BENEFITS AND CHALLENGES**

16. Does this project’s existence and implementation help your protected area meet the broad objectives/mandates we discussed in question 3? In what ways? Even more broadly, (how) does it contribute to Parks Canada’s/BC Parks mission/mandates?

17. Do you see potential environmental/conservation benefits of this initiative? If so, what are they? How long do you think it will take to see them fully materialize?
18. Do you see potential social, economic, and/or educational benefits of this initiative? If so, what are they? How long do you think it will take to see them fully materialize?

19. (even if mentioned benefits in Q 14-16) What possibly limits this initiative’s potential to facilitate/catalyze benefits?

20. What were the greatest logistical challenges in initiating this project?

21. Are there any legislative barriers, either Parks legislation or otherwise that prevents the further implementation of this initiative over a larger scale? Prompt: formal treaty in place, land use agreements (may not view as barriers but helpful instead).

22. Have the greatest logistical challenges for this project changed since its initiation? If so, how?

23. If you could plan and implement this project from the start over again, is there anything that you would change? If yes, what would that be and why?

24. Based on the projects potential to create social benefits, do you think cultural reconstruction projects work as one way to acknowledge or address past criticisms of state-led parks and their involvement or lack thereof with First Nations? How?

25. How is the inclusion of First Nations knowledge different in this initiative compared to past projects that attempt to include IK? Prompt: knowledge co-production

**BIG PICTURE/WRAP-UP**

26. In your professional opinion, are projects such as ________________ reflective of Parks Canada’s efforts to stay socially and/or environmentally relevant in the 21st century? In what way(s)? What about them makes them important for the future of conservation in North America?

27. In your professional opinion, do projects such as __________ have the potential to create more opportunities for local involvement within state-led parks and increase interests in the State-led park system by locals, government or other organizations?

28. Do you think that projects such as ______________ change the perception of the park to the public and therefore the Canadian state-led park system?
29. In your professional opinion, are projects such as _______________ reflective of an approach to conservation that is attentive to/integrates human dimensions? In what way(s)?

30. I have noticed in some parks management documents and promotional materials that the areas are often portrayed as pristine. Given the history of parks such as Yellowstone or Banff excluding local or indigenous people, do you think that the initiation of cultural reintroduction projects contradicts this portrayal of a pristine space? Why or why not?

31. Through the implementation of these projects, do you see any potential for them to change the perception of park boundaries, whether physically or socially? For example in deciding new areas that should be protected or changing the size of protected areas. (especially important answers from marine related parks- ocean boundary making)

32. Is there anything else you’d like to discuss about the initiative?

33. Are there other staff in your protected area or Parks Canada/BC Parks more generally that I should contact for an interview?