4. COMMUNICATIONS

*4.3 Correspondence from Oleg Semkov, respecting Building a Recreation Park

Recommendation: Be received.

5. DELEGATION REQUESTS

*5.1 Robert Manley, respecting Wesley: Conflict of Interest & Supporting Criminal Activity (for today’s meeting)

*5.2 Medora Uppal and Graham Cubitt, Hamilton is Home, respecting Endorsement of the Hamilton is Home initiative (for today’s meeting)

6. CONSENT ITEMS

*6.1 Reopening the Child Care and Early Years Systems (HSC20027(a)) (City Wide)
*6.2 Temporary Emergency Benefit for Persons on Ontario Works and Ontario Disability Support Program to Assist with COVID-19 Related Expenses (HSC20033) (City Wide)

9. DISCUSSION ITEMS

*9.4 Municipal-Indigenous Relationship Building related to City-Initiated Archaeological and Natural Heritage Assessments (HSC20030) (City Wide)
Hi Ladies and Gents,

I live in Hamilton and 90% of my neighbors have kids and wanted to inform you that we do not have any parks with playground sets or community splash pads within like 3+ km.

In 2019, you demolished the last kids' playground set at: Dover Park Teresa St Hamilton, ON L8G 4A1

Currently, there are about 8 football goals that nobody uses.

In addition to that, there is nowhere to ride bicycles or rollerblades but just along the roads (is it acceptable for kids' safety?)

Also we have 2 schools:
- St. David Catholic Elementary School (our kids are attending one)
- Sir Isaac Brock

None of these schools have outdoor playground sets or even small bike trails around at all.

There is a new construction of Retirement house which is good but not sufficient for us families with kids.

As a result, we have to drive to other areas of Hamilton to find playgrounds, splash pads or just ride a bike (incl Ancaster, Bayfront Park, Confederation Park and even Burlington and Oakville parks)

Please seriously consider building a nice recreation park nearby or do some renovation at Dover Park, currently there is nothing available for kids at all.

I pay my taxes regularly to the Hamilton city hall and expect some return as described above.

PS. Honestly speaking, I started thinking of moving out of my area (or Hamilton) only due to this reason.

Email me if you have any questions or concerns.

Thanks and stay healthy,

Oleg Semkov

(My contact: [Signature and date: Aug 14th, 2020])
Request to Speak to Committee of Council
Submitted on Saturday, August 8, 2020 - 3:22 pm

==Committee Requested==
Committee: Emergency & Community Services Committee

==Requestor Information==
Name of Individual: Robert Manley

Name of Organization:

Contact Number:

Email Address:

Mailing Address:

Reason(s) for delegation request:
Wesley: Conflict of Interest & Supporting Criminal Activity
Wesley Community homes manages the attached buildings @ 195/195A Ferguson Ave. North.+
They have promised the tenants to evict the Wesley Day Center (*themselves) on 2 occasions. Now they claim they are reviewing *themselves every 3 months (with no tenant input). I am a tenant. How would you like to come home (Wesley closed at night) and be forced to use your back door because your front door is blocked by people in lawn chairs partying and people sleeping in your lobby? How about a nice sunny day sit outside with nowhere to sit because of trespassers? Unlike the Salvation Army (Across from the library) there is no security presence. It is the Wesley’s location and lack of security that has robbed the tenants of their safety & freedom. The landlord takes no action. These people do not pay their tickets and they just return. Police drop by several times daily, but their presence would be required 24/7 (because of
lack of security). If a tenant calls the Police (e.g. people sleeping in the lobby) they say contact your landlord, then the landlord says contact the police. Since when, do criminal squatter’s rights & freedoms, out way those of law-abiding rent payers?
COVID UPDATE: I walked past 7 tents on my way to the bus.
STATS:
3 tents smoking Heroin (foil & straw), 2 tents smoking crystal meth (round bowled pipe), and 1 tent smoking crack (blackened straw).
Dear Hamilton/Court System: My neighbors and I would like to thank you for the 10-day criminal activity extension. Was Einstein called in?
My neighbors and I are looking forward to your visits, please bring your sympathy and children. You might even get to witness an overdose!
*themselves: both Wesley Community Homes & Wesley Day Center can be found at https://wesley.ca/

P.S. Canada Post & Fed Ex have refused deliveries (at times), citing carrier safety. Some friends & family are too fearful to visit.

**Will you be requesting funds from the City?** No

**Will you be submitting a formal presentation?** Yes
Homeless on Ferguson: This has created a heavy burden on the neighbourhood. The Ferguson neighbourhood is already unsafe due to criminal activities (and trespassers) from the Wesley center. Granting extensions is exactly the same as granting a permit for publicly exhibited criminal activity. "Our" neighbourhood deserves a break. If a tent area is required I would not suggest putting it in a populated area (out front of 2 large apartment buildings). Hamilton has a large amount of vacant factories that are accessible via public transit. I believe the city owns a large lot at Queen & Barton.
Form: Request to Speak to Committee of Council
Submitted on Wednesday, August 12, 2020 - 3:20 pm

==Committee Requested==
Committee: Emergency & Community Services Committee

==Requestor Information==
Name of Individual: Medora Uppal and Graham Cubitt

Name of Organization: Hamilton is Home - Kiwanis Non-Profit Homes, Good Sheppard, Victoria Park, YWCA, Sacajawea Non-Profit, Indwell

Contact Number:

Email Address:

Mailing Address:
1430 Main Street east
Hamilton
L8K 1C3

Reason(s) for delegation request:
Seeking endorsement of the Hamilton is Home initiative to:
a) provide credibility to our federal and provincial funding requests by confirming that the City is aligned with the goals and objectives of the coalition
b) support senior staff working with the coalition to establish how we can collectively address the affordable housing crisis

Will you be requesting funds from the City? No

Will you be submitting a formal presentation? Yes
COLLECTIVE'S GOAL

An unprecedented commitment: build 3,000 units of new affordable housing in the next 3 years.
AFFORDABLE HOUSING COLLECTIVE

Hamilton is Home

Allies in an investment plan to build 3000 units of affordable housing over 3 years
PROFILE

A collective:

- **Launched** by the 7 active affordable housing developers in the City of Hamilton

- **Expanding** with 4 housing additional providers and growing

- **Supported** by 8 community service organizations and growing
Ability to Deliver Projects Across the Housing Continuum

Housing Collective's Expertise
Experienced, with recent build out of 14 projects and management of 4,752 units.

Other's Expertise
Through mixed-income real estate transactions.
Financial and Social Returns

**HEALTH**

Affordable housing:
- Linked to the **determinants of health**
- Promotes **community wellness** (supporting those living with physical and mental wellness issues)

**EMPLOYMENT**

Affordable housing:
- Provides the equivalent of a **person year of employment per new unit built**
- Reinvests in the **Canadian economy**

**CLIMATE**

Affordable housing:
- Catalyzes the **low carbon economy**, driving down cost to implement
- Demonstrates **2050 sustainability targets** can be achieved now
Federal Support

A $1.12B TARGETED INVESTMENT FOR 3000 NEW AFFORDABLE UNITS

At $350,000 to $400,000* per door project cost...

The plan requires, from CMHC's Co-Investment Fund:

• 80%, or $280,000 - $320,000 combined grant/loan per door
• Streamlined application review for these high-performance, best in-class buildings and social benefits

*Exact cost is dependant on unit count, bedroom type, market conditions and other factors.
COUNCIL DIRECTION

Not Applicable

INFORMATION

In Hamilton, the licensed child care system began to reopen on June 22, 2020 based on provincial direction. Licensed child care centres were able to reopen with enhanced health and safety measures in place, including reduced capacity as detailed in Report HSC20027. As of July 31, 2020, 78% of child care programs that typically operate during the summer months had reopened. Most programs were operating at approximately 30% of their typical licensed capacity.

On July 30, 2020, the Ministry of Education announced that effective September 1, 2020, all licensed child care centres, including before and after school programs, may reopen at their full licensed capacity. Additional health and safety measures such as enhanced cleaning, screening of children and staff, and exclusion policies for those showing potential COVID-19 symptoms remain in place. Locally, the requirement to pass an in-person Public Health inspection also remains in place. Effective September 1, 2020, the ministry will also be mandating the use of medical masks and face shields for all staff and cloth masks/face coverings for children in grades 4 and above.
On July 30, 2020, the Ministry of Education also announced that effective September 1, 2020, all EarlyON Child and Family Centres may also reopen. All EarlyON Child and Family Centres have remained closed for in-person programming since March 14, 2020. During this closure period, EarlyON centres have continued to provide virtual programming to families including online story and gathering times and activities for families to do at home with their children aged 0-6 years. EarlyON centres will also be required to implement enhanced health and safety measures, including a reservation system so that families can book a time to attend. In Hamilton, City staff are working closely with EarlyON operators to offer a blended model in September which will include a combination of in-person EarlyON programs, outdoor programming and virtual programming. EarlyON centres will be phased in based on staffing capacity and physical space requirements.

While both the licensed child care and EarlyON systems are reopening, many operators are facing staffing pressures which may limit their ability to fully reopen immediately. The child care and early years system was facing a shortage of Registered Early Childhood Educators prior to the pandemic. As a result of the pandemic, several operators have indicated that they are experiencing further staffing shortages at the same time that the need for additional staff for screening and enhanced cleaning has increased.

The Ministry of Education has also announced that beginning September 1, 2020, the requirement to hold a child’s space has been lifted. Operators are required to provide 14 days notice to the family before the space can be offered to another family. The requirement to maintain parental fees at pre-closure (March 2020) levels has also been lifted. In order to mitigate impacts on families, the City has extended the Affordability Grant which reduces the cost of child care by $10/day for children aged 0-3.8 years until December 31, 2020.

Children’s Services and Neighbourhood Development staff are currently working closely with Public Health staff to develop and update both child care and EarlyON guidelines to reflect these recent announcements. Community meetings are being held with child care and early years operators to support them in this reopening process. Staff are also working closely with our school board partners to plan for the reopening of child care centres and EarlyON Child and Family Centres located in schools.

**APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED**

None
INFORMATION REPORT

TO: Chair and Members
Emergency and Community Services Committee

COMMITTEE DATE: August 17, 2020

SUBJECT/REPORT NO: Temporary Emergency Benefit for Persons on Ontario Works and Ontario Disability Support Program to Assist with COVID-19 Related Expenses (HSC20033) (City Wide)

WARD(S) AFFECTED: City Wide

PREPARED BY: Erica Brimley (905) 546-2424 Ext. 4815

SUBMITTED BY: Bonnie Elder
Director, Ontario Works Division
Healthy and Safe Communities Department

SIGNATURE:

COUNCIL DIRECTION

Not Applicable

INFORMATION

The provincial Emergency Benefit was created as a one-time, temporary discretionary benefit in March 2020 to assist with immediate and exceptional costs related to COVID-19 for Ontario Works (OW) and Ontario Disability Support Program (ODSP) clients. The Emergency Benefit was extended in April 2020 for an additional three months to continue supporting clients who had extra costs for food, non-medical transportation and other health and safety items that were more difficult to access due to public health restrictions. This benefit was 100% provincially funded.

On July 28, 2020, the Ministry of Children, Community and Social Services (MCCSS) announced that this benefit would no longer be extended and would end on July 31, 2020. The direction from MCCSS stated that OW Administrators have the discretion to provide supports for exceptional COVID-related costs to OW and ODSP clients through their regular discretionary benefits capped funding envelope.
Effective August 1, 2020, the City of Hamilton Ontario Works will be providing a temporary one-time Emergency Benefit to support those that are most medically vulnerable and directly impacted by COVID-19. This benefit will be available to persons in receipt of the City of Hamilton OW and ODSP programs. Those who are in receipt of the Canada Emergency Response Benefit (CERB) income will be ineligible.

Eligible persons will receive a one-time payment up to $100 for singles and $200 for families to assist with exceptional COVID-19 related costs, for example:

- personal protective equipment (PPE) required for hospital or clinic visits;
- cleaning supplies for those who have a family member diagnosed with COVID-19;
- delivery cost of food, medical or other essential supplies for those that have to self-isolate or be quarantined; and,
- travel costs to pick up food staples, medical or essential supplies to avoid public transit.

Clients who are requesting this benefit can contact the Ontario Works Special Supports Program at 905-546-2590. Clients will be required to submit supporting medical documentation to confirm eligibility.

APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED

None
TO:      Chair and Members  
         Emergency and Community Services Committee

COMMITTEE DATE: August 17, 2020

SUBJECT/REPORT NO: Municipal-Indigenous Relationship Building related to City-Initiated Archaeological and Natural Heritage Assessments (HSC20030) (City Wide)

WARD(S) AFFECTED: City Wide

PREPARED BY: Shelly Hill (905) 546-2424 Ext. 4081

SUBMITTED BY: Grace Mater  
                Director, Children's Services and Neighbourhood Development Division  
                Healthy and Safe Communities Department

SIGNATURE: 

RECOMMENDATION(S)

(a) That the City of Hamilton continue to facilitate, and fund Indigenous monitoring of City-initiated archaeological assessment work, as set out in the Indigenous Archaeological Monitoring Policy attached as Appendix “A” to Report HSC20030, until such time as Municipal-Indigenous agreements are prepared as per Recommendation (b) of Report HSC20030;

(b) That Urban Indigenous Strategy staff be directed to lead discussions between City staff and Indigenous communities to develop corporate-wide approaches for engaging with each community on City-initiated archaeological assessment work, which may include the negotiation of Municipal-Indigenous agreements, and report back to Council for review and approval; and,

(c) That Urban Indigenous Strategy staff be directed to lead discussions between City staff and Indigenous communities to investigate opportunities to improve how the communities are engaged in City-initiated natural heritage assessment work, including the potential to facilitate and fund Indigenous monitors, and report back to Council with recommended approaches for review and approval.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Hamilton acknowledges Indigenous peoples as the original peoples of this land. Indigenous peoples have an inherent and rights-based interest in the archaeology and heritage of their ancestors and assert Aboriginal and Treaty Rights over lands, waters and resources within their traditional territories. Local First Nations and Indigenous communities want to participate in archaeological and natural heritage assessments on their traditional territories in order to continue to steward their cultural and natural resources. Preliminary engagement with the Haudenosaunee, the Mississaugas, and the Huron-Wendat indicate a desire from each Indigenous community to improve existing Municipal-Indigenous relationships, including how they are involved in these assessment processes.

The recommendations of this Report align with the actions of the Council-endorsed Urban Indigenous Strategy, which call on the City to: improve how the City works with Indigenous communities when conducting archaeology; show respect for, and incorporate, Indigenous traditional ecological knowledge in municipal practices; and, improve meaningful consultation on municipal projects, plans and approvals. This Report directs staff to continue to facilitate and fund Indigenous monitoring of City-initiated archaeological assessments, allowing Indigenous communities to participate meaningfully in the work taking place on their traditional territories. Staff are also directed to work with Indigenous communities to develop corporate-wide approaches that improve upon how the City engages, and involves, Indigenous communities in City-initiated archaeological and natural heritage assessment work.

Finally, this Report provides legal analysis on statutory municipal consultation and the concept of ‘duty to consult’ as it relates to Indigenous involvement in the archaeological and natural heritage assessment processes. While courts have found that municipalities are not bound by the ‘duty to consult’, being an obligation of the Crown, in the context of archaeological assessment, courts have found that municipalities must consult early, give Indigenous people meaningful opportunities to participate, and be funded by the municipality.

Alternatives for Consideration – N/A

FINANCIAL – STAFFING – LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Financial: N/A

Staffing: N/A

Legal: N/A
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

In 2002, with the onset of the construction for the Red Hill Valley parkway, the City of Hamilton and the Six Nations community came together in a collection of agreements intended to preserve the Haudenosaunee interest in the Valley (Report PW04055). The intent of the Hamilton-Haudenosaunee Red Hill agreements was to foster long-term relationships and to create a plan for the Valley that reflects the best thinking of both peoples.

Under the Joint Stewardship Agreement, the Joint Stewardship Board was formed to ensure cooperation and successful continuation of the environmental management plans for the Red Hill Valley. The Medicine Plants agreement resulted in a medicinal plant program and strategies for their protection. The Economic Opportunities agreement provided for partnerships between Hamilton and the Haudenosaunee on ecological restoration work in the Valley, focusing on native plant material. A newly created Haudenosaunee enterprise was awarded a post-construction contract to create, enhance and restore hundreds of hectares of habitat in the Valley. The intent of which was to continue to produce plant material that extends beyond the Red Hill Valley Project and into parks and streetscapes managed by the City of Hamilton. The Burials and Archaeology agreement provided for Haudenosaunee involvement in the archaeological assessments, including a permanent presence during all work, setting a standard for future archaeological work. These agreements laid the groundwork for Municipal-Indigenous collaboration on archaeological and natural heritage matters moving forward.

Since the Red Hill Valley project, the City of Hamilton has taken steps to sustain existing, and build new, Municipal-Indigenous relationships through:

- Collaboration with the Haudenosaunee on the Joint Stewardship Board;
- Preparation of the Archaeology Management Plan in consultation with the Mississaugas of the Credit, the Haudenosaunee at Six Nations and the Huron-Wendat at Wendake;
- Providing training to City staff on the “Municipal Duty to Consult”, presented by Legal Services staff in 2014, including an overview of relevant legislation and caselaw related to Indigenous and treaty rights;
- Council’s acknowledgement of Indigenous peoples as the original peoples of this area and endorsement of the Urban Indigenous Strategy; and,
- Facilitation and funding of Indigenous monitoring of City-initiated archaeological assessment work with the Haudenosaunee, Mississaugas and Huron-Wendat.

More recently, Indigenous communities have requested that the City facilitate and fund Indigenous monitoring of archaeological assessments earlier in the process than
currently required by provincial legislation. For example, the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation (MCFN) released the Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology in 2018, providing direction to archaeologists working on Treaty Lands and Traditional Territory of the MCFN as to how the First Nation expects to be engaged throughout the process, including involvement in the archaeological assessment process as early as Stage 1 to determine if the area being assessed holds cultural heritage value or interest to their Nation.

The City also began receiving requests from Indigenous communities to be involved in projects that include natural heritage components, including specialized/earlier notices, project meetings and funding of Indigenous monitoring of the assessment work to ensure they have adequate capacity for their meaningful participation in these projects, also referred to as capacity funding. For example, the MCFN’s Consultation and Accommodation Protocol sets out a process for their involvement in environmental assessments and environmental decision making. Currently, staff engage with Indigenous communities as part of the Environmental Assessment process, but do not facilitate or fund Indigenous monitoring of City-initiated natural heritage assessments, including: terrestrial assessments, such as botanical inventories and bird, amphibian and reptile surveys; and, aquatic assessments, such as fish community and habitat assessments.

To proactively address these requests from Indigenous communities, an internal working group was established in 2019, led by Urban Indigenous Strategy staff and comprised of staff from various City departments and divisions. Focusing first on archaeological assessments, the working group identified challenges with existing processes, developed a work plan to guide the development of a corporate policy and process, began preliminary discussions with some Indigenous communities to better understand their history and rationale for early engagement, and conducted preliminary analysis of the costs associated with Indigenous engagement. An interim Indigenous Archaeological Monitoring Policy (attached as Appendix “A” to Report HSC20030) was developed to standardize the Indigenous engagement process for City-initiated archaeological assessment work and endorsed by the Senior Leadership Team in January 2020. The interim policy is intended to be used until a corporate-wide strategy for Indigenous engagement on City-initiated archaeological assessments is developed in partnership with each Indigenous community.

The working group has also conducted a similar review of the City’s natural heritage assessment processes and identified a need to address these requests consistently across the corporation.
POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS

The recommendations of this Report are consistent with municipal and provincial policy.

Municipal Policy Framework
The Council-endorsed Urban Indigenous Strategy (2019) is the City’s response to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action and identifies implementation actions related to the themes of land, people and spirit. The Strategy’s actions relevant to the City conducting archaeological and natural heritage assessments include:

- Improve meaningful consultation with urban Indigenous residents and First Nations communities on municipal projects, plans and approvals;
- Continue to improve how the City works with First Nations when conducting archaeology. This will include identifying how to educate the public on the rich archaeological history in Hamilton; and,
- Show respect for traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) by including Indigenous voices in environmental leadership and incorporating TEK in municipal practices.

The Council-approved Archaeology Management Plan (2016) (Report PED16108) outlines the City’s roles and responsibilities to ensure the management of archaeology is systematic, consistent and transparent across the City’s jurisdiction. The Plan commits the City to engage and maintain a dialogue with Indigenous communities on matters involving Indigenous archaeology, including entering into agreements and facilitating Indigenous monitoring of City-initiated archaeological assessment work. The Plan also includes a First Nations Consultation and Engagement Protocol to assist the City of Hamilton where municipal actions may affect the interests of Indigenous peoples. Key aspects of the Protocol include: circulating information to Indigenous communities on City activities, initiatives or directives that may affect their interests; involving Indigenous communities as early as possible in the process; and, City staff managing a municipal project should be responsible for all communication with Indigenous communities and the negotiation of accommodations or other agreements related to the project.

Provincial Policy Framework
Archaeology in Ontario is administered by the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries under Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, which outlines priorities, policies and programs for the conservation of archaeological resources. The Ministry has issued Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists, which set out policies and protocols for conducting archaeological assessment work in Ontario, including guidelines for engaging Indigenous communities during the archaeological fieldwork process and for reporting on that engagement.
The Provincial Policy Statement (2020) highlights the unique relationship Indigenous communities have with the land and its resources, recognizes the role Indigenous communities have in land use planning and development, and acknowledges the contribution of Indigenous communities’ perspectives and traditional knowledge to land use planning decisions. The PPS encourages planning authorities “to build constructive, cooperative relationships through meaningful engagement with Indigenous communities to facilitate knowledge-sharing in land use planning processes and inform decision-making.” Relevant PPS policies include:

- Planning authorities shall engage with Indigenous communities and coordinate on land use planning matters. (PPS, 1.2.2);
- Planning authorities shall engage with Indigenous communities and consider their interests when identifying, protecting and managing cultural heritage and archaeological resources. (PPS, 2.6.5); and,
- This Provincial Policy Statement shall be implemented in a manner that is consistent with the recognition and affirmation of existing Aboriginal and treaty rights in section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982. (PPS, 4.3)

The Ontario Environmental Assessment Act requires engagement with Indigenous communities as part of Municipal Class Environmental Assessments (EAs). The Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) advise that local Indigenous communities should be contacted as part of the Species at Risk screening process.

Legal Framework
Municipal consultation is required by several statutes or Ministerial guidelines that apply to city-initiated projects requiring archaeological or natural heritage assessments, as described above, including the Ontario Heritage Act, the Environmental Assessment Act, the Planning Act and Provincial Policy Statement, and the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act. The ‘Duty to Consult’ is a principle which, while not binding on municipalities, informs how statutory municipal consultation with Indigenous groups should be undertaken. The level of consultation required is determined, in part, by the potential severity of infringement on Aboriginal rights, title, or treaty rights. There is limited caselaw relating to consultation for archaeological assessment and the required threshold of consultation such activity requires. The Local Planning Appeal Tribunal, formerly the Ontario Municipal Board, has held that there is a less onerous duty to consult in the context of archaeological assessment than in respect of more entrenched Aboriginal rights such as land claims. However, this analysis will depend on the facts of a given project.

The MCFN’s Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology offer a framework for expanded consultation relating to archaeological assessment and the MCFN’s Consultation and...
Accommodation Protocol relating to natural heritage assessment. Standards for consultation issued by Indigenous communities have been held to be important sources to be considered in determining the scope of consultation. The scope of consultation under statutes and within the broader ‘Duty to Consult’ is to be determined by the Crown or relevant municipality on a case by case basis, informed by the potential adverse impact of a proposed activity on an Aboriginal interest. In this context, based on the limited caselaw concerning municipal archaeological assessment, it is likely that a court or tribunal would find that consultation by a municipality must be undertaken as early as possible in the process, give the Indigenous group the opportunity to be involved, and be funded by the municipality.

With respect to natural heritage assessment, the threshold question of whether a given natural heritage assessment is likely to infringe Aboriginal rights is likely different from the archaeological assessment framework. More work will need to be done by staff to evaluate the potential threshold and scope of Indigenous consultation relating to natural heritage assessment.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION

Internal

The inter-departmental working group described above consisted of staff who conduct Indigenous engagement as part of their projects, assist in the administration of said work, or develop and implement related policy, including:

- City Managers Office: Community Initiatives;
- Corporate Services: Capital Budgets & Development Finance, Legal Services, Procurement;
- Planning and Economic Development: Growth Management, Planning, Tourism and Culture; and,

Additional staff were engaged through an internal e-mail survey of Indigenous engagement practices and updated throughout the process, including: Facilities; the West Harbour Team; members of the Environmental Assessment Working Group; and the Indigenous Relations Staff Circle. The inter-departmental working group provided updates on this process to the Senior Leadership Team in April 2019, December 2019 and January 2020.
External

Staff have engaged in preliminary discussions with Indigenous communities regarding their involvement in City-initiated archaeological assessments, including meeting with the following representatives over the course of fall 2019 to summer 2020: the Haudenosaunee Development Institute; the Department of Consultation and Accommodation (DOCA) of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation (MCFN); the Huron-Wendat First Nation at Wendake; and, the Six Nations Land and Resources Office. Staff also kept the Aboriginal Advisory Committee and the Urban Indigenous Strategy Coordinating Circle informed of this process as part of their regular UIS updates.

ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Local First Nations and Indigenous communities have asserted their interest in participating in archaeological and natural heritage assessments, including monitoring work associated with projects in their traditional territories. The City of Hamilton’s acknowledgment of traditional Indigenous territory needs to be demonstrated beyond words. The City should consider the requests of the MCFN and other Indigenous groups for improved or expanded consultation relating to archaeological and natural heritage assessment. Engaging Indigenous communities early in the assessment process can help foster positive working relationships and help avoid expensive project delays, lack of cooperation, negative publicity, conflicts and legal disputes. The City should ensure that Indigenous communities have capacity to adequately participate in consultation and engagement. Courts have found that where a duty to consult exists, it includes an obligation to fund consultation.

The inter-departmental working group found that the level and form of Indigenous engagement in City-initiated assessment work varies across the corporation. There is a lack of clarity in policies related to capacity funding Indigenous monitoring, which has raised concerns amongst staff managing municipal projects that require archaeological and natural heritage assessments, including: the risk associated with individual staff negotiating with First Nations on behalf of the City; confusion regarding the legal requirements of ‘Duty to Consult’ and determining what reasonable accommodation is; and, the challenge of estimating, and keeping to, project budgets when capacity funding Indigenous monitoring.

Caselaw relating to Indigenous consultation, with respect to archaeological and natural heritage assessment, supports a robust, meaningful, and effective framework that takes into account Indigenous frameworks for consultation. Guidelines for expanded consultation issued by the MCFN, and anticipated consultation requests by other Indigenous communities received through the working group, should be reviewed and
considered in light of the potential for adverse impact by City-initiated projects on Aboriginal interests. In the context of archaeological assessment, there is a significant (but not high) potential for adverse impact. In the context of natural heritage assessment, the potential impact should be identified and reviewed by City staff and discussed with Indigenous communities.

The Indigenous Archaeological Monitoring Policy provides an interim approach for facilitating and capacity funding Indigenous monitoring of archaeological assessments. However, the City does not currently have a policy for addressing requests for Indigenous monitoring of natural heritage assessments, or Indigenous involvement in natural heritage assessments conducted outside of the Environmental Assessment (EA) process. The City of Hamilton’s Indigenous partners have identified a desire to improve and build upon existing Municipal-Indigenous relationships and engagement practices. Each community has expressed unique priorities and needs related to how the City interacts with, and engages them, on City-initiated assessment work in their traditional territories, necessitating unique responses on behalf of the City. Although the Métis Nation is not currently recognized as having traditional territory in the City of Hamilton, staff will explore any requirements for consultation under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act and engage with the Métis Nation of Ontario, as necessary, as a part of this relationship-building process.

This Report is the first step in acknowledging the need to proactively build Municipal-Indigenous relationships with each of our Indigenous partners and provides direction for staff to begin discussions in areas of common and mutual interest related to the stewardship of cultural and natural resources. These actions are a step towards respectful and meaningful coordination with our Indigenous partners that addresses the Calls to Action laid out in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and the implementation actions identified in the City of Hamilton’s Urban Indigenous Strategy and Archaeology Management Plan.

As per the Report recommendations, the Urban Indigenous Strategy staff will lead an inter-departmental working group of staff in discussions with each Indigenous community to develop corporate-wide approaches that expand and improve upon how the City conducts engagement. This process will explore opportunities to build and strengthen existing relationships with our Indigenous partners, improve project outcomes, provide capacity for their meaningful involvement and facilitate the sharing of important historical and cultural knowledge. Any anticipated impacts to project budgets and timing that may result from expanded engagement will also be reviewed as part of this process.

This Report recommends that Council endorse the Indigenous Archaeological Monitoring Policy as an interim approach and the starting point for improving
engagement with Indigenous communities on City-initiated archaeological assessments. This Report also recommends that the City investigate opportunities to improve how Indigenous communities are engaged as part of natural heritage assessments initiated by the City, including the facilitation and capacity funding of Indigenous monitoring. Improvements to be explored with the City’s Indigenous partners may include the negotiation of collaborative relationship agreements addressing:

- Stewardship board models;
- Communication protocols;
- Fee schedules;
- Opportunities for repatriation of Indigenous archaeological artifacts;
- Processes for addressing Indigenous archaeological burial sites;
- Medicine Plants; and,
- Economic opportunities related to ecological restoration.

The negotiation of Municipal-Indigenous agreements will be made in the context of the treaties with the Crown, but the agreements themselves will not be treaties, and will not affect treaty rights.

Any resulting Municipal-Indigenous agreements will be brought forward to Council for consideration and approval. Any changes in municipal policy will be reflected in updated plans and protocols, such as the Archaeology Management Plan. Training and information should be provided to City staff managing municipal projects that require archaeological and natural heritage assessment work and Indigenous engagement, including updated training on “Municipal Duty to Consult” from Legal Services staff.

ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION
None

ALIGNMENT TO THE 2016 – 2025 STRATEGIC PLAN

Community Engagement & Participation
Hamilton has an open, transparent and accessible approach to City government that engages with and empowers all citizens to be involved in their community.

Culture and Diversity
Hamilton is a thriving, vibrant place for arts, culture, and heritage where diversity and inclusivity are embraced and celebrated.
APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED

# Indigenous Archaeological Monitoring Policy

## POLICY STATEMENT

The City of Hamilton acknowledges Indigenous peoples as the original peoples of this land. Indigenous peoples have an inherent and rights-based interest in the archaeology of their ancestors and their traditional territories. Within the Hamilton area, the following Indigenous communities retain such interests:

- The Haudenosaunee Confederacy;
- The Mississaugas; and,
- The Huron-Wendat.

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to standardize an interim process for engaging with Indigenous communities on City-initiated archaeological assessment work and for coordinating and funding Indigenous monitoring, until relationship agreements are developed with each Indigenous community and adopted by the respective Councils.

This policy is intended to provide clarity and direction to City staff on:

- Which Indigenous communities to engage with and how to contact them;
- When to engage with Indigenous communities; and,
- The coordination of Indigenous monitoring, including processing invoices and budgeting.

## SCOPE

This policy applies to all employees of the City of Hamilton who are responsible for coordinating City-initiated archaeological assessments as part of planning studies, development projects and soil disturbances. Staff should refer to the Council-approved policies in the [Archaeology Management Plan](#) for further information on when archaeological assessments may be required and what protocols should be followed.

To determine if an archaeological assessment is required for work you are looking to undertake, please contact Cultural Heritage Planning staff in the Development Planning, Heritage and Design Section of the Planning Division (see Appendix for contact information).

The following Indigenous communities shall be engaged on City-initiated archaeological assessments:

- **Haudenosaunee Confederacy**, represented by:
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| Definitions | Aboriginal Peoples – The term “Aboriginal” refers to the first inhabitants of Canada, and includes First Nations, Inuit, and Métis peoples. These are three distinct peoples with unique histories, languages, cultural practices and spiritual beliefs. This term came into popular usage in Canadian contexts after 1982, when Section 35 of the Canadian Constitution defined the term. Aboriginal peoples are now more commonly referred to as Indigenous Peoples (see definition below).

**Archaeological Assessment** is a survey undertaken by a licensed archaeologist in a defined project area determined to have archaeological potential. There are four stages of archaeological assessment, as defined by in the Ministry’s Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists, including:

- Stage 1: Background study and property inspection
- Stage 2: Property assessment
- Stage 3: Site-specific assessment
- Stage 4: Mitigation of development impacts

**Capacity Funding** refers to funding that builds the capacity of an Indigenous community, allowing its peoples to be meaningfully and actively engaged in the archaeological assessment process. Agreements for capacity funding should be entered into by the proponent of the project.

Note: The coordination of Indigenous monitors for natural heritage assessments is out of scope of this policy document. This policy document does not address requirements for Indigenous consultation under the Environmental Assessment Act, including consultation with Métis peoples.

| Please refer to the Appendix for the Indigenous community contact information.

- Haudenosaunee Confederacy of Chiefs Council (HCCC, Six Nations Traditional Council);
- Six Nations of the Grand River Elected Council (SNEC);
- **Mississaugas**, represented by the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation (MCFN); and,
- **Huron-Wendat**, represented by the Huron-Wendat First Nation at Wendake.

| Note: The coordination of Indigenous monitors for natural heritage assessments is out of scope of this policy document. This policy document does not address requirements for Indigenous consultation under the Environmental Assessment Act, including consultation with Métis peoples.
### Field Liaison Representative (FLR)

(FLR) is a term used by the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation to refer to their Indigenous Monitors - see definition below. FLRs observe fieldwork, provide cultural advice and assist with compliance in archaeological assessments.

### First Nation

A term used to describe Indigenous peoples of Canada who are ethnically neither Métis nor Inuit. This term came into common usage in the 1970s and ‘80s and generally replaced the term “Indian”. Unlike “Indian,” the term “First Nation” does not have a legal definition. While “First Nations” refers to the ethnicity of First Nations peoples, the singular “First Nation” can refer to a band, a reserve-based community, or a larger tribal grouping and the status Indians who live in them.

Note: Haudenosaunee Development Institute representing the Haudenosaunee Confederacy Chiefs Council do not consider themselves to be a First Nation under the Indian Act (1876).

### Indigenous Peoples

A collective name for the original peoples of Turtle Island (North America) and their descendants. Aboriginal peoples (see definition above) has also been used in the past to describe Indigenous peoples. The term “Indigenous” came into wide usage during the 1970s when Aboriginal groups organized transnationally and pushed for greater presence in the United Nations (UN). In the UN, “Indigenous” is used to refer broadly to peoples of long settlement and connection to specific lands who have been adversely affected by incursions by industrial economies, displacement, and settlement of their traditional territories by others.

### Indigenous Monitor

Is a member of an Indigenous community that has been trained in methods of archaeology and traditional Indigenous teachings who monitors archaeological assessments conducted within their traditional territory and treaty lands in order to advocate for, and document, the interests of their community. The Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation refer to Indigenous Monitors as Field Liaison Representatives (FLRs).

### Métis

Refers to a collective of cultures and ethnic identities that resulted from unions between First Nation and European people in...
what is now Canada. It is sometimes used as a general term to refer to people of mixed ancestry, whereas in a legal context, “Métis” refers to descendants of specific historic communities.

**Traditional Territory**, also referred to as Indigenous territory, describes the ancestral and contemporary connections of Indigenous peoples to a geographical area. Territories may be defined by kinship ties, occupation, seasonal travel routes, trade networks, management of resources, and cultural and linguistic connections to place.

**Treaty Rights** and Aboriginal Rights (commonly referred to as Indigenous rights) are recognized and affirmed in Section 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982* and are also a key part of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) which the Government of Canada has committed to adopt.

### BACKGROUND

Archaeology in Ontario is administered by the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (the “Ministry”). The Ministry has issued [Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists](#), which set out policies and protocols for conducting archaeological assessment work in Ontario, including guidelines for engaging Indigenous communities during the archaeological fieldwork process and for reporting on that engagement.

In May 2016, City Council approved the [Archaeology Management Plan](#) (AMP), which outlines the City’s roles and responsibilities to ensure the management of archaeology is systematic, consistent and transparent across the City’s jurisdiction. Archaeology within the City of Hamilton reflects two central cultures: Indigenous and EuroCanadian. The majority of registered archaeological sites in Hamilton are Indigenous and the AMP was developed in consultation with the interested Indigenous communities. The AMP commits the City to engage and maintain a dialogue with Indigenous communities on matters involving Indigenous archaeology, including entering into agreements and facilitating Indigenous monitoring of City-initiated archaeological assessment work.

The AMP also includes a First Nations Consultation and Engagement Protocol to assist the City of Hamilton where municipal actions may affect the interests of Indigenous peoples. Key aspects of the Protocol include:
• Circulating information on City activities, initiatives or directives that may affect Indigenous interests;
• Involving Indigenous communities as early as possible in the process; and,
• City staff managing a municipal project should be responsible for all communication with Indigenous communities and the negotiation of accommodations or other agreements related to the project.

In July 2019, City Council endorsed the Urban Indigenous Strategy (UIS). The UIS identifies a number of implementation actions related to the themes of land and spirit, and relevant to conducting archaeological assessments, including:
• Improve meaningful consultation with urban Indigenous residents and First Nations communities on municipal projects, plans and approvals; and,
• Continue to improve how the City works with First Nations when conducting archaeology. This will include identifying how to educate the public on the rich archaeological history in Hamilton.

INTERIM PROCESS  
The City is in the process of engaging with our Indigenous communities to develop collaborative relationship agreements as part of the implementation of the Urban Indigenous Strategy, including how archaeological assessment work is conducted in the City. Recognizing that developing relationships takes time, there is a need for a consistent interim approach. The following process shall be followed by staff coordinating City-initiated archaeological assessment work:
• Staff will engage with Indigenous communities at the start of a project, as directed by the Archaeology Management Plan. Engagement and the negotiation of monitoring agreements should be coordinated by staff and should not be delegated to consultants or the consultant archaeologist.
• Draft Stage 1 archaeological assessment reports should be circulated to all of the Indigenous communities for their review and input.
• For Stage 2 through 4 assessments, City staff will continue to have the authority to enter into Indigenous monitor agreements (sometimes referred to as FLR agreements), based on the signing authority rules established by the City of Hamilton.
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</table>

**Procurement Policy**, as amended, under Policy #13 – Authority to Execute Contracts, Section 4.13.

- Indigenous monitors will be funded as early as Stage 2 archaeological assessments, as requested by Indigenous communities. This has been past practice on some projects, however many projects have funded Indigenous monitors at Stages 3 and 4 only. Note: Not all Indigenous communities want to be involved in every project and at every stage.

- Once an Indigenous monitoring agreement is signed, the consultant archaeologist typically coordinates the scheduling of assessment work and Indigenous monitoring on-site.

- The cost of Indigenous monitoring will continue to be funded through project budgets using Schedule B(5) Exemptions, for government to government payments, as outlined in the City of Hamilton Procurement Policy, as amended.

- All invoices and payments of Indigenous monitors will be tracked using a new Account No. 55733 – Indigenous Monitoring. This new account will allow the City to more accurately quantify its capacity funding of Indigenous monitoring.

### BUDGETING

The cost of Indigenous monitoring should be budgeted for as part of the overall project costs for approval through the capital budget program. It is recommended that staff speak with the consultant archaeologist when they are preparing a proposal for work to request their estimated number of hours on site, which can then be used to estimate the cost for Indigenous monitoring.

Agreements for Indigenous monitoring are typically entered into for each separate stage of archaeological assessment work. The best practice is to estimate the anticipated value of payment for the duration of that agreement and have the appropriate City staff sign that agreement based on signing authority. For example, if the total estimated cost exceeds the signing authority of the project manager, then the General Manager may be required to sign.

Note: Staff should ensure that terms of reference for consultant archaeologists hired from the Archaeology Roster, or through multi-disciplinary firms on other City Rosters, and their subsequent proposals do not include Indigenous monitoring costs since these will be paid directly by the City.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indigenous Monitor Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mississaugas</strong> - $75 / hour, plus mileage and per diem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: There is a sliding scale for the number of FLRs required. The minimum number being 2 for an on-site crew of 1-14 consultants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SNEC</strong> – $75 / hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HDI / HCCC</strong> - $100 / hour, plus mileage ($0.58 / km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: The Indigenous Monitor to Consultant ratio is 1:4. In certain circumstances a Field Supervisor/Coordinator may be required on site for a rate of $150 / hour, plus mileage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Huron-Wendat</strong> – Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: The Wendake Nation representing the interests of the Huron-Wendat is located in Quebec and has not historically been involved with on-site monitoring.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These rates may be subject to change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The following are estimated ranges of total costs for Indigenous monitoring per stage of archaeological assessment work. Actual costs would depend on the property size, complexity of the archaeological site(s) and number of Indigenous groups involved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 1 – No on-site assessment or Indigenous monitoring. Stage 1 reports should be circulated in draft form to each of the Indigenous groups for comment and feedback. Note: There is typically no cost for the review of the report. However, many Indigenous communities have policies for charging for peer reviews of reports, if required.

Stage 2 – Approximate cost range: $1,000 to $6,000

Stages 3 and 4 – $5,000 to $100,000
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATED DOCUMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- City of Hamilton’s <a href="#">Archaeology Management Plan</a> (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation’s <a href="#">Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology</a> (April 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <a href="#">Haudenosaunee Confederacy of Chiefs Council and the Haudenosaunee Development Institute’s Archaeology Policies</a> (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <a href="#">Six Nations of the Grand River Consultation and Accommodation Policy</a> (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ministry’s <a href="#">Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ministry’s <a href="#">Engaging Aboriginal Communities in Archaeology</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <a href="#">City of Hamilton Procurement Policy</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPENDICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An appendix of City staff and Indigenous community contact information is attached for reference. The contact information will be monitored and updated by staff in the Planning and Economic Development Department, as required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Staff may want to consider adding a 25% contingency to their estimated monitoring budget for unanticipated costs.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIGENOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING CONTACTS</th>
<th>Haudenosaunee Development Institute (HDI) for the Haudenosaunee Confederacy of Chiefs Council (HCCC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haudenosaunee Confederacy</td>
<td>Todd Williams, Program Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone: 519-445-4222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: 519-445-2389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:hdi2@bellnet.ca">hdi2@bellnet.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mailing Address: 16 Sunrise Court, Suite 600, P.O. Box 714, Ohsweken, Ontario, N0A 1M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Webpage: <a href="https://www.haudenosauneeconfederacy.com/departments/haudenosaunee-development-institute/">https://www.haudenosauneeconfederacy.com/departments/haudenosaunee-development-institute/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six Nations Land and Resources Department, Land Use Unit for the Six Nations of the Grand River Elected Council (SNEC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Hill-Montour, Archaeology Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 519-753-0665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: 519-753-3449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:tanyahill-montour@sixnations.ca">tanyahill-montour@sixnations.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address: 2498 Chiefswood Road, P. O. Box 5000, Ohsweken ON, N0A 1M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also copy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonny Bomberry, Director, <a href="mailto:lonnybomberry@sixnations.ca">lonnybomberry@sixnations.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn LaForme, Secretary, <a href="mailto:dlaforme@sixnations.ca">dlaforme@sixnations.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webpage:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.sixnations.ca/LandsResources/ContactUs.htm">http://www.sixnations.ca/LandsResources/ContactUs.htm</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mississaugas</th>
<th>Department of Consultation and Accommodation (DOCA) of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Consultation and Accommodation (DOCA) of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation</td>
<td>Megan DeVries, Archaeological Operations Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 905-768-4260</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:Megan.DeVries@mncfn.ca">Megan.DeVries@mncfn.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Huron-Wendat** | Mailing Address: 4065 Highway 6, Hagersville, ON, N0A 1H0  
Webpage: [http://mncfn.ca/doca-2/](http://mncfn.ca/doca-2/) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Huron Wendat First Nation at Wendake</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maxime Picard, Coordinator of Projects - Ontario  
E-mail: maxime.picard@cnhw.qc.ca  
Tina Durand, Executive Secretary to Grand Chief Konrad Sioui  
Email: tina.durand@cnhw.qc.ca  
Phone: 418-843-3767  
Fax: 418-842-1108  
Mailing Address: 255, place Chef Michel Laveau, Wendake, Quebec G0A 4V0  
Webpage: [https://wendake.ca/](https://wendake.ca/) |
| **CITY CONTACTS** |  |
| **Archaeology Management Plan** | Alissa Golden, Heritage Project Specialist,  
[alissa.golden@hamilton.ca](mailto:alissa.golden@hamilton.ca), Extension 4654 |
| **City of Hamilton Roster Category 18 – Archaeology** | Cynthia Graham, Archaeology Roster Captain,  
[cynthia.graham@hamilton.ca](mailto:cynthia.graham@hamilton.ca), Extension 2337 |
| **Urban Indigenous Strategy** | Shelly Hill, Senior Project Manager,  
[shelly.hill@hamilton.ca](mailto:shelly.hill@hamilton.ca), Extension 4081 |
| **Cultural Heritage Planning Staff** | Miranda Brunton, Suburban and Rural Areas,  
[miranda.brunton@hamilton.ca](mailto:miranda.brunton@hamilton.ca), Extension 1202  
David Addington, Urban Area,  
[david.addington@hamilton.ca](mailto:david.addington@hamilton.ca), Extension 1214 |
| **UPDATES** | June 18, 2020 – Six Nations Contact Update |