

Procedure:	FN Communication Tone and Language Guide
Approved By:	Executive Committee
Approval Date:	March 8, 2017
Amendment Date(s):	
Policy Holder:	



Islands Trust

First Nations Communication: Tone and Language Guide

Purpose / Rationale

To provide guidelines for staff and trustees on how to implement the new principles of First Nations (FN Relations) into written and verbal communications with the 37 FNs associated with Islands Trust¹:

Principle #1: *Islands Trust is committed to becoming aware of what it does not know or understand about First Nations.*

Principle #2: *Islands Trust is committed to proving sincere desire for reconciliation*

Principle #3: *Islands Trust is committed to integrating, where possible, activities that support First Nations reconnecting with the Trust Area lands and waters*

This Guide is intended to help people become aware of their biases, as well as how to counteract them. This will allow for a conscious choice to approach FN communications with a tone, language and timing that reflect a genuine desire to develop a mutually respectful relationship.

Scope / Limits

For staff and trustees who are new to communicating with First Nations, there are three documents attached to this Guide that will set a good foundation for the basic terminology and “dos and don’ts” of First Nation communication. This Guide assumes users have this foundation and is therefore specifically designed for those writing letters and correspondence representing the Islands Trust as an organization to First Nations.

Prerequisite Documents

- 27 Tips on What Not to Do and Say When Working with First Nations (Bob Joseph)
- 23 Tips on What to Say to First Nations (Bob Joseph)
- Indigenous Guide to Terminology (Bob Joseph)

¹ See Appendix A: List of 37 First Nations Associated with Islands Trust

A 'Real Friendship' Model

When Initiating a New Communication Approach, Do So with Honesty and Humility

Cynicism grows when your interests are ignored or minimized by another. It's no different for First Nations. As the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2015) points out, "we recognize that being part of a dominant culture, our attitudes and perspectives made the Residential School experience possible and that these attitudes and perspectives became entrenched in our relationships and in our culture."²

It takes considerable courage to be voluntarily vulnerable in the language we use. It is human instinct to protect our assumptions of power; vulnerability exposes us to the risk that our power may be questioned or criticized, either as individuals or as an organization. Given that First Nations have been required to be vulnerable in almost every aspect of our society, we need to show some of our own vulnerability to them before a relationship is even possible.

Generally speaking, this historical sense of apathy or power doesn't come from a place of malice. Regardless, its negative effects have to be addressed. When communicating with First Nations in writing or verbally, begin by stating the obvious with a tone of humility. This is the best way to address the cynicism that may be felt regarding Islands Trust's sincerity in building a mutually respectful relationship. Some examples:

"Often the referral process is a frustrating one. Although the intent is to have early and meaningful discussions about important issues that affect interests in a parcel of land/waters, the reality is that sometimes for First Nations, referrals pile up and unintentionally put stress on the administrative capacity to deal with these, as well as limit the nature and scope of the responses. Islands Trust wants to move away from this kind of "transactional" relationship to real and meaningful relationships with our neighbouring First Nations..."

"We recognize there is much we don't know about the First Nations' connections to the lands and waters of the Trust Area and we genuinely want to understand that history as well as the current issues from a First Nations' perspective. It will undoubtedly help us do our job better..."

"Although this is our first effort in approaching the referral process in a more meaningful way, we welcome any suggestions as to how we could improve this process that we are obliged to perform. Thank you for your patience as we learn how to build a genuine and mutually respectful relationship with your Nation."

Acknowledge Each First Nation's Unique Weight of Claim in the Trust Area

Generally, you should think of weight of claim like a continuum based on layered interests. At the upper end of consideration is a First Nation that has nearby Reserve Lands, *plus* Treaty rights that may be impeded, *plus* Traditional Core Territory that may be impacted *and/or* who is currently before the courts or in negotiations with the BC Treaty process. At the lower end of consideration would be a First Nation who

² Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. 2015 Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication ISBN 978-0-660-02078-5 Cat. no.: IR4-7/2015E-PDF, p.394.

had previously interests as part of their claimed Traditional Territory but now have modern Treaty land certainty that is not impacted - for them, consideration is more like a level of respectful notification

This means avoiding form letters that are exactly the same being sent out to multiple First Nations. Although this requires more care and time resources, it demonstrates that a basic level of research has been done on the individual First Nation being addressed. Acknowledging their unique core interests is the first step of showing respect.

The diversity of “weighted claim” amongst the 37 First Nations in the Trust Area is immense. A good analogy would be explaining the European Union to someone who has no familiarity with the European continent. At first you only understand that Europeans are different than non-Europeans. Then, as you learn more, you understand the distinctions between individual sovereign Nations, and are able to name them and geographically place them in relation to each other. After that, you begin to understand the differences in language and culture amongst the Nations and further to that, you begin to realize the nuances within the sovereign Nations themselves. There is no shortcut to this kind of learning. For a list of the 37 First Nations and links to their websites where one can become familiar through each Nations’ online representation of themselves, see Appendix A.

Using Indigenous or English names when Addressing a First Nations

If your communication is only in written form, without a verbal follow-up, and you have observed on that Nation’s website that they prefer to use their Indigenous language to name their Nation, by all means, use the Indigenous name. However, if you do not know how to properly pronounce a Nation’s Indigenous name either explicitly ask how to pronounce it or use their English name and explain that you don’t know how to pronounce it. Do not try to pronounce an Indigenous name if you don’t know how to say it properly. It is better to use English in that case. First Nations will understand and not be offended if you are honest about your limits in pronouncing Indigenous names.

Special Deference to First Nations with Neighbouring Reserve Land Directly Adjacent to the Trust Area

There are eight First Nations with Reserve land holdings that have borders directly adjacent to the Trust Area’s land base. These Nations are our literal neighbours and when addressing them, be cognizant of that and acknowledge it, even before acknowledging their asserted Aboriginal rights and title. The setting aside of Reserve lands was a mixed bag of methodology but as a general rule of thumb, assume that a Reserve is a small subset of territory and that before the setting of Reserve land boundaries in the 1870s Indigenous connections to the land went well into what is now the Trust Area land base.

1. Tsawout First Nation (Salt Spring Island, South Pender Island, Saturna Island and Bare Island)
 - a. Neighbours to Salt Spring Island LTA (Local Trust Area), North Pender Island LTA, Saturna Island LTA and South Pender Island LTA
2. Tseycum First Nation (South Pender Island, Saturna Island and Bare Island)
 - a. Neighbours to South Pender Island LTA, Saturna Island LTA and North Pender Island LTA
3. Tsartlip First Nation (Mayne Island)
 - a. Neighbours to Mayne Island LTA
4. Penelakut Tribe (Penelakut Island, Tent Island and Galiano Island)

- a. Neighbours to Thetis Island LTA and Galiano Island LTA)
- 5. Lyackson First Nation (Valdes Island)
 - a. Neighbours to Thetis Island LTA
- 6. Snuneymuxw First Nation (Nanaimo First Nation) (Gabriola Island)
 - a. Neighbours to the Gabriola Island LTA
- 7. Halalt First Nation (Halalt Island)
 - a. Neighbours to the Salt Spring Island LTA
- 8. Squamish Nation (Defense Islands)
 - a. Neighbours to the Gambier Island LTA

Acknowledging Treaty Nations and their Specific Treaty Rights

The Government of Canada and the courts understand treaties between the Crown and Aboriginal people to be solemn agreements that set out promises, obligations and benefits for both parties. In Canada, we are all treaty people – Indigenous and non-Indigenous alike. For Islands Trust, beyond the fundamental respect for our immediate land-based neighbours as described above, our first consideration is the treaty rights of our 10 First Nations who have Douglas Treaty rights in the Trust Area.

Douglas Treaty rights have either been ignored or misunderstood, not just by citizens of BC, but by the Crown and courts. For over 50 years Douglas Treaty Nations have been defining their treaty rights through case law. The uniqueness of the Douglas Treaties is that, although the courts have lent clarity to the validity of the treaties and the extent of hunting and fishing rights, they have yet to clarify what the treaties meant by “villages and enclosed villages” for exclusive use of these 10 First Nations. The treaties make no mention of the islands. This could be interpreted either against the drafters of the treaties, or in their favour.

While the Crown and the courts seek increased clarity on the definition of treaty lands and how that intersects with Crown land assumptions and private property rights in the Trust Area, representatives of Island Trust need to take particular care to acknowledge that the following 10 First Nations have treaty rights and hear from these Nations what their perspectives are on how those rights should be respected by Islands Trust:

- 1. Esquimalt Nation
- 2. Tsartlip First Nation
- 3. Tsawout First Nation
- 4. Pauquachin First Nation
- 5. Tseycum First Nation
- 6. Malahat Nation (also part of Te’Mexw Treaty Assoc.; stage 5 of 6 in BC Treaty process)
- 7. Songhees First Nation (also part of Te’Mexw Treaty Assoc.; stage 5 of 6 in BC Treaty process)
- 8. Sc’ianew First Nation (Beecher Bay) (also part of Te’Mexw Treaty Assoc.; stage 5 of 6 in BC Treaty process)
- 9. T’Sou-ke First Nation (Sooke) (also part of Te’Mexw Treaty Assoc.; stage 5 of 6 in BC Treaty process)
- 10. Snuneymuxw First Nation (Nanaimo First Nation) (also in stage 4 of 6 in BC Treaty process)

Acknowledge asserted Aboriginal rights and title as stated through the BC Treaty Process

Of the 37 First Nations with asserted rights and title in the Trust Area, 25 of them are currently participating in the BC Treaty process in hopes of finalizing a modern day treaty (two First Nations have already finalized their modern treaty – Tsawwassen First Nation and Sliammon First Nation). Of those 25 First Nations in this process, five of them are also Douglas Treaty Nations. For a list of these First Nations and their current status in the BC Treaty Process, see Appendix B: Trust Area First Nations in the BC Treaty Process or Before the Courts.

All First Nations assert their Aboriginal rights and title in their traditional territories. Being a Douglas Treaty Nation or in the BC Treaty process gives weight to those rights and title. Aboriginal rights and title are not extinguished by a treaty (see *Chartrand v. British Columbia (Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations* 2015 BCCA 345). Rather, it is another “layer” of claim. The 37 First Nations that Islands Trust has identified as having interests in the Trust Area either have treaty rights or have specifically identified part of the Trust Area as part of their statement of interest in the BC Treaty Process.

When communicating with a First Nation, first acknowledge their neighbouring Reserve land holdings if applicable, then acknowledge their Douglas Treaty or modern treaty rights if applicable, but most importantly, with all 37 First Nations, be sure to acknowledge their Aboriginal rights and title in the Trust Area.

Acknowledge Previously Stated Priorities from First Nations to Islands Trust

The foundation of all human relationships is the ability to listen to the other. Active listening is about seeking out the message being communicated, processing its meaning and responding with empathy.

Over the years, First Nations have communicated their priorities, their frustrations and their aspirations for relationship-building with the Islands Trust. They have done this through letters, responses to referrals, Territorial Declarations signed by Chiefs, invitations to have workshops and emails, not to mention how they may have relayed this verbally over time. Much of this communication is well-thought out, well-articulated, intellectually sophisticated yet due to our cultural inclination to ignore or minimize the voice of First Nations, Islands Trust hasn’t focused on these messages as well as we could have.

Take the time to do a bit of research before communicating with a First Nation. Islands Trust has a First Nations database that might prove to be useful (data entry is ongoing and should be complete by March 2018) or, alternatively, go to the website of the Nation and notice how that Nation defines themselves and the terms they use to indicate their Nation’s priorities. Do a Google search under “News” using the name of the First Nation to see what high profile issues they may be dealing with. If a Nation expresses frustration and exasperation over, say, the desecration of a sacred site, it does not mean they will feel those intense emotions over every issue. It does, however, indicate what has relative importance to them.

In the same vein, pay special attention to who is copied on a letter from a First Nation. If other First Nations are copied (particularly if Chiefs from other Nations are copied), assume the Nation authoring the letter is speaking on behalf of the group. Unlike government, First Nations do not copy other Nations on

correspondence unless there has been full consensus to do so. All responses, whether written or verbal, should be to all the copied First Nations as a group.

Special attention and care should be taken when it comes to foreshore/marine issues. First Nations have clearly articulated their interests as it directly impacts their ability to exercise their traditional foreshore and marine activities. It is a common saying amongst First Nations with a strong interest in the Trust Area to say, “when the tide is out, the table is set”. This saying reflects the integral role that the shoreline of the islands has had – and continues to have - in sustaining these First Nations. Respecting this heightened historical and current interest in marine and foreshore issues should be reflected by an explicit invitation to meet and perhaps walk a site. For example, the following is a new way Islands Trust is trying to recognize previously stated priorities and assumed interest in a foreshore site:

“We would like to ask you if you would be interested in setting up a site visit with our staff at the Fulford marina. An in-person meeting would allow us an opportunity to better understand your Nation’s connection to the shoreline and waters of Fulford Harbour to include in our files and our consideration of this application. Please let us know as soon as possible if you are interested in a site visit and we can set up the details in a timely manner.”

[for Tsawout...“We have also attached a copy of the SENCOTEN Territorial Declaration, the recent Tsawout Marine Use Study Map of Special Places and the Tsawout Referral Checklist, which we have reviewed and considered. Please let us know if you would also like to discuss elements of these documents as well, as we recognize there is much we have yet to understand about your connection to the land and waters of Fulford Harbour.”]

[for the six Hul’quimi’num Nations...“we have also attached http://www.hulquminum.bc.ca/pubs/Place_Names_maps_2005.pdf?lbisphpreq=1 Map 4 Hul’quimi’num Selected Place Names, which we have reviewed and considered. Please let us know if you would also like to discuss elements of this document as well, as we recognize there is much we have yet to understand about your connection to the land and waters of Fulford Harbour.”]

Early Stages of Proving Sincerity Will Require Increased Resources

There is no shortcut to proving sincerity and the best indication of a real change is that the follow-up action is consistent and costs the giver in some way. Whether it is time, travel costs or simple gestures like ignoring incoming cell calls while in a meeting, most people have a good nose for sincerity and notice what it costs the giver. Although building trust takes time, if it’s sincere and believed, there is less and less need to prove it over time.

As First Nations start receiving correspondence that is significantly more respectful in tone, they may take up invitations to meet in person to see if the appearance of respect goes beyond just words on paper. Assume that there is no lack of desire for First Nations to visit the islands. The reasons that often constrain them include (but are not limited to) their own time constraints in their professional capacity, the lack of funds to pay for the travel costs or coming over to participate in an event where they are outnumbered or may be placed in a socially uncomfortable situation. Trying to mitigate some of these challenges may induce more willingness to meet in person.

In-person meetings can be in a meeting room somewhere, walking a site that a First Nations has expressed interest in or being in a location that is comfortable for the First Nations attendees (e.g. walking on Reserve lands or at their band office). Often, the best way to approach this is after a desire to meet in person is expressed by a First Nation.

Gift-giving When Meeting with First Nations in Person

When a First Nation – either their elected officials or members – go out of their way to share information with you or take time from their own priorities to get to know you, then a gift of thanks is a kind gesture. For more formal meetings between elected officials of a First Nation and Islands Trust, particularly for the first time, a gift of First Nations art (for example, a framed print or a carving), done by one of their own members or a First Nation artist with close association to the First Nation would be appropriate and appreciated. A non-Indigenous idea of what is “artistic” is not always shared by First Nations.

For more informal meetings between First Nations and staff/trustees of Islands Trust, a gift of a blanket and a small additional gift such as a potted plant or a locally made food is a good choice. Nice blankets, such as nice-quality throw blankets found in any household retail store, are appreciated especially with elders and knowledge-keepers who continue to participate in longhouse cultural practices.

Islands Trust May be Perceived as just “Government”

As we have all experienced, once real relationships are built and more understanding is gained the tendency toward broad sweeping labels and stereotypes starts to decrease. Nuances and differences are appreciated and respected. Just as many Canadians see First Nations as one big category and assume similarities within that group because they do not yet understand the differences amongst them, so it is with First Nations and government agencies. For example, trying to explain the difference between the Province’s “duty to consult” and Islands Trust’s “delegation to engage” or their “statutory consultation on Official Community Plans” is likely meaningless to a First Nation not yet familiar with these legal distinctions of government hierarchies.

When engaging, always invite a First Nation to share their concerns or interests, whether those interests are site-specific, high-level or strategic in nature. Once expressed, they can be shared with the appropriate agency. Avoid the tendency to point out to a First Nation that they contacted the wrong agency or committee. This can be seen as “splitting hairs” by a First Nation.

Awareness that Language has Underlying Assumptions

Being part of the dominant culture for the last century or more, the language we use is imbued with assumptions that may not be shared by First Nations. Our systems, our legislation, even some of our everyday terms are a direct legacy of the colonial mindset. One of the more obvious examples of this is the term “Crown land”. Although a Nation will understand what this refers to, it also reminds them that Crown lands were assumed by the colonial settlers without consent or surrender. For First Nations, this issue is not settled. We need to be aware of this continued unresolved issue and not exacerbate it.

The following subtleties should be avoided in communicating with First Nations:

- If the term “Crown land” needs to be used specifically; soften its presentation by saying something like “what we refer to as Crown lands”
- Conditional co-operation can be read into terms like “willing to co-operate” or “we agree/support...however”, etc.). Rather than be ambiguous and open the door to being interpreted as being in the position of choice to listen - or not listen - to the views of First Nations, state a spirit of cooperation very clearly (i.e. “we will seek to find ways to cooperate with you on this matter” or more simply, “we agree with your position on this issue. Please let us know how you think we can more specifically support you with the tools we have.”
- Authoritative language (i.e. “we hereby notify...”, “we will decide...”, “you must...”, etc.) assumes that everything is subordinate to our legislative authority
- Much like the case with using the term “Crown land”, we use other terms that may be offensive (i.e. “landowner”, “private property”, “land title”, etc.) as they infer that the lands question is settled and unquestioned in favour of “the Crown”. If there is no adequate alternative to describe a specific concept, state that as an unfortunate fact and explicitly include your recognition that these terms may offend but that it not your intention
- Consideration of residents as paramount (i.e. “unfortunately our tools are triggered by...residents”) implies First Nations are merely one of many “external stakeholders”
- Deference to our own organizational processes or the jurisdiction of another government agency as a reason to not act will be received as a First Nation as “passing the buck” instead of engaging in conversation on an issue; even if we cannot act, we can learn from discussing the issue

Requesting Information from a First Nation

Whether it is requesting input on a site-specific referral, inviting a First Nation to a Community-to-Community meeting, a technical review of a report or attendance at a cultural event, who we approach in a First Nation and how we do that is important. Just like our own organization, First Nations have people in their community who are experts in their field.

It is preferable to check out who is on staff and what role they play. If there isn't a person in the band office you know well enough to call and ask for advice on this, then start with the Nation's website. Is a referral marine or foreshore-related? Then a good approach would be to call the Fisheries Manager (if the Nation has one) and ask them who the referral should be addressed to. Is there information needed about the historical significance of a certain place? Then calling the band office to ask if there is an elder or “knowledge-keeper” able to help is likely the best way forward. Is it an invitation to meet and get to know “Islands Trust staff or Trustees? Then it is the Chief and Council that the invitation should be addressed to.

Following Up on Non-Responses and Off-Topic Responses

When you ask someone a direct question and they do not answer you, they are often communicating a message in their silence. Perhaps you are not regarded as important enough to warrant the effort of an answer. A non-answer may reflect a sense of built up exasperation at having previous efforts at responding make no difference. Sometimes, a non-response is simply because a First Nation does not have any budget to hire someone to respond, or it just has gotten lost in a volume of paper and emails within the band office.

Take the time to follow-up within 30 days but without assuming why a response hasn't been articulated. It is within reason to explain that you would like to move forward with action but that you understand a non-response can mean many things. Express a willingness to keep the doors of communication open on any topic and reiterate that there is a sincere desire to start communicating with a deepened level of respect.

In the same way, an off-topic response can be conveying an important message as well. Follow-up with a direct engagement of the topic the First Nation has brought up. For example, if a First Nation has responded to a site-specific referral by pointing to an issue that is more important to them, respond to that issue or ask for more clarification. Don't hesitate to start these kinds of conversations. The resolution of the issues may not be within the scope of Islands Trust but discussing it with integrity shows respect. If another agency needs to be involved, we can help the First Nations make those connections.

Acknowledging Traditional Territory at the Beginning of a Meeting

In recent years there have been many "guides" made public about how to acknowledge the traditional territory of the First Nation that a meeting is taking place in. Although these guides have principles that are excellent, the Trust Area is a unique context of 37 First Nations with overlapping interests. It is not uncommon to have 15-20 First Nations claim a single island as their core territory and have those Nations represent two or more different language groups. To single out a particular First Nation or a particular language group, is to possibly cause offense to those First Nations or language groups not acknowledged.

To best serve the 37 First Nations with interests in the Trust Area, staff and Trustees need to seek out ways to be neutral, but respectful of all 37 First Nations. Almost all these Nations³ belong to the five branches of the Coast Salish languages, so it is entirely appropriate to acknowledge territory in the following way:

"Islands Trust would first like to acknowledge that we are meeting on Coast Salish Territory"

If a meeting is taking place where either K'omoks Nation or Sliammon First Nation also have asserted interests, it could be worded as:

"Islands Trust would first like to acknowledge that we are meeting on overlapping Coast Salish and Kwakwaka'wakw Territories."

This is the minimum show of respect. Staff and Trustees can expand on this territorial acknowledgement as they feel appropriate. However, do so with care because as you get more detailed you may run the risk of leaving out a First Nation or a language group.

Often the best way to approach a territorial acknowledgement is be humble and openly admit that you would like to express respect in this gesture but the complexity of 37 First Nations with overlapping Aboriginal interests, multiple Indigenous languages and a variety of welcome protocols in the Trust Area can inadvertently cause offense if we get it wrong, despite our best intentions. Stating the obvious with honesty and humility is, in fact, a good demonstration of respect.

³ K'omoks First Nation and Sliammon first Nation being the exceptions – they belong to the northern Kwakwaka'wakw Territory and are the southern boundaries for the Wakashan languages

Dealing with Racist Comments against First Nations

It is very unfortunate that in Canadian culture there are still many non-Aboriginal people who default to negative generalities and stereotyping of First Nations people, culture and groups. Islands Trust has a zero-tolerance for racist comments against any people based on culture, ethnicity or race. When dealing with racist comments against First Nations it is very important to deal with it quickly and strongly. If a written or verbal comment is left unaddressed, Islands Trust can be construed as being in agreement by its complicity. Try the following response to address racist comments being made against First Nations in the context of Islands Trust's work:

"Islands Trust greatly values its relationship with over 30 First Nations who have interests in the Trust Area. Although we care deeply about the transparency of dialogue at Islands Trust, we ask that you consider rewording your message in a more respectful way. As it is stated now, we will not consider nor record it due to its offensive wording to First Nations."

More often disrespectful comments come from individuals who feel they personally were not at fault for what has happened to First Nations and therefore feel no requirement to be sensitive about it. This presents a good opportunity to shift the focus from "fault" to "responsibility". It is the responsibility of all non-Aboriginal Canadians to correct the attitudes and systems of discrimination. This helps shift the language and perspective of many people, especially when you can point out that non-Aboriginals have enjoyed much privilege and prosperity from the same systems that have discriminated against First Nations. There are no easy answers as to how this will all work out but we need to collectively take responsibility as citizens.

APPENDIX A: 37 First Nations with Asserted Interests⁴ in the Trust Area

Listed Saanich Peninsula, south Vancouver Island, then northward on Vancouver Island. Then Mainland BC, north to south, then eastward.

WSÁNEĆ (Saanich) Peoples https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saanich_people

- Tsartlip First Nation <http://tsartlip.com/>
- Tsawout First Nation <http://www.tsawout.com/>
- Tseycum First Nation <http://www.tseycum.ca/>
- Pauquachin First Nation <http://pauquachin.com/>
- Malahat Nation <https://www.malahatnation.ca/>

Lekwungen People

- Songhees First Nation <http://www.songheesnation.ca/>
- Esquimalt First Nation <http://www.esquimaltnation.ca/>

Beecher Bay (Sc'ianew) First Nation <http://www.beecherbaybc.com/>

Sooke (T'sou-ke) First Nation <http://www.tsoukenation.com/>

Hul'quimi'num Treaty Group <http://www.hulquminum.bc.ca/>

- Cowichan Tribes <http://www.cowichantribes.com/>
- Halalt First Nation <https://halalt.org/>
- Penelakut Tribe <http://www.penelakut.ca/>
- Lyackson First Nation <http://lyackson.bc.ca/>
- Lake Cowichan First Nation <http://lakecowichanfn.ca/>
- Chemainus (Stz'uminus) First Nation <http://www.stzuminus.com/>

Nanaimo (Snuneymuxw) First Nation <http://www.snuneymuxw.ca/>

Nanoose (Snaw-Naw-As) First Nation <http://www.nanoose.org/>

Qualicum First Nation <http://www.qualicumfirstnation.com/>

K'omoks First Nation <http://www.komoks.ca/>

Campbell River (Wei Wai Kum) First Nation <http://www.weiwaikum.ca/>

Cape Mudge (We Wai Kai) Nation <http://www.wewaikai.com/welcome-we-wai-kai-nation>

⁴ "Interests" assumes asserted Aboriginal rights and title on the land base of the Trust Area

Sliammon (Tla'amin) First Nation <http://www.tlaaminnation.com/>

Sechelt (shíshálh) Nation <http://www.shishalh.com/>

Squamish Nation <http://www.squamish.net/>

Tseil-Waututh Nation <http://www.burrardband.com/>

Musqueam First Nation <http://www.musqueam.bc.ca/>

Tsawwassen First Nation <http://tsawwassenfirstnation.com/>

Semiahmoo First Nation https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Semiahmoo_First_Nation

Sto:Lo Xwexwilmexw Treaty Association. <http://www.stolonation.bc.ca/>

- Aitchelitz First Nation
- Matsqui First Nation
- Popkum
- Skawahlook
- Skowkale
- Squiala
- Tzeachten
- Yakweakwioose

Hwiltsum First Nation https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hwiltsum_First_Nation

Appendix B: Trust Area First Nations in the BC Treaty Process or Before the Courts

First Nations in Stage 5 of 6 in Treaty Process (Agreement-in-Principle; awaiting ratification)

1. K'omoks first Nation
2. Snaw-naw-as First Nation (Nanoose First Nation) (part of Te'Mexw Treaty Assoc.)
3. Malahat First Nation (also part of Te'Mexw Treaty Assoc., and a Douglas Treaty Nation)
4. Songhees First Nation (also part of Te'Mexw Treaty Assoc., and a Douglas Treaty Nation)
5. Sc'ianew First Nation (Beecher Bay) (also part of Te'Mexw Treaty Assoc., and a Douglas Treaty Nation)
6. T'Sou-ke First Nation (Sooke) (also part of Te'Mexw Treaty Assoc., and a Douglas Treaty Nation)

First Nations in Stage 4 of 6 in Treaty Process (Negotiating Agreement)

1. Cowichan Tribes (part of the Hul'quimi'num Treaty Group)
2. Stz'uminus First Nation (Chemainus) (part of the Hul'quimi'num Treaty Group)
3. Penelakut Tribe (part of the Hul'quimi'num Treaty Group)
4. Halalt First Nation (part of the Hul'quimi'num Treaty Group)
5. Lyackson First Nation (part of the Hul'quimi'num Treaty Group)
6. Lake Cowichan First Nation (part of the Hul'quimi'num Treaty Group)
7. Snuneymuxw First Nation (Nanaimo First Nation) (also a Douglas Treaty Nation)
8. shíshálh First Nation (Sechelt First Nation)
9. Tseil-Waututh First Nation
10. Musqueam First Nation
11. Aitchelitz First Nation (part of the Sto:lo Nation treaty group)
12. Leqá:mel First Nation (part of the Sto:lo Nation treaty group)
13. Popkum First Nation (part of the Sto:lo Nation treaty group)
14. Skawahlook First Nation (part of the Sto:lo Nation treaty group)
15. Skowkale First Nation (part of the Sto:lo Nation treaty group)
16. Tzeachten First Nation (part of the Sto:lo Nation treaty group)
17. Yakweawkoose First Nation (part of the Sto:lo Nation treaty group)

First Nations in Stage 3 of 6 in Treaty Process (Agreement Framework)

1. Squamish Nation

First Nations in Stage 2 of 6 in Treaty Process (Statement of Intent)

1. Hwlitsum First Nation (status of Nation under review)

First Nations with Ratified Modern Treaties

1. Tsawwassen First Nation (2009)
2. Tla'amin (Sliammon) First Nation (2016)

First Nation Currently Before the Court Regarding Rights and Title, Impacting Islands Trust

1. Esquimalt First Nation
2. Songhees First Nation
3. Hwlitsum First Nation