

the apogee of the archaeological food chain; amongst us authors, we hold various professional and academic credentials—including several advanced graduate degrees—and each of us still consciously chose consulting over other forms of archaeological employment.

2. Permits are issued by the B.C. Archaeology Branch for a number of different reasons. Types of permits include Heritage Investigation Permits (often issued to academics), Site Alteration Permits (issued for sites that will be impacted), and Heritage Inspection Permits. The predominant type of permit is the Heritage Inspection Permit, which includes single proponent/single development permits, and two types of blanket permits, single proponent/multiple development permits and multiple proponent/multiple development permits. It is problematic to compare these permits as apples to apples (as La Salle and Hutchings have) because their scope, complexity, and most particularly, their potential impact to the archaeological record, differ significantly. The increasing volume of permits is directly related to an increase in regulation of development, and cannot be taken as a direct measure of an increase in the number of impacts to archaeological sites, which might be better measured by the number of site alteration permits issued.

3. La Salle and Hutchings present an erroneous summary of the CRM process. A more accurate depiction follows: 1) conduct background research (including in many cases field reconnaissance) to determine the potential for an archaeological site to be both present and preserved on a subject property; 2) conduct field survey to determine the extent, nature, and significance of archaeological deposits on the subject property; 3) assess the potential impacts the proposed development may have on the archaeological deposits and provide management recommendations that range from site avoidance (usually the archaeologist's first option) to data recovery, to no further work; 4) submit a report to the Archaeology Branch that contains management recommendations; 5) conduct further work depending upon the Branch's decisions (it is the Branch

that makes the decisions about how a site is managed, not the individual CRM archaeologist), and; 6) submit a final report that adheres to the Branch's reporting standards. In summary, archaeologists do not take out permits to impact sites, they take out permits to *manage impacts to sites*.

4. La Salle and Hutchings rightly suggest that more should be published about the 'business' of archaeology. In our experience, non-disclosure agreements do not represent as serious an impediment as they are made out to be by these authors. The real culprits are both time and the orientation of CRM work. Cultural resource management practitioners are paid to assess projects, apply for permits, carry out fieldwork, write technical reports, and in effect 'manage' resources, rather than publish their observations about the meta-level of the business they engage in (which, when written, is really compelling stuff!). Nevertheless, it is a tricky business to write about our dealings with various 'stakeholders' and to simultaneously avoid 'biting the hand that feeds' (for further discussion, see Lyons forthcoming).

References Cited

- La Salle, Marina and Rich Hutchings. 2012. Commercial Archaeology in British Columbia. *The Midden* 44(2):8-16.
- Lyons, Natasha. Forthcoming. Where the wind blows us: Practicing critical community archaeology in the Canadian North. The Archaeology of Colonialism in Native North America Series. In press for 2013 at the University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Mason, Andrew and Don Bain. 2003. Report on the Evolution of British Columbia's Heritage Environment: An Overview and Discussion of First Nations Issues. [Available online at: http://www.ubcic.bc.ca/files/PDF/rep-0429-final_draft.pdf]

This Fall, *The Tye* featured a collection of articles as part of its "BC's Enduring Central Coast" series, the goal of which was to investigate "a land and culture that has thrived for thousands of years." Archaeology featured prominently in these articles, reporting on a summer of site visits and storytelling by practitioners in the field.

While archaeology is one contributor to history in these stories, oral traditions, museum repatriations, contemporary fishing and resource planning for the future are all interwoven. The resulting colourful fabric offers a holistic picture of Central Coast Indigenous peoples—past, present and future.

B.C.'s Central Coast Heritage Featured in *The Tye*

Titles of articles and videos include:

- *Bringing the Ancestors Home (video)*
- *Sifting Evidence with BC's Ancient Civilization Sleuths*
- *Ghost Towns and Living Defenders: A Coastal Timeline*
- *Coastal People's Past Powers Their Political Future*
- *Stone Fish Traps Explained (video)*
- *Bella Bella's Revitalized Fish Plant*
- *Hakai Beach Institute: A Science Hub for BC's Central Coast*
- *On BC's Central Coast, the Way Forward*

Check out the features and videos here:

<http://thetyee.ca/Series/2012/10/29/BCs-Enduring-Central-Coast/>