



1.0 PROJECT REPORT COVER PAGE

LICENSEE INFORMATION:

Contact Information:

Michael B. Henry CD BA FRAI FRSA
Southwestern District Office
553 Dufferin Avenue
London, ON N6B 2A5
Phone: (519) 432-4435
Email: mhenry@amick.ca
www.amick.ca

Licensee:

Ontario Archaeology Licence:

Marilyn Cornies
P038

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Corporate Project Number:

16932

MTCS Project Number:

P038-0901-2017

Investigation Type:

Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment

Project Name:

423003 Harbour Drive

Project Location:

423003 Harbour Drive,
Part of Lot 3, Broken Front Concession
(Geographic Township of Sydenham)
Municipality of Meaford, County of Grey

Project Designation Number:

Not Currently Available

MTCS FILING INFORMATION:

Site Record/Update Form(s):

N/A

Date of Report Filing:

November 2, 2017

Type of Report:

ORIGINAL

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report describes the results of the 2016 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 423003 Harbour Drive, Part of Lot 3, Broken Front Concession (Geographic Township of Sydenham) Municipality of Meaford, County of Grey, conducted by AMICK Consultants Limited. This study was conducted under Professional Archaeologist License #P038 issued to Marilyn Cornies by the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport for the Province of Ontario. This assessment was undertaken as a requirement under the Planning Act (RSO 1990b) and the Provincial Policy Statement (2014) in order to support a Draft Plan of Subdivision application and companion Zoning By-law Amendment application as part of the pre-submission process. Within the land use planning and development context, Ontario Regulation 544/06 under the Planning Act (1990b) requires an evaluation of archaeological potential and, where applicable, an archaeological assessment report completed by an archaeologist licensed by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS). Policy 2.6 of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS 2014) addresses archaeological resources. All work was conducted in conformity with Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture (MTC) Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011), the Ontario Heritage Act (RSO 1990a).

AMICK Consultants Limited was engaged by the proponent to undertake a Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of lands potentially affected by the proposed undertaking and was granted permission to carry out archaeological fieldwork. The entirety of the study area was subject to property inspection and photographic documentation concurrently with the Stage 2 Property Assessment by high intensity test pit methodology at a five-metre interval between individual test pits on 5-7, and 11-12 October 2016. All records, documentation, field notes, photographs and artifacts (as applicable) related to the conduct and findings of these investigations are held at the Lakelands District corporate offices of AMICK Consultants Limited until such time that they can be transferred to an agency or institution approved by the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) on behalf of the government and citizens of Ontario.

As a result of the property Assessment of the study area, no archaeological resources were encountered. Consequently, the following recommendations are made:

- *No further archaeological assessment of the study area is warranted;*
- *The Provincial interest in archaeological resources with respect to the proposed undertaking has been addressed;*
- *The proposed undertaking is clear of any archaeological concern.*

3.0 TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 PROJECT REPORT COVER PAGE	1
2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
3.0 TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
4.0 PROJECT PERSONNEL	3
5.0 PROJECT CONTEXT	4
6.0 FIELD WORK METHODS AND WEATHER CONDITIONS	14
7.0 RECORD OF FINDS	17
8.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS	17
9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS	27
10.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION	30
11.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES	31
12.0 MAPS	33
13.0 IMAGES	38

4.0 PROJECT PERSONNEL

AMICK CONSULTANTS LIMITED PARTNERS

Michael Henry (MTCS Professional Archaeologist Licence #P058)

Marilyn Cornies (MTCS Professional Archaeologist Licence #P038)

AMICK CONSULTANTS LIMITED BUSINESS MANAGER

Melissa Maclean BBA email mmaclean@amick.ca

PROJECT COORDINATOR

Melissa Maclean

PROJECT LICENSEE ARCHAEOLOGIST

Marilyn Cornies (MTCS Professional Archaeologist Licence #P038)

PROJECT FIELD DIRECTORS

Kayleigh MacKinnon (MTCS Professional Archaeologist Licence #P384)

Sarah MacKinnon (MTCS Professional Archaeologist Licence #P1024)

PROJECT FIELD ASSISTANTS

Megan Hadubiuk Nicole Markle Sheeba Hsan

PROJECT REPORT PREPARATION

Dylan Morningstar

Michael Henry (MTCS Professional Archaeologist Licence #P058)

PROJECT GRAPHICS

Dylan Morningstar

PROJECT PHOTOGRAPHY

Kayleigh MacKinnon (MTCS Professional Archaeologist Licence #P384)

5.0 PROJECT CONTEXT

5.1 DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

This report describes the results of the 2016 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 423003 Harbour Drive, Part of Lot 3, Broken Front Concession (Geographic Township of Sydenham) Municipality of Meaford, County of Grey, conducted by AMICK Consultants Limited. This study was conducted under Professional Archaeologist License #P038 issued to Marilyn Cornies by the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport for the Province of Ontario. This assessment was undertaken as a requirement under the Planning Act (RSO 1990b) and the Provincial Policy Statement (2014) in order to support a Draft Plan of Subdivision application and companion Zoning By-law Amendment application as part of the pre-submission process. Within the land use planning and development context, Ontario Regulation 544/06 under the Planning Act (1990b) requires an evaluation of archaeological potential and, where applicable, an archaeological assessment report completed by an archaeologist licensed by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS). Policy 2.6 of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS 2014) addresses archaeological resources. All work was conducted in conformity with Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture (MTC) Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011), the Ontario Heritage Act (RSO 1990a).

AMICK Consultants Limited was engaged by the proponent to undertake a Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of lands potentially affected by the proposed undertaking and was granted permission to carry out archaeological fieldwork. The entirety of the study area was subject to property inspection and photographic documentation concurrently with the Stage 2 Property Assessment on 5-7, and 11-12 October 2016 consisting of high-intensity test pit survey at an interval of five metres between individual test pits. All records, documentation, field notes, photographs and artifacts (as applicable) related to the conduct and findings of these investigations are held at the Lakelands District corporate offices of AMICK Consultants Limited until such time that they can be transferred to an agency or institution approved by the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) on behalf of the government and citizens of Ontario.

A preliminary plan of the proposed development has not been submitted at the time of the completion of this report.

5.2 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

5.2.1 GENERAL HISTORICAL OUTLINE

The Huron, Petun and various Algonkian First Nations resided in this area for an extended period of time prior to any European visitors to the area. The County of Grey was first established in 1852. Before the county was organized, the British referred to the entire area as “The Queen’s Bush”. Until 1852 this area was known for its dangerous travelling

conditions for Euro-Canadians. The first townships within Grey County were originally called “Alta” and “Zero” which were quickly renamed Collingwood and St. Vincent respectively. During the colonization of the County, a quickly established network of trails and roads, in addition to several natural harbours, provided easy access for settlers. However, due to the great distances involved and dangerous traveling conditions, the early settlers of this area relied heavily on First Nations to advise on settlement area selection, crop planting, medicine and survival. From the start of colonization it was easy to use the numerous natural resources easily available in the area as a means to generate income. Typically fish, furs, minerals, and forestation were the initial main industries. By 1865 Grey County consisted of 16 Townships, 4 towns and 44 villages or post offices (Grey County 2010).

Sydenham is a township community in Grey County, Ontario, Canada, named in part for Lord Sydenham, governor of Canada from 1839 to 1841. The area is bounded on the north side by Owen's Sound, a large inlet of Georgian Bay. Sydenham Township was surveyed in 1842, with concessions running north to south, and at that time the land consisted mainly of hardwood forest. Immigrants from Scotland and Ireland began to settle this area at about this time. The first mill was built in 1846, and the first school section was organized in 1851 (Marsh, Edith L., 1931). The first post office, at Woodford, was established in 1852. In 1853 the residents organized an Agricultural Society. By 1861 there were over 3,000 people living in the township. Although telephone lines were connecting nearby towns as early as 1886, it was not until 1908 that telephones began to be installed in Sydenham Township. (Ufland, Vina R., 1967)

Map 2 is a facsimile segment of the Township of Sydenham map reproduced from the “Grey County Supplement”. *Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada* (H. Belden & Co. 1881). Map 2 illustrates the location of the study area and environs as of 1881. The study area is not shown to belong to anyone and no structures are shown to be within the study area. A historic road is depicted within Johnsons Harbour Rd. Accordingly, it has been determined that there is potential for archaeological deposits related to early Euro-Canadian settlement within the study area.

It must be borne in mind that inclusion of names of property owners and depictions of structures within properties on these maps were sold by subscription. While information included within these maps may provide information about occupation of the property at a specific point in time, the absence of such information does not indicate that the property was not occupied.

5.2.2 CURRENT CONDITIONS

The present use of the study area is as wooded recreational waterfront lot. The study area is roughly 5.06 hectares in area. The study area includes within it mostly wood area that slopes towards a rocky shoreline in three terraces. There are three areas of steep slope located within the study area. One at the southern boundary of the study area, one located centrally within the southern portion of the study area which bisects the study area, and a small area of

steep slope is located within the northern portion of the study area. However, this area was too narrow to affect the test pit survey. A low-lying and wet area is located centrally within the study area. This area was delineated with markers and test pit survey was continued 5 metres into this area to confirm. Due to the nature of the terrain of the study area some portions appear to be seasonally wet. None of these areas were wet at the time of assessment. A rocky shoreline extends along the north border of the study area. A camper trailer with a deck, a picnic table, a fire pit, and a portable latrine are located along the north boundary of the property. A gravel laneway is located adjacent to the eastern boundary of the study area running north to south, which enters the study area in the northern portion and travels west across the study area to the western boundary. Small areas of lawn are located along the southern boundary as well as at the northwestern corner of the study area. The study area is bounded on the north by a rocky shoreline along Georgian Bay, on the east by woodland and a gravel lane, on the south by Harbour Drive, and on the west by woodland. The study area is approximately 150 metres to the northeast of the intersection of Harbour Drive and Johnsons Harbour. A plan of the study area is included within this report as Map 3. Current conditions encountered during the Stage 1-2 Property Assessment are illustrated in Maps 4 & 5.

5.2.3 SUMMARY OF HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The brief overview of documentary evidence readily available indicates that the study area is situated within an area that was close to the historic transportation routes and as such has potential for sites relating to early Post-contact settlement in the region. Background research indicates the property has potential for significant archaeological resources of Native origins based on proximity to a natural source of potable water in the past.

5.3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

The Archaeological Sites Database administered by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) indicates that there are no (0) previously documented sites within 1 kilometre of the study area. However, it must be noted that this is based on the assumption of the accuracy of information compiled from numerous researchers using different methodologies over many years. AMICK Consultants Limited assumes no responsibility for the accuracy of site descriptions, interpretations such as cultural affiliation, or location information derived from the Archaeological Sites Database administered by MTCS. In addition, it must also be noted that a lack of formerly documented sites does not indicate that there are no sites present as the documentation of any archaeological site is contingent upon prior research having been conducted within the study area.

On the basis of information supplied by MTCS, no archaeological assessments have been conducted within 50 metres of the study area. AMICK Consultants Limited assumes no responsibility for the accuracy of previous assessments, interpretations such as cultural affiliation, or location information derived from the Archaeological Sites Database administered by MTCS. In addition, it must also be noted that the lack of formerly

documented previous assessments does not indicate that no assessments have been conducted.

Data contained in previous archaeological reports in close proximity to the study area that is relevant to Stage 1 Background Study is defined within the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists in Section 7.5.8 Standard 4 as follows:

*“Provide descriptions of previous archaeological fieldwork carried out within the limits of, or immediately adjacent to the project area, as **documented by all available reports that include archaeological fieldwork carried out on the lands to be impacted by this project, or where reports document archaeological sites immediately adjacent (i.e., within 50 m) to those lands.**”*

(MTCS 2011: 126 Emphasis Added)

In accordance with data supplied by MTCS for the purposes of completing this study, there are no previous reports detailing, “archaeological fieldwork carried out on the lands to be impacted by this project”, nor do any previous reports document known archaeological sites within 50 metres of the study area.

The Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists stipulates that the necessity to summarize the results of previous archaeological assessment reports, or to cite MTCS File Numbers in references to other archaeological reports, is reserved for reports that are directly relevant to the fieldwork and recommendations for the study area (S & Gs 7.5.7, Standard 2, MTC 2011: 125). This is further refined and elaborated upon in Section 7.5.8, Standards 4 & 5, MTC 2011:

*“4. Provide descriptions of previous archaeological fieldwork carried out within the limits of, or immediately adjacent to the project area, as documented by all available **reports that include archaeological fieldwork carried out on the lands to be impacted by this project, or where reports document archaeological sites immediately adjacent (i.e., within 50m) to those lands.**”*

*“5. **If previous findings and recommendations are relevant** to the current stage of work, provide the following:*

- a. *a brief summary of previous findings and recommendations*
- b. *documentation of any differences in the current work from the previously recommended work*
- c. *rationale for the differences from the previously recommended work”*

(Emphasis Added)

The study area is situated in area for which there is no archaeological master plan.

It must be further noted that there are no relevant plaques associated with the study area.

5.3.1 PRE-CONTACT REGISTERED SITES

A summary of registered and/or known archaeological sites within a 1-kilometre radius of the study area was gathered from the Archaeological Sites Database, administered by MTCS. As a result it was determined that no (0) archaeological sites relating directly to First Nations habitation/activity had been formally registered within the immediate vicinity of the study area. However, the lack of formally documented archaeological sites does not mean that First Nations people did not use the area; it more likely reflects a lack of systematic archaeological research in the immediate vicinity. Even in cases where one or more assessments may have been conducted in close proximity to a proposed landscape alteration, an extensive area of physical archaeological assessment coverage is required throughout the region to produce a representative sample of all potentially available archaeological data in order to provide any meaningful evidence to construct a pattern of land use and settlement in the past.

The study area is bounded by Georgian Bay, which is a source of potable water and a navigable water way. The distance to water criteria used to establish potential for archaeological sites suggests potential for Pre-contact occupation and land use in the area in the past.

Table 2 illustrates the chronological development of cultures within southern Ontario prior to the arrival of European cultures to the area at the beginning of the 17th century. This general cultural outline is based on archaeological data and represents a synthesis and summary of research over a long period of time. It is necessarily generalizing and is not necessarily representative of the point of view of all researchers or stakeholders. It is offered here as a rough guideline and outline to illustrate the relationships of broad cultural groups and time periods.

TABLE 2 CULTURAL CHRONOLOGY FOR SOUTHERN ONTARIO

Years ago	Period	Southern Ontario
250	Terminal Woodland	Ontario and St. Lawrence Iroquois Cultures
1000 2000	Initial Woodland	Princess Point, Saugeen, Point Peninsula, and Meadowood Cultures
3000 4000 5000 6000	Archaic	Laurentian Culture
7000 8000 9000 10000 11000	Palaeo-Indian	Plano and Clovis Cultures
		(Wright 1972)

5.3.2 POST-CONTACT REGISTERED SITES

A summary of registered and/or known archaeological sites within a 1-kilometre radius of the study area was gathered from the Archaeological Sites Database, administered by MTCS. As a result it was determined that no (0) archaeological sites relating directly to Euro-Canadian habitation/activity had been formally registered within the immediate vicinity of the study area.

5.3.3 LOCATION AND CURRENT CONDITIONS

The study area is described as 423003 Harbour Drive, Part of Lot 3, Broken Front Concession (Geographic Township of Sydenham), Municipality of Meaford, County of Grey. This assessment was undertaken as a requirement under the Planning Act (RSO 1990b) in order to support a Draft Plan of Subdivision application and companion Zoning By-law Amendment application as part of the pre-submission process.

The present use of the study area is as wooded recreational waterfront lot. The study area is roughly 5.06 hectares in area. The study area includes within it mostly wood area that slopes towards a rocky shoreline in three terraces. There are three areas of steep slope located within the study area. One at the southern boundary of the study area, one located centrally within the southern portion of the study area which bisects the study area, and a small area of steep slope is located within the northern portion of the study area. However, this area was too narrow to affect the test pit survey. A low-lying and wet area is located centrally within the study area. This area was delineated with markers and test pit survey was continued 5 metres into this area to confirm. Due to the nature of the terrain of the study area some portions appear to be seasonally wet. None of these areas were wet at the time of assessment. A rocky shoreline extends along the north border of the study area. A camper trailer with a deck, a picnic table, a fire pit, and a portable latrine are located along the north boundary of the property. A gravel laneway is located adjacent to the eastern boundary of the study area running north to south, which enters the study area in the northern portion and travels west across the study area to the western boundary. Small areas of lawn are located along the southern boundary as well as at the northwestern corner of the study area. The study area is bounded on the north by a rocky shoreline along Georgian Bay, on the east by woodland and a gravel lane, on the south by Harbour Drive, and on the west by woodland. The study area is approximately 150 metres to the northeast of the intersection of Harbour Drive and Johnsons Harbour. A plan of the study area is included within this report as Map 3. Current conditions encountered during the Stage 1-2 Property Assessment are illustrated in Maps 4 & 5.

5.3.4 PHYSIOGRAPHIC REGION

The study area is situated within the Cape Rich Steps physiographic region. In preglacial times this was the upland area between two valleys. From the shore of Georgian Bay at 580 a.s.l. the land rises 500 feet in a series of five steps. The terraces are cut out of red shale and

dolostone. There is little glacial till. The two lower terraces are noted for gravel beaches and a profusion of boulders. The area is characterized by a red clay soil which supports forest cover or pasture but is less than ideal for agricultural tillage (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 126-127).

5.3.5 SURFACE WATER

Sources of potable water, access to waterborne transportation routes, and resources associated with watersheds are each considered, both individually and collectively to be the highest criteria for determination of the potential of any location to support extended human activity, land use, or occupation. Accordingly, proximity to water is regarded as the primary indicator of archaeological site potential. The Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists stipulates that undisturbed lands within 300 metres of a water source are considered to have archaeological potential (MTC 2011: 21).

The study area is bounded by Georgian Bay, which is a source of potable water and a navigable water way. Additionally, a low-lying and wet area is located within the study area.

5.3.6 CURRENT PROPERTY CONDITIONS CONTEXT

Current characteristics encountered within an archaeological research study area determine if property Assessment of specific portions of the study area will be necessary and in what manner a Stage 2 Property Assessment should be conducted, if necessary. Conventional assessment methodologies include pedestrian survey on ploughable lands and test pit methodology within areas that cannot be ploughed. For the purpose of determining where property Assessment is necessary and feasible, general categories of current landscape conditions have been established as archaeological conventions. These include:

5.3.6.1 BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURAL FOOTPRINTS

A building, for the purposes of this particular study, is a structure that exists currently or has existed in the past in a given location. The footprint of a building is the area of the building formed by the perimeter of the foundation. Although the interior area of building foundations would often be subject to property Assessment when the foundation may represent a potentially significant historic archaeological site, the footprints of existing structures are not typically assessed. Existing structures commonly encountered during archaeological assessments are often residential-associated buildings (houses, garages, sheds), and/or component buildings of farm complexes (barns, silos, greenhouses). In many cases, even though the disturbance to the land may be relatively shallow and archaeological resources may be situated below the disturbed layer (e.g. a concrete garage pad), there is no practical means of assessing the area beneath the disturbed layer. However, if there were evidence to suggest that there are likely archaeological resources situated beneath the disturbance, alternative methodologies may be recommended to study such areas.

The study area contains a camper trailer with a deck, as well as a portable latrine. Although these buildings do not have foundations that would have resulted in deep disturbance, there is no practical means of assessing the area upon which these sit. The size of the portable latrine resulted in no impact to the survey interval. The size of camper trailer with deck resulted in minimal impact to the survey interval. Maps 4 & 5 of this report illustrate the locations of these features.

5.3.6.2 DISTURBANCE

Areas that have been subjected to extensive and deep land alteration that has severely damaged the integrity of archaeological resources are known as land disturbances. Examples of land disturbances are areas of past quarrying, major landscaping, and sewage and infrastructure development (MTC 2011: 18), as well as driveways made of gravel or asphalt or concrete, in-ground pools, and wells or cisterns. Surfaces paved with interlocking brick, concrete, asphalt, gravel and other surfaces meant to support heavy loads or to be long wearing hard surfaces in high traffic areas, must be prepared by the excavation and removal of topsoil, grading, and the addition of aggregate material to ensure appropriate engineering values for the supporting matrix and also to ensure that the installations shed water to avoid flooding or moisture damage. All hard surfaced areas are prepared in this fashion and therefore have no or low archaeological potential. Major utility lines are conduits that provide services such as water, natural gas, hydro, communications, sewage, and others. These major installations should not be confused with minor below ground service installations not considered to represent significant disturbances removing archaeological potential, such as services leading to individual structures which tend to be comparatively very shallow and vary narrow corridors. Areas containing substantial and deeply buried services or clusters of below ground utilities are considered areas of disturbance, and may be excluded from Stage 2 Property Assessment. Disturbed areas are excluded from Stage 2 Property Assessment due to no or low archaeological potential and often because they are also not viable to assess using conventional methodology.

*“Earthwork is one of the major works involved in road construction. This process includes excavation, material removal, filling, compaction, and construction. Moisture content is controlled, and compaction is done according to standard design procedures. Normally, rock explosion at the road bed is not encouraged. While filling a depression to reach the road level, **the original bed is flattened after the removal of the topsoil.** The fill layer is distributed and compacted to the designed specifications. This procedure is repeated until the compaction desired is reached. **The fill material should not contain organic elements,** and possess a low index of plasticity. Fill material can include gravel and decomposed rocks of a particular size, but should not consist of huge clay lumps. Sand clay can be used. The area is considered to be adequately compacted when the roller movement does not create a noticeable deformation. **The road surface finish is reliant on the economic aspects, and the estimated usage.**” [Emphasis Added]*

(Goel 2013)

The supporting matrix of a hard paved surface cannot contain organic material which is subject to significant compression, decay and moisture retention. Topsoil has no engineering value and must be removed in any construction application where the surface finish at grade requires underlying support.

Installation of sewer lines and other below ground services associated with infrastructure development often involves deep excavation that can remove archaeological potential. This consideration does not apply to relatively minor below ground services that connect structures and facilities to services that support their operation and use. Major servicing corridors will be situated within adjacent road allowances with only minor, narrow and relatively shallow underground services entering into the study area to connect existing structures to servicing mainlines. The relatively minor, narrow and shallow services buried within a residential property do not require such extensive ground disturbance to remove or minimize archaeological potential within affected areas.

A gravel laneway is located adjacent to the eastern boundary of the study area running south to north, which enters the study area in the northern portion and travels west across the study area to the western boundary. Maps 4 & 5 of this report illustrate the locations of these features.

5.3.6.3 LOW-LYING AND WET AREAS

Landscape features that are covered by permanently wet areas, such as marshes, swamps, or bodies of water like streams or lakes, are known as low-lying and wet areas. Low-lying and wet areas are excluded from Stage 2 Property Assessment due to inaccessibility.

A low-lying and wet area is located centrally within the study area. This area was delineated with markers and test pit survey was continued 5 metres into this area to confirm. Due to the nature of the terrain of the study area some portions appear to be seasonally wet. None of these areas were wet at the time of assessment. Maps 4 & 5 of this report illustrate the locations of this feature.

5.3.6.4 STEEP SLOPE

Landscape which slopes at a greater than (>) 20 degree change in elevation, is known as steep slope. Areas of steep slope are considered uninhabitable, and are excluded from Stage 2 Property Assessment.

Generally, steep slopes are not assessed because steep slopes are interpreted to have low potential, not due to viability to assess, except in cases where the slope is severe enough to become a safety concern for archaeological field crews. In such cases, the Occupational Health and Safety Act takes precedence as indicated in the introduction to the Standards and Guidelines. AMICK Consultant Limited policy is to assess all slope areas whenever it is safe to do so. Assessment of slopes, except where safety concerns arise, eliminates the invariably subjective interpretation of what might constitute a steep slope in the field. This is done to

minimize delays due to conflicts in such interpretations and to increase the efficiency of review.

There are three areas of steep slope located within the study area. One at the southern boundary of the study area, one located centrally within the southern portion of the study area which bisects the study area, and a small area of steep slope is located within the northern portion of the study area. However, this area was too narrow to affect the test pit survey. Maps 4 & 5 of this report illustrate the locations of these features.

5.3.6.5 WOODED AREAS

Areas of the property that cannot be ploughed, such as natural forest or woodlot, are known as wooded areas. These wooded areas qualify for Stage 2 Property Assessment, and are required to be assessed using test pit survey methodology.

The majority of the study area is wooded.

5.3.6.6 PLOUGHABLE AGRICULTURAL LANDS

Areas of current or former agricultural lands that have been ploughed in the past are considered ploughable agricultural lands. Ploughing these lands regularly turns the soil, which in turn brings previously buried artifacts to the surface, which are then easily identified during visual inspection. Furthermore, by allowing the ploughed area to weather sufficiently through rainfall, soil is washed off of exposed artifacts at the surface and the visibility of artifacts at the surface of recently worked field areas is enhanced markedly. Pedestrian survey of ploughed agricultural lands is the preferred method of physical assessment because of the greater potential for finding evidence of archaeological resources if present.

The study area does not contain any ploughable lands.

5.3.6.7 LAWN, PASTURE, MEADOW

Landscape features consisting of former agricultural land covered in low growth, such as lawns, pastures, meadows, shrubbery, and immature trees. These are areas that may be considered too small to warrant ploughing, (i.e. less than one hectare in area), such as yard areas surrounding existing structures, and land-locked open areas that are technically workable by a plough but inaccessible to agricultural machinery. These areas may also include open area within urban contexts that do not allow agricultural tillage within municipal or city limits or the use of urban roadways by agricultural machinery. These areas are required to be assessed using test pit survey methodology.

The study area does contain a small area of lawn along the southern boundary as well as at the northwestern corner of the study area.

5.3.7 SUMMARY

Background research indicates the vicinity of the study area has potential for archaeological resources of Native origins based on proximity to a source of potable water that was also used as a means of waterborne trade and communication. Background research also suggests potential for archaeological resources of Post-contact origins based on proximity to a historic roadway.

Current conditions within the study area indicate that some areas of the property may have no or low archaeological potential and do not require Stage 2 Property Assessment or should be excluded from Stage 2 Property Assessment. These areas would include the footprint of existing structures, areas under gravel, areas of steep slope, and low-lying and wet areas. A significant proportion of the study area does exhibit archaeological potential and therefore a Stage 2 Property Assessment is required.

Archaeological potential does not indicate that there are necessarily sites present, but that environmental and historical factors suggest that there may be as yet undocumented archaeological sites within lands that have not been subject to systematic archaeological research in the past.

6.0 FIELD WORK METHODS AND WEATHER CONDITIONS

This report confirms that the study area was subject to Stage 2 Property Assessment by high intensity test pit methodology at a five-metre interval between individual test pits on 5-7, and 11-12 October 2016. The fieldwork undertaken as a component of this study was conducted according to the archaeological fieldwork standards and guidelines (including weather and lighting conditions). Weather conditions were appropriate for the necessary fieldwork required to complete the Stage 2 Property Assessment and to create the documentation appropriate to this study. The locations from which photographs were taken and the directions toward which the camera was aimed for each photograph are illustrated in Maps 4 & 5 of this report. Upon completion of the property inspection of the study area, it was determined that select areas would require Stage 2 archaeological assessment consisting of test pit survey methodology.

6.1 PROPERTY INSPECTION

A detailed examination and photo documentation was carried out on the study area in order to document the existing conditions of the study area to facilitate the Stage 2 Property Assessment. All areas of the study area were visually inspected and photographed. Observations made of conditions within the study area at the time of the inspection were used to inform the requirement for Stage 2 Property Assessment for portions of the study area as well as to aid in the determination of appropriate Stage 2 Property Assessment strategies. The locations from which photographs were taken and the directions toward which the camera was aimed for each photograph are illustrated in Maps 4 & 5 of this report.

6.2 TEST PIT SURVEY

In accordance with the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists, test pit survey is required to be undertaken for those portions of the study area where deep prior disturbance had not occurred prior to assessment or which were accessible to survey. Test pit survey is only used in areas that cannot be subject to ploughing or cultivation. This report confirms that the conduct of test pit survey within the study area conformed to the following standards:

1. Test pit survey only on terrain where ploughing is not possible or viable, as in the following examples:

a. wooded areas

[All wooded areas were test pit surveyed at an interval of 5 m between individual test pits]

b. pasture with high rock content

[Not Applicable - The study area does not contain any pastures with high rock content]

c. abandoned farmland with heavy brush and weed growth

[Not Applicable - The study area does not contain any abandoned farmland with heavy brush and weed growth]

d. orchards and vineyards that cannot be strip ploughed (planted in rows 5 m apart or less), gardens, parkland or lawns, any of which will remain in use for several years after the survey

[Not Applicable - The study area does not contain any of the above-mentioned circumstances]

e. properties where existing landscaping or infrastructure would be damaged. The presence of such obstacles must be documented in sufficient detail to demonstrate that ploughing or cultivation is not viable.

[Small areas of lawn are located along the southern boundary as well as at the northwestern corner of the study area. Both of these areas are not viable to plough due to location and size. All areas that were not viable to be ploughed were test pit at an interval of 5 metres between individual test pits]

f. narrow (10 m or less) linear survey corridors (e.g., water or gas pipelines, road widening). This includes situations where there are planned impacts 10 m or less beyond the previously impacted limits on both sides of an existing linear corridor (e.g., two linear survey corridors on either side of an existing roadway). Where at the time of fieldwork the lands within the linear corridor meet the standards as stated under the above section on pedestrian survey land preparation, pedestrian survey must be carried out. Space test pits at

maximum intervals of 5 m (400 test pits per hectare) in areas less than 300 m from any feature of archaeological potential.

[Not Applicable – The study area does not contain any linear corridors]

2. *Space test pits at maximum intervals of 5 m (400 test pits per hectare) in areas less than 300 m from any feature of archaeological potential.*
[All test pits were spaced at an interval of 5m between individual test pits]
3. *Space test pits at maximum intervals of 10 m (100 test pits per hectare) in areas more than 300 m from any feature of archaeological potential.*
[The entirety of the test pitted areas of the study area were assessed using high intensity test pit methodology at an interval of 5 metres between individual test pits]
4. *Test pit to within 1 m of built structures (both intact and ruins), or until test pits show evidence of recent ground disturbance.*
[Test pits were placed within 1m of all built structures]
5. *Ensure that test pits are at least 30 cm in diameter.*
[All test pits were at least 30 cm in diameter]
6. *Excavate each test pit, by hand, into the first 5 cm of subsoil and examine the pit for stratigraphy, cultural features, or evidence of fill.*
[Regardless of the interval between individual test pits, all test pits were excavated by hand into the first 5 cm of subsoil where possible and examined for stratigraphy, cultural features, or evidence of fill. In areas where rocky subsurface prevented subsoil from being reached, test pits were excavated by hand to the rocky subsurface]
7. *Screen soil through mesh no greater than 6 mm.*
[All soil was screened through mesh no greater than 6 mm]
8. *Collect all artifacts according to their associated test pit.*
[Not Applicable - No archaeological resources were encountered]
9. *Backfill all test pits unless instructed not to by the landowner.*
[All test pits were backfilled]

(MTC 2011: 31-32)

Approximately 75% of the study area consisted of wooded area and lawn area that was test pit surveyed at an interval of 5 metres between individual test pits. Approximately 7% of the study area was low-lying and wet and was excluded from the test pit survey. Approximately 3% of the study area was not assessable due to the presence of steep slope. Approximately 2.5% of the study area was not assessable due to the presence of existing structures and a disturbed gravel laneway. Approximately 2.5% of the study area was not assessable due to the presence of a rocky shoreline.

7.0 RECORD OF FINDS

Section 7.8.2 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011: 137-138) outlines the requirements of the Record of Finds component of a Stage 2 report:

- 1. For all archaeological resources and sites that are identified in Stage 2, provide the following:*
 - a. a general description of the types of artifacts and features that were identified*
 - b. a general description of the area within which artifacts and features were identified, including the spatial extent of the area and any relative variations in density*
 - c. a catalogue and description of all artifacts retained*
 - d. a description of the artifacts and features left in the field (nature of material, frequency, other notable traits).*
- 2. Provide an inventory of the documentary record generated in the field (e.g. photographs, maps, field notes).*
- 3. Submit information detailing exact site locations on the property separately from the project report, as specified in section 7.6. Information on exact site locations includes the following:*
 - a. table of GPS readings for locations of all archaeological sites*
 - b. maps showing detailed site location information.*

7.1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

No archaeological resources of any description were encountered anywhere within the study area.

7.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELDWORK DOCUMENTATION

The documentation produced during the field investigation conducted in support of this report includes: two sketch maps, two pages of photo log, 6 pages of field notes, and 45 digital photographs.

8.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

AMICK Consultants Limited was engaged by the proponent to undertake a Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of lands potentially affected by the proposed undertaking and was granted permission to carry out archaeological fieldwork. The entirety of the study area was subject to property inspection and photographic documentation concurrently with the Stage 2 Property Assessment on 5-7, and 11-12 October 2016, consisting of high-intensity test pit survey at an interval of five metres between individual test pits. All records, documentation, field notes, photographs and artifacts (as applicable) related to the conduct and findings of these investigations are held at the Lakelands District corporate offices of

AMICK Consultants Limited until such time that they can be transferred to an agency or institution approved by the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) on behalf of the government and citizens of Ontario.

8.1 STAGE 1 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

As part of the present study, background research was conducted in order to determine the archaeological potential of the proposed project area.

“A Stage 1 background study provides the consulting archaeologist and Ministry report reviewer with information about the known and potential cultural heritage resources within a particular study area, prior to the start of the field assessment.” (OMCzCR 1993)

The evaluation of potential is further elaborated Section 1.3 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologist (2011) prepared by the Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture:

“The Stage 1 background study (and, where undertaken, property inspection) leads to an evaluation of the property’s archaeological potential. If the evaluation indicates that there is archaeological potential anywhere on the property, the next step is a Stage 2 assessment.” (MTC 2011: 17)

Features or characteristics that indicate archaeological potential when documented within the study area, or within close proximity to the study area (as applicable), include:

- “ - previously identified archaeological sites
 - water sources (It is important to distinguish types of water and shoreline, and to distinguish natural from artificial water sources, as these features affect site locations and types to varying degrees.):
 - primary water sources (lakes, rivers, streams, creeks)
 - secondary water sources (intermittent streams and creeks, springs, marshes, swamps)
 - features indicating past water sources (e.g., glacial lake shorelines indicated by the presence of raised sand or gravel beach ridges, relic river or stream channels indicated by clear dip or swale in the topography, shorelines of drained lakes or marshes, cobble beaches)
 - accessible or inaccessible shoreline (e.g., high bluffs, swamp or marsh fields by the edge of a lake, sandbars stretching into marsh)
 - elevated topography (e.g., eskers, drumlins, large knolls, plateaux)
 - pockets of well-drained sandy soil, especially near areas of heavy soil or rocky ground
 - distinctive land formations that might have been special or spiritual places, such as waterfalls, rock outcrops, caverns, mounds, and promontories and their bases. There may be physical indicators of their use, such as burials, structures, offerings, rock paintings or carvings.

- resource areas, including:
 - food or medicinal plants (e.g., migratory routes, spawning areas, prairie)
 - scarce raw materials (e.g., quartz, copper, ochre or outcrops of chert)
 - early Post-contact industry (e.g., fur trade, logging, prospecting, mining)
- areas of early Post-contact settlement. These include places of early military or pioneer settlement (e.g., pioneer homesteads, isolated cabins, farmstead complexes), early wharf or dock complexes, pioneer churches and early cemeteries. There may be commemorative markers of their history, such as local, provincial, or federal monuments or heritage parks.
- Early historical transportation routes (e.g., trails, passes, roads, railways, portage routes)
- property listed on a municipal register or designated under the Ontario Heritage Act that is a federal, provincial or municipal historic landmark or site
- property that local histories or informants have identified with possible archaeological sites, historical events, activities, or occupations”

(MTC 2011: 17-18)

The evaluation of potential does not indicate that sites are present within areas affected by proposed development. Evaluation of potential considers the possibility for as yet undocumented sites to be found in areas that have not been subject to systematic archaeological investigation in the past. Potential for archaeological resources is used to determine if property assessment of a study area or portions of a study area is required.

“Archaeological resources not previously documented may also be present in the affected area. If the alternative areas being considered, or the preferred alternative selected, exhibit either high or medium potential for the discovery of archaeological remains an archaeological assessment will be required.”

(MCC & MOE 1992: 6-7)

“The Stage 1 background study (and, where undertaken, property inspection) leads to an evaluation of the property’s archaeological potential. If the evaluation indicates that there is archaeological potential anywhere on the property, the next step is a Stage 2 assessment.”

(MTC 2011: 17)

In addition, archaeological sites data is also used to determine if any archaeological resources had been formerly documented within or in close proximity to the study area and if these same resources might be subject to impacts from the proposed undertaking. This data was also collected in order to establish the relative cultural heritage value or interest of any resources that might be encountered during the conduct of the present study. For example, the relative rarity of a site can be used to assign an elevated level of cultural heritage value or interest to a site that is atypical for the immediate vicinity. The requisite archaeological sites data of previously registered archaeological sites was collected from the Programs and Services Branch, Culture Programs Unit, MTCS and the corporate research library of AMICK Consultants Limited. The Stage 1 Background Research methodology also includes

a review of the most detailed available topographic maps, historical settlement maps, archaeological management plans (where applicable) and commemorative plaques or monuments. When previous archaeological research documents lands to be impacted by the proposed undertaking or archaeological sites within 50 metres of the study area, the reports documenting this earlier work are reviewed for pertinent information. AMICK Consultants Limited will often modify this basic methodology based on professional judgment to include additional research (such as, local historical works or documents and knowledgeable informants).

Section 7.7.3 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011: 132) outlines the requirements of the Analysis and Conclusions component of a Stage 1 Background Study.

- 1) *“Identify and describe areas of archaeological potential within the project area.*
- 2) *Identify and describe areas that have been subject to extensive and deep land alterations. Describe the nature of alterations (e.g., development or other activity) that have severely damaged the integrity of archaeological resources and have removed archaeological potential.”*

CHARACTERISTICS INDICATING ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

Section 1.3.1 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists specifies the property characteristics that indicate archaeological potential (MTC 2011: 17-18). Factors that indicate archaeological potential are features of the local landscape and environment that may have attracted people to either occupy the land or to conduct activities within the study area. One or more of these characteristics found to apply to a study area would necessitate a Stage 2 Property Assessment to determine if archaeological resources are present. These characteristics are listed below together with considerations derived from the conduct of this study.

1) *Previously Identified Archaeological Sites*

Previously registered archaeological sites have not been documented within 300 metres of the study area.

2) *Water Sources*

Primary water sources are described as including lakes, rivers streams and creeks. Close proximity to primary water sources (300 metres) indicates that people had access to readily available sources of potable water and routes of waterborne trade and communication should the study area have been used or occupied in the past.

The study area is bounded by Georgian Bay, which is a source of potable water and a navigable water way.

Secondary water sources are described as including intermittent streams and creeks, springs, marshes, and swamps. Close proximity (300 metres) to secondary water

sources indicates that people had access to readily available sources of potable water, at least on a seasonal basis, and in some cases seasonal access to routes of waterborne trade and communication should the study area have been used or occupied in the past.

A low-lying and wet area is located centrally within the study area. This area was delineated with markers and test pit survey was continued 5 metres into this area to confirm. Due to the nature of the terrain of the study area some portions appear to be seasonally wet. None of these areas were wet at the time of assessment.

3) *Features Indicating Past Water Sources*

Features indicating past water resources are described as including glacial lake shorelines indicated by the presence of raised sand or gravel beach ridges, relic river or stream channels indicated by clear dip or swale in the topography, shorelines of drained lakes or marshes, and cobble beaches. Close proximity (300 metres) to features indicating past water sources indicates that people had access to readily available sources of potable water, at least on a seasonal basis, and in some cases seasonal access to routes of waterborne trade and communication should the study area have been used or occupied in the past.

There are identified features indicating past water sources within 300 metres of the study area. The study area is situated within an area once under glacial Lake Algonquin and then subsequently under Nipissing Great Lakes. The study area is now located between the old Lake Algonquin and Nipissing shorelines and the current shoreline of Georgian Bay. Through the receding and rising of the past lakes the study area would have been within close proximity to the shorelines of both Lake Algonquin and Nipissing providing access to an abundance of natural resources as well as waterborne trade and communication. The steep slopes within the study area are likely remnants of former shorelines created during the receding process, as there are former shorelines located south of the study area representing the highest level of the former Lakes.

4) *Accessible or Inaccessible Shoreline*

This form of landscape feature would include high bluffs, swamp or marsh fields by the edge of a lake, sandbars stretching into marsh, etc.

The study area is bounded on the north by Georgian Bay.

5) *Elevated Topography*

Features of elevated topography that indicate archaeological potential include eskers, drumlins, large knolls, and plateaux.

The property contains rolling slopes that plateau above each slope in receding elevation towards the shoreline.

6) Pockets of Well-drained Sandy Soil

Pockets of sandy soil are considered to be especially important near areas of heavy soil or rocky ground.

The soil throughout the study area is medium brown sandy loam with areas of rock, increasing in rockiness towards the shoreline. This soil is consistent with the wider area surrounding the property. Therefore, the presence of this soil has no impact on potential within the study area, as the wider area is not known for clay soils or exposed bedrock.

7) Distinctive Land Formations

These are landscape features that might have been special or spiritual places, such as waterfalls, rock outcrops, caverns, mounds, and promontories and their bases. There may be physical indicators of their use, such as burials, structures, offerings, rock paintings or carvings.

There are no identified distinctive land formations within the study area.

8) Resource Areas

Resource areas that indicate archaeological potential include food or medicinal plants (e.g., migratory routes, spawning areas, and prairie), scarce raw materials (e.g., quartz, copper, ochre or outcrops of chert) and resources of importance to early Post-contact industry (e.g., logging, prospecting, and mining).

There are no identified resource areas within the study area.

9) Areas of Early Post-contact Settlement

These include places of early military or pioneer settlement (e.g., pioneer homesteads, isolated cabins, and farmstead complexes), early wharf or dock complexes, pioneer churches and early cemeteries. There may be commemorative markers of their history, such as local, provincial, or federal monuments or heritage parks.

The study area is situated in close proximity to a historic road identified on the historic atlas map.

10) Early Historical Transportation Routes

This includes evidence of trails, passes, roads, railways, portage routes.

The study area is situated within 175 metres of an early settlement road that appears on the Historic Atlas Map of 1881. This historic road corresponds to the road presently known as Johnsons Harbour Road. The property is situated bounded by a body of water that was used for waterborne trade and communication.

11) Heritage Property

Property listed on a municipal register or designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act* or is a federal, provincial or municipal historic landmark or site.

There are no listed or designated heritage buildings or properties that form a part of the study area. There are no listed or designated heritage buildings or properties that are adjacent to the study area.

12) *Documented Historical or Archaeological Sites*

This includes property that local histories or informants have identified with possible archaeological sites, historical events, activities, or occupations. These are properties which have not necessarily been formally recognized or for which there is additional evidence identifying possible archaeological resources associated with historic properties in addition to the rationale for formal recognition.

There are no known heritage features, or known historic sites, or known archaeological sites within the study area in addition to those formally documented with the appropriate agencies or previously noted under a different criterion.

CHARACTERISTICS INDICATING REMOVAL OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

Section 1.3.2 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists specifies the property characteristics which indicate no archaeological potential or for which archaeological potential has been removed (MTC 2011: 18-19). These characteristics are listed below together with considerations derived from the conduct of this study.

The introduction of Section 1.3.2 (MTC 2011: 18) notes that “*Archaeological potential can be determined not to be present for either the entire property or a part(s) of it when the area under consideration has been subject to extensive and deep land alterations that have severely damaged the integrity of any archaeological resources. This is commonly referred to as ‘disturbed’ or ‘disturbance’, and may include:*”

1) *Quarrying*

There is no evidence to suggest that quarrying operations were ever carried out within the study area.

2) *Major Landscaping Involving Grading Below Topsoil*

Unless there is evidence to suggest the presence of buried archaeological deposits, such deeply disturbed areas are considered to have lost their archaeological potential. Properties that do not have a long history of Post-contact occupation can have archaeological potential removed through extensive landscape alterations that penetrate below the topsoil layer. This is because most archaeological sites originate at grade with relatively shallow associated excavations into the soil. Pre-contact sites and early historic sites are vulnerable to extensive damage and complete removal due to landscape modification activities. In urban contexts where a lengthy history of occupation has occurred, properties may have deeply buried archaeological deposits covered over and sealed through redevelopment activities that do not include the deep

excavation of the entire property for subsequent uses. Buildings are often erected directly over older foundations preserving archaeological deposits associated with the earlier occupation.

There is no evidence to suggest that major landscaping operations involving grading below topsoil were ever carried out within the study area. Surfaces paved with interlocking brick, concrete, asphalt, gravel and other surfaces meant to support heavy loads or to be long wearing hard surfaces in high traffic areas, must be prepared by the excavation and removal of topsoil, grading, and the addition of aggregate material to ensure appropriate engineering values for the supporting matrix and also to ensure that the installations shed water to avoid flooding or moisture damage. All hard surfaced areas are prepared in this fashion and therefore have no or low archaeological potential. Disturbed areas are excluded from Stage 2 Property Assessment due to no or low archaeological potential and often because they are also not viable to assess using conventional methodology.

3) *Building Footprints*

Typically, the construction of buildings involves the deep excavation of foundations, footings and cellars that often obliterate archaeological deposits situated close to the surface.

The study area contains a camper trailer with a deck, as well as a portable latrine. Although these buildings do not have foundations that would have resulted in deep disturbance, there is no practical means of assessing the area upon which these sit. The size of the portable latrine resulted in no impact to the survey interval. The size of camper trailer with deck resulted in minimal impact to the survey interval.

4) *Sewage and Infrastructure Development*

Installation of sewer lines and other below ground services associated with infrastructure development often involves deep excavation that can remove archaeological potential.

There is no evidence to suggest that substantial below ground services of any kind have resulted in significant impacts to any significant portion of the study area. Major utility lines are conduits that provide services such as water, natural gas, hydro, communications, sewage, and others. These major installations should not be confused with minor below ground service installations not considered to represent significant disturbances removing archaeological potential, such as services leading to individual structures which tend to be comparatively very shallow and vary narrow corridors. Areas containing substantial and deeply buried services or clusters of below ground utilities are considered areas of disturbance, and may be excluded from Stage 2 Property Assessment.

“Activities such as agricultural cultivation, gardening, minor grading and landscaping do not necessarily affect archaeological potential.”

(MTC 2011: 18)

“Archaeological potential is not removed where there is documented potential for deeply buried intact archaeological resources beneath land alterations, or where it cannot be clearly demonstrated through background research and property inspection that there has been complete and intensive disturbance of an area. Where complete disturbance cannot be demonstrated in Stage 1, it will be necessary to undertake Stage 2 assessment.”

(MTC 2011: 18)

SUMMARY

Table 2 below summarizes the evaluation criteria of the Ministry of Tourism and Culture together with the results of the Stage 1 Background Study for the proposed undertaking. Based on the criteria, the property is deemed to have archaeological potential on the basis of proximity to water, and proximity to a historic settlement road.

TABLE 2 EVALUATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

FEATURE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL		YES	NO	N/A	COMMENT
1	Known archaeological sites within 300m		N		If Yes, potential determined
PHYSICAL FEATURES					
2	Is there water on or near the property?	Y			If Yes, what kind of water?
2a	Primary water source within 300 m. (lakeshore, river, large creek, etc.)	Y			If Yes, potential determined
2b	Secondary water source within 300 m. (stream, spring, marsh, swamp, etc.)	Y			If Yes, potential determined
2c	Past water source within 300 m. (beach ridge, river bed, relic creek, etc.)	Y			If Yes, potential determined
2d	Accessible or Inaccessible shoreline within 300 m. (high bluffs, marsh, swamp, sand bar, etc.)	Y			If Yes, potential determined
3	Elevated topography (knolls, drumlins, eskers, plateaus, etc.)	Y			If Yes, and Yes for any of 4-9, potential determined
4	Pockets of sandy soil in a clay or rocky area		N		If Yes and Yes for any of 3, 5-9, potential determined
5	Distinctive land formations (mounds, caverns, waterfalls, peninsulas, etc.)		N		If Yes and Yes for any of 3-4, 6-9, potential determined
HISTORIC/PREHISTORIC USE FEATURES					
6	Associated with food or scarce resource harvest areas (traditional fishing locations, agricultural/berry extraction areas, etc.)		N		If Yes, and Yes for any of 3-5, 7-9, potential determined.
7	Early Post-contact settlement area within 300 m.		N		If Yes, and Yes for any of 3-6, 8-9, potential determined
8	Historic Transportation route within 100 m. (historic road, trail, portage, rail corridors, etc.)	Y			If Yes, and Yes for any 3-7 or 9, potential determined
9	Contains property designated and/or listed under the Ontario Heritage Act (municipal heritage committee, municipal register, etc.)		N		If Yes and, Yes to any of 3-8, potential determined
APPLICATION-SPECIFIC INFORMATION					
10	Local knowledge (local heritage organizations, Pre-contact, etc.)		N		If Yes, potential determined
11	Recent disturbance not including agricultural cultivation (post-1960-confirmed extensive and intensive including industrial sites, aggregate areas, etc.)		N		If Yes, no potential or low potential in affected part (s) of the study area.

If **YES** to any of 1, 2a-c, or 10 Archaeological Potential is **confirmed**

If **YES** to 2 or more of 3-9, Archaeological Potential is **confirmed**

If **YES** to 11 or No to 1-10 Low Archaeological Potential is **confirmed** for at least a portion of the study area.

8.2 STAGE 2 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

Section 7.8.3 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011: 138-139) outlines the requirements of the Analysis and Conclusions component of a Stage 2 Property Assessment.

1. *Summarize all finding from the Stage 2 survey, or state that no archaeological sites were identified.*
2. *For each archaeological site, provide the following analysis and conclusions:*
 - a. *A preliminary determination, to the degree possible, of the age and cultural affiliation of any archaeological sites identified.*
 - b. *A comparison against the criteria in 2 Stage 2: Property Assessment to determine whether further assessment is required*
 - c. *A preliminary determination regarding whether any archaeological sites identified in Stage 2 show evidence of a high level cultural heritage value or interest and will thus require Stage 4 mitigation.*

No archaeological sites or resources were found during the Stage 2 survey of the study area.

9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 STAGE 1 RECOMMENDATIONS

Under Section 7.7.4 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011: 133) the recommendations to be made as a result of a Stage 1 Background Study are described.

- 1) *Make recommendations regarding the potential for the property, as follows:*
 - a. *if some or all of the property has archaeological potential, identify areas recommended for further assessment (Stage 2) and areas not recommended for further assessment. Any exemptions from further assessment must be consistent with the archaeological fieldwork standards and guidelines.*
 - b. *if no part of the property has archaeological potential, recommend that the property does not require further archaeological assessment.*
- 2) *Recommend appropriate Stage 2 assessment strategies.*

The study area has been identified as a property that exhibits potential to yield archaeological deposits of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI). The objectives of the Stage 1 Background Study have therefore been met and in accordance with the results of this investigation, the following recommendations are made:

1. *Further archaeological assessment of the study area is warranted;*

2. *The Provincial interest in archaeological resources with respect to the proposed undertaking remains to be addressed;*
3. *The proposed undertaking has a potential for archaeological resources and a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment is recommended;*
4. *A test pit survey at 5 metre intervals between individual test pits is recommended in all areas that are not viable to be ploughed and are at a less than (<) 20 degree change in elevation;*
5. *The steepness of any slopes within the study area must be determined through a Property Inspection since slopes at an angle of greater than (>) 20 degrees have low archaeological potential and may be excluded from Stage 2 Property Assessment;*
6. *Areas of disturbance can only be identified and be excluded from Stage 2 Property Assessment if confirmed by a licensed archaeologist through a Property Inspection and employing the required standards to document such areas.*
7. *The requirement to complete an archaeological study in order to file a By-law Zoning Amendment application and a Draft Plan of Subdivision application under the Planning Act has been met;*
8. *It is recommended that the completion of the Stage 2 Property Assessment, and any potential recommended further investigations flowing from the results of the Stage 2 Property Assessment, be made a Condition of Draft Plan Approval.*
9. *The Condition of Draft Plan approval will not be considered addressed and the Crown's interest in archaeological resources will not be considered addressed until a report documenting the completion of all required archaeological studies with a recommendation to clear the archaeological concern is submitted to MTCS and accepted into the Provincial Registry of Archaeological Reports.*
10. *No soil disturbances or removal of vegetation shall take place within the study area prior to the acceptance of a report recommending that all archaeological concerns for the study area have been addressed and that no further archaeological studies are warranted into the Provincial Registry of Archaeological reports maintained by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS).*

9.2 STAGE 2 RECOMMENDATIONS

Under Section 7.8.4 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011: 139) the recommendations to be made as a result of a Stage 2 Property Assessment are described.

- 1) *For each archaeological site, provide a statement of the following:*
 - a. *Borden number or other identifying number*
 - b. *Whether or not it is of further cultural heritage value or interest*
 - c. *Where it is of further cultural heritage value or interest, appropriate Stage 3 assessment strategies*

- 2) *Make recommendations only regarding archaeological matters. Recommendations regarding built heritage or cultural heritage landscapes should not be included.*
- 3) *If the Stage 2 survey did not identify any archaeological sites requiring further assessment or mitigation of impacts, recommend that no further archaeological assessment of the property be required.*

As a result of the Stage 2 Property Assessment of the study area, no archaeological resources were encountered. Consequently, the following recommendations are made:

1. *No further archaeological assessment of the study area is warranted;*
2. *The Provincial interest in archaeological resources with respect to the proposed undertaking has been addressed;*
3. *The proposed undertaking is clear of any archaeological concern.*

10.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION

While not part of the archaeological record, this report must include the following standard advisory statements for the benefit of the proponent and the approval authority in the land use planning and development process:

- a. This report is submitted to the Minister of Tourism and Culture as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. 0.18. The report is reviewed to ensure that it complies with the standards and guidelines issued by the Minister, and that the archaeological fieldwork and report recommendations ensure the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario. When all matters relating to archaeological sites within the project area of a development proposal have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Ministry of Tourism and Culture, a letter will be issued by the ministry stating that there are no further concerns with regard to alterations to archaeological sites by the proposed development.*
- b. It is an offence under Sections 48 and 69 of the Ontario Heritage Act for any party other than a licensed archaeologist to make any alteration to a known archaeological site or to remove any artifact or other physical evidence of past human use or activity from the site, until such time as a licensed archaeologist has completed archaeological fieldwork on the site, submitted a report to the Minister stating that the site has no further cultural heritage value or interest, and the report has been filed in the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports referred to in Section 65.1 of the Ontario Heritage Act.*
- c. Should previously undocumented archaeological resources be discovered, they may be a new archaeological site and therefore subject to Section 48 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act. The proponent or person discovering the archaeological resources must cease alteration of the site immediately and engage a licensed archaeologist to carry out archaeological fieldwork, in compliance with sec. 48 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act.*
- d. The Cemeteries Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.4 and the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33 (when proclaimed in force) require that any person discovering human remains must notify the police or coroner and the Registrar of Cemeteries at the Ministry of Consumer Services.*
- e. Archaeological sites recommended for further archaeological fieldwork or protection remain subject to Section 48 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act and may not be altered, or have artifacts removed from them, except by a person holding an archaeological licence.*

11.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES

- Chapman, L.J. & D.F. Putnam. (1984). *The Physiography of Southern Ontario (Third Edition)*. Ontario Geological Survey, Special Report #2. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Toronto.
- Goel, Tarun (2013). Road Construction: History and Procedure. Bright Hub Engineering. Retrieved 24 May 2015 from URL: <http://www.brighthubengineering.com/structural-engineering/59665-road-construction-history-and-procedure/>
- Google Earth (Version 6.0.3.2197) [Software]. (2009). Available from <http://www.google.com/earth/index.html>.
- Google Maps. (2012). Available from: http://maps.google.ca/?utm_campaign=en&utm_source=en-ha-na-ca-bk-gm&utm_medium=ha&utm_term=google%20maps.
- Grey County (2010). History of Grey County. Retrieved 22 September, 2010 from URL: <http://www.grey.ca/government-administration/about-grey/history-of-grey-county/>. Owen Sound, Ontario.
- H. Belden & Co. (1881) “*Grey County Supplement*”. *Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada*. H. Belden & Co., Toronto.
- Marsh, Edith Louise. (1931). *A History of the County of Grey*. (Fleming Publishing Co., Owen Sound).
- Milne, Neil C. (2007). *Plan of Survey of Part of Lot 3 Broken Front Concession, Geographic Township of Sydenham, Municipality of Meaford, County of Grey*. Hewett and Milne Limited, Owen Sound.
- Ontario Heritage Act, RSO 1990a, Government of Ontario. (Queen’s Printer, Toronto).
- Ontario Heritage Amendment Act, SO 2005, Government of Ontario. (Queen’s Printer, Toronto).
- Ontario Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation (OMCzCR). (1993). *Archaeological Assessment Technical Guidelines, Stages 1-3 and Reporting Format*. (Queen’s Printer for Ontario 1993)
- Ontario Ministry of Culture (MCL). (2005). *Conserving a Future for Our Past: Archaeology, Land Use Planning & Development in Ontario (An Educational Primer and Comprehensive Guide for Non-Specialists)*. (Heritage & Libraries Branch, Heritage Operations Unit: Toronto).
- Ontario Ministry of Culture and Communications (MCC) & Ministry of Environment (MOE). (1992). *Guideline for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments*. (Cultural Programs Branch, Archaeology and Heritage Planning: Toronto).
- Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture (MTC). (2011). *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologist*. (Programs and Services Branch: Culture Programs Unit, Toronto).

2016 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Property Assessment of 423003 Harbour Drive, Part of Lot 3, Broken Front Concession (Geographic Township of Sydenham) Municipality of Meaford, County of Grey (AMICK File #16932/MTCS File #P038-0901-2017)

Ontario Planning Act, RSO 1990b, Government of Ontario. (Queen's Printer, Toronto).

Provincial Policy Statement (2014). Government of Ontario. (Queen's Printer, Toronto).


Ufland, Vina Rose. (1967). *History of Sydenham Township*. (R. Bond & Wright, Owen Sound).

Wright, J.V. (1972). *Ontario Prehistory: an Eleven-thousand-year Archaeological Outline*.
Archaeological Survey of Canada. National Museum of Man, Ottawa.

12.0 MAPS




MAP 1 LOCATION OF THE STUDY AREA (GOOGLE MAPS 2012)




MAP 2 FACSIMILE SEGMENT OF THE HISTORIC ATLAS MAP OF THE TOWNSHIP OF SYDENHAM (H. BELDEN & Co. 1881)

2016 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Property Assessment of 423003 Harbour Drive, Part of Lot 3, Broken Front Concession (Geographic Township of Sydenham) Municipality of Meaford, County of Grey (AMICK File #16932/MTCS File #P038-0901-2017)




MAP 3 PLAN OF SURVEY (HEWETT AND MILNE LTD. 2007)



MAP 4 AERIAL PHOTO OF THE STUDY AREA (GOOGLE EARTH 2011)

2016 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Property Assessment of 423003 Harbour Drive, Part of Lot 3, Broken Front Concession (Geographic Township of Sydenham) Municipality of Meaford, County of Grey (AMICK File #16932/MTCS File #P038-0901-2017)



MAP 5 DETAILED PLAN OF THE STUDY AREA

13.0 IMAGES

	
PLATE 1 STEEP SLOPE	PLATE 2 SEASONAL WET AREA TEST PIT SURVEYED
	
PLATE 3 STEEP SLOPE	PLATE 4 TEST PIT SURVEY CONDITIONS
	
PLATE 5 LOW-LYING AND WET AREA	PLATE 6 TEST PIT FILLING WITH WATER

2016 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Property Assessment of 423003 Harbour Drive, Part of Lot 3, Broken Front Concession (Geographic Township of Sydenham) Municipality of Meaford, County of Grey (AMICK File #16932/MTCS File #P038-0901-2017)



PLATE 7 TEST PIT FILLING WITH WATER



PLATE 8 TEST PIT SURVEY CONDITIONS



PLATE 9 TEST PIT SURVEY CONDITIONS



PLATE 10 ROCKY SHORELINE



PLATE 11 TEST PIT SURVEY CONDITIONS



PLATE 12 ROCKY SHORELINE

2016 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Property Assessment of 423003 Harbour Drive, Part of Lot 3, Broken Front Concession (Geographic Township of Sydenham) Municipality of Meaford, County of Grey (AMICK File #16932/MTCS File #P038-0901-2017)

	
PLATE 13 CAMPER TRAILER, FIRE PIT, PICNIC TABLE, PORTABLE LATRINE	PLATE 14 GRAVEL LANEWAY
	
PLATE 15 ROCKY SHORELINE	PLATE 16 STEEP SLOPE
	
PLATE 17 TEST PIT SURVEY CONDITIONS	PLATE 18 TEST PIT SURVEY CONDITIONS