



1.0 PROJECT REPORT COVER PAGE

LICENSEE INFORMATION:

Contact Information:

Marilyn E. Cornies BA CAHP
Southwestern District Office
553 Dufferin Avenue
London, ON N6B 2A5
Phone: (419) 432-4435
Email: mcornies@amick.ca
www.amick.ca

Licensee:

Ontario Archaeology Licence:

Marilyn E. Cornies BA CAHP
P038

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Corporate Project Number:

2020122

MHSTCI Project Number:

P038-1006-2020

Investigation Type:

Stage 1-2 Archaeological Property Assessment

Project Name:

Prince of Wales Road, Primrose

Project Location:

506243 & 506249 Ontario Highway 89,
Part of the East Half of Lot 1, Concession 2 West of
Hurontario Street (Geographic Township of Mulmur,
County of York), Township of Mulmur, County of
Dufferin

Project Designation Number:

Not Currently Available

MHSTCI FILING INFORMATION:

Site Record/Update Form(s):

N/A

Date of Report Filing:

02 March 2021

Type of Report:

ORIGINAL

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report describes the results of the 2020 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 506243 & 506249 Ontario Highway 89, Part of the East Half of Lot 1, Concession 2 West of Hurontario Street (Geographic Township of Mulmur, County of York) conducted by AMICK Consultants Limited. This study was conducted under Professional Archaeologist License #P038 issued to Marilyn Cornies by the Minister of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries for the Province of Ontario. This assessment was undertaken as a requirement under the Planning Act (RSO 1990) and the Provincial Policy Statement (2020) in order to support a Draft Plan 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 Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI). Policy 2.6 of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS 2020) 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, by test pit survey at a ten metre interval to confirm disturbance and by high intensity pedestrian survey at an interval of one-metre between individual transects on 4 August 2020. 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 Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) on behalf of the government and citizens of Ontario.

STAGE 2 RECOMMENDATIONS:

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.*

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	3
6.0	FIELD WORK METHODS AND WEATHER CONDITIONS	19
7.0	RECORD OF FINDS	25
8.0	ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS	26
9.0	RECOMMENDATIONS	35
10.0	ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION	36
11.0	BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES	38
12.0	MAPS	40
13.0	IMAGES	46

4.0 PROJECT PERSONNEL

AMICK CONSULTANTS LIMITED PARTNERS

Michael Henry (MHSTCI Professional Archaeologist Licence #P058)

Marilyn Cornies (MHSTCI Professional Archaeologist Licence #P038)

PROJECT COORDINATOR

Michael Henry (MHSTCI Professional Archaeologist Licence #P058)

PROJECT LICENSEE ARCHAEOLOGIST

Marilyn Cornies (MHSTCI Professional Archaeologist Licence #P038)

PROJECT FIELD DIRECTORS

Katrina Mason (MHSTCI Applied Research Archaeologist Licence #R1226)

PROJECT FIELD ASSISTANTS

Kelly Tremblay

PROJECT REPORT PREPARATION

Katrina Mason (MHSTCI Applied Research Archaeologist Licence #R1226)

PROJECT GRAPHICS

Katrina Mason (MHSTCI Applied Research Archaeologist Licence #R1226)

PROJECT PHOTOGRAPHY

Katrina Mason (MHSTCI Applied Research Archaeologist Licence #R1226)

5.0 PROJECT CONTEXT

5.1 DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

This report describes the results of the 2020 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 506243 & 506249 Ontario Highway 89, Part of the East Half of Lot 1, Concession 2 West of Hurontario Street (Geographic Township of Mulmur, County of York) conducted by AMICK Consultants Limited. This study was conducted under Professional Archaeologist License #P038 issued to Marilyn Cornies by the Minister of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries for the Province of Ontario. This assessment was undertaken as a requirement under the Planning Act (RSO 1990) and the Provincial Policy Statement (2020) in order to support a Draft Plan of Subdivision 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 Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI). Policy 2.6 of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS 2020) 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). The current study area is an addition to lands that were assessed under PIF P058-1726-2018.

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, by test pit survey at a ten metre interval to confirm disturbance and by high intensity pedestrian survey at an interval of one-metre between individual transects on 4 August 2020. 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 Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) on behalf of the government and citizens of Ontario.

The proposed development of the study area includes three industrial development blocks, one environmental protection block and one storm water management block. There is also a proposed road that ends in a roundabout. A preliminary plan of the proposed development has been submitted together with this report to MHSTCI for review and reproduced within this report as Map 4.

5.2 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

5.2.1 PRE-CONTACT LAND-USE OUTLINE

What follows is an outline of Aboriginal occupation in the area during the Pre-Contact Era from the earliest known period, about 9000 B.C. up to approximately 1650 AD.

5.2.1.1 PALAEO-INDIAN PERIOD (APPROXIMATELY 9000-7500 B.C.)

North of Lake Ontario, evidence suggests that early occupation began around 9000 B.C. People probably began to move into this area as the glaciers retreated and glacial lake levels began to recede. The early occupation of the area probably occurred in conjunction with environmental conditions that would be comparable to modern Sub-Arctic conditions. Due to the great antiquity of these sites, and the relatively small populations likely involved, evidence of these early inhabitants is sparse and generally limited to tools produced from stone or to by-products of the manufacture of these implements. Some sites of this earliest period of First Nations occupation of Simcoe County have been documented to the south and to the west of Kempenfelt Bay.

5.2.1.2 ARCHAIC PERIOD (APPROXIMATELY 8000-1000 B.C.)

By about 8000 B.C. the gradual transition from a post glacial tundra-like environment to an essentially modern environment was largely complete. Prior to European clearance of the landscape for timber and cultivation, the area was characterized by forest. The Archaic Period is the longest and the most apparently stable of the cultural periods identified through archaeology. The Archaic Period is divided into the Early, Middle and Late Sub-Periods, each represented by specific styles in projectile point manufacture. Many more sites of this period are found throughout Ontario, than of the Palaeo-Indian Period. This is probably a reflection of two factors: the longer period of time reflected in these sites, and a greater population density. The greater population was likely the result of a more diversified subsistence strategy carried out in an environment offering a greater variety of abundant resources. (Smith 2002:58-59)

Current interpretations suggest that the Archaic Period populations followed a seasonal cycle of resource exploitation. Although similar in concept to the practices speculated for the big game hunters of the Palaeo-Indian Period, the Archaic populations utilized a much broader range of resources, particularly with respect to plants. It is suggested that in the spring and early summer, bands would gather at the mouths of rivers and at rapids to take advantage of fish spawning runs. Later in the summer and into the fall season, smaller groups would move to areas of wetlands to harvest nuts and wild rice. During the winter, they would break into yet smaller groups probably based on the nuclear family and perhaps some additional relatives to move into the interior for hunting. The result of such practices would be to create a distribution of sites across much of the landscape. (Smith 2002: 59-60).

The material culture of this period is much more extensive than that of the Palaeo-Indians. Stylistic changes between Sub-Periods and cultural groups are apparent, although the overall quality in production of chipped lithic tools seems to decline. This period sees the introduction of ground stone technology in the form of celts (axes and adzes), manos and metates for grinding nuts and fibres, and decorative items like gorgets, pendants, birdstones, and bannerstones. Bone tools are also evident from this time period. Their presence may be a result of better preservation from these more recent sites rather than a lack of such items in earlier occupations. In addition, copper and exotic chert types appear during the period and are indicative of extensive trading (Smith 2002: 58-59).

Three First Nations trails known as the Rouge Trail, the Don Trail, and the Humber Trail began on the north shore of Lake Ontario in the Toronto area and terminated on the two branches of the Holland River (Myers 1977: 2). These trails form part of a long established trade and communications network that linked the upper and lower Great Lakes. The route followed the Holland River into the southern end of Lake Simcoe. Also, the route followed the western shore of Lake Simcoe northward to Kempenfelt Bay, and then westward to the end of the bay. A portage was then undertaken to the Nottawasaga River and this river was followed into Georgian Bay at the present location of the Town of Wasaga Beach. This network of trade and communication had been long established by the time Europeans began to operate in the area. The presence of artifacts dating to the Early Archaic Period in close proximity to the upper and lower landings on the Holland River east branch suggests that the use of this system most likely dates back to at least that period.

5.2.1.3 WOODLAND PERIOD (APPROXIMATELY 1000 B.C.-1650 A.D.)

The primary difference in archaeological assemblages that differentiates the beginning of the Woodland Period from the Archaic Period is the introduction of ceramics to Ontario populations. This division is probably not a reflection of any substantive cultural changes, as the earliest sites of this period seem to be in all other respects a continuation of the Archaic mode of life with ceramics added as a novel technology. The seasonally based system of resource exploitation and associated population mobility persists for at least 1500 years into the Woodland Period. (Smith 2002: 61-62)

The Early Woodland Sub-Period dates from about 1000-400 B.C. Many of the artifacts from this time are similar to the late Archaic and suggest a direct cultural continuity between these two temporal divisions. The introduction of pottery represents an entirely new technology that was probably acquired through contact with more southerly populations from which it likely originates. (Smith 2002:62)

The Middle Woodland Sub-Period dates from about 400 B.C.-800 A.D. Within the region including the study area, a complex emerged at this time termed "Point Peninsula". Point Peninsula pottery reflects a greater sophistication in pottery manufacture compared with the earlier industry. The paste and temper of the new pottery is finer and new decorative techniques such as dentate and pseudo-scallop stamping appear. There is a noted Hopewellian influence in southern Ontario populations at this time. Hopewell influences

from south of the Great Lakes include a widespread trade in exotic materials and the presence of distinct Hopewell style artifacts such as platform pipes, copper or silver panpipe covers and shark's teeth. The populations of the Middle Woodland participated in a trade network that extended well beyond the Great Lakes Region.

The Late Woodland Sub-Period dates from about 500-1650 A.D. The Late Woodland includes four separate phases: Princess Point, Early Ontario Iroquoian, Middle Ontario Iroquoian and Late Ontario Iroquoian.

The Princess Point phase dates to approximately 500-1000 A.D. Pottery of this phase is distinguished from earlier technology in that it is produced by the paddle method instead of coil and the decoration is characterized by the cord wrapped stick technique. Ceramic smoking pipes appear at this time in noticeable quantities. Princess Point sites cluster along major stream valleys and wetland areas. Maize cultivation is introduced by these people to Ontario. These people were not fully committed to horticulture and seemed to be experimenting with maize production. They generally adhere to the seasonal pattern of occupation practiced by earlier occupations, perhaps staying at certain locales repeatedly and for a larger portion of each year (Smith 2002: 65-66)

The Early Ontario Iroquoian stage dates to approximately 950-1050 A.D. This stage marks the beginning of a cultural development that led to the historically documented Ontario Iroquoian groups that were first contacted by Europeans during the early 1600s (Petun, Neutral, and Huron). At this stage formal semi-sedentary villages emerge. The Early stage of this cultural development is divided into two cultural groups in southern Ontario. The areas occupied by each being roughly divided by the Niagara Escarpment. To the west were located the Glen Meyer populations, and to the east were situated the Pickering people (Smith 2002: 67).

The Middle Ontario Iroquoian stage dates to approximately 1300-1400 A.D. This stage is divided into two sub-stages. The first is the Uren sub-stage lasting from approximately 1300-1350 A.D. The second of the two sub-stages is known as the Middleport sub-stage lasting from roughly 1350-1400 A.D. Villages tend to be larger throughout this stage than formerly (Smith 2002: 67).

The Late Ontario Iroquoian stage dates to approximately 1400-1650 A.D. During this time the cultural divisions identified by early European explorers are under development and the geographic distribution of these groups within southern Ontario begins to be defined. During this period the Huron and Petun become established in their respective homelands familiar to early explorers, traders and missionaries.

5.2.2 GENERAL HISTORICAL OUTLINE

York County's boundaries were originally from Lake Ontario to Lake Simcoe, until 1834. The County of York was originally comprised of ten townships and the Town of York (now

Toronto) until Toronto separated and incorporated in 1834 (Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville 2010).

Dufferin County formed as a county on January 24th, 1881, consisting of Melancton, Mulmur, Mono, East Luther, Amaranth, and East Garafraxa Townships. Prior to the formation of Dufferin County, East Luther Township was part of Wellington County. In 1995, East Luther and Grand Valley amalgamated to form the Township of East Luther Grand Valley. The land that currently makes up Dufferin County was first partially surveyed in 1837 by Lewis Burwell, and the first Euro-Canadian settler is considered to be William McPherson circa 1851. The survey of the lands was finally finished in the years of 1854 and 1855 by William McPhillips (Ontario GenWeb 2014). The Township of Mulmur and the Township of Mono were transferred from Simcoe to Dufferin in 1881 (Wikipedia 2017).

Map 2 is a facsimile segment from Hogg's Map of the County of Simcoe (Hogg 1871). Map 2 illustrates the location of the study area and environs as of 1871. The study area is shown to belong to R. Yool; there are no structures shown to be within the study area. This demonstrates that the original property of which the study area is a part was settled by the time that the atlas data was compiled. Accordingly, it has been determined that there is potential for archaeological deposits related to early Post-contact settlement within the study area. In addition, this map illustrates a settlement road adjacent to the study area to the south. This road is the current Ontario Highway 10/89.

Map 3 is a facsimile segment of the Township of Mulmur map reproduced from Simcoe Supplement in Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada (Belden, H. & Co 1881). Map 3 illustrates the location of the study area and environs as of 1881. The study area is not shown to belong to anyone; there are however, a hotel and post office buildings to the east of the study area. Accordingly, it has been determined that there is potential for archaeological deposits related to early Post-contact settlement within the study area. In addition, this map illustrates a settlement road adjacent to the study area to the south. This road is the current Ontario Highway 10/89.

5.2.3 CURRENT CONDITIONS

The present use of the study area is as commercial property. The study area is roughly 1.91 hectares in area. The study area includes within it mostly disturbed lands. The Shelburne Motel is located in the southwest of the study area and contains mainly asphalt parking lot and a narrow gravel driveway to the west of the motel. Steven's Restaurant (now unoccupied) is located in the southeast of the study area. There is also a small gazebo located on the lawn to the south of the Shelburne Motel for guests. The majority of the southern part of the study area is paved asphalt with some small sections of lawn. The northwest of the study area is lawn. The northeast of the study area has a small section of corn crop along the border of the study area and the rest is overgrown meadow. The study area is bounded on the north by farmland, on the east by farmland and commercial property, on the west by farmland and on the south by Ontario Highway 10/89. The study area is approximately 180 metres to the west of the intersection of Prince of Wales Road West and Ontario Highway

10/89. A plan of the study area is included within this report as Map 4. Current conditions encountered during the Stage 1-2 Property Assessment are illustrated in Maps 5 & 6.

5.2.4 SUMMARY OF HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The brief overview of readily available documentary evidence indicates that the study area is situated within an area that was close to historic transportation routes and proximity to areas of documented settlement and therefore has potential for sites relating to early Post-Contact settlement in the region. However, it also appears that while the area was moving toward urban development by the fourth quarter of the 19th century, it was still predominantly rural in character and the likelihood of locating significant Post-Contact archaeological deposits of cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI) on a very small parcel of the original township lot is not likely. 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 Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) indicates that there is 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 MHSTCI. 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 MHSTCI, one (1) archaeological assessment has 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 MHSTCI. In addition, it must also be noted that the lack of formerly documented previous assessments does not indicate that no assessments have been conducted.

Background research shows that one (1) previous study has taken place within 50m of the study area. For further information see the bibliography below and Section 5.3.3:

AMICK Consultants Limited. (2011). *Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment 636040 Prince of Wales Road West, Part of the East Half of Lot 1 and Part of the East Half of Lot 2, Concession 2 West of Hurontario Street (Geographic Township of Mulmur), Township of Mulmur, County of Dufferin*. Port McNicoll, Ontario. Archaeological

License Report on File With the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries, Toronto, Ontario.

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 MHSTCI for the purposes of completing this study, there is one (1) previous report detailing, “archaeological fieldwork carried out on the lands to be impacted by this project”, but there are no (0) previous reports documenting known archaeological sites within 50 metres of the study area. The lands within the study area were an addition to lands conducted under PIF P058-1726-2018. Therefore, the work conducted under this current study area and the adjacent lands that were assessed under P058-1726-2018 will be impacted by this project. For further information see Section 5.3.3.

The Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists stipulates that the necessity to summarize the results of previous archaeological assessment reports, or to cite MHSTCI 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 within an area subject to an archaeological master plan or a similar

regional overview study. *The Official Plan for the County of Dufferin* was issued for adoption by Council in September 2014. The plan does mention that protecting the cultural heritage and archaeological resources of the county is a priority, and reiterates the province-wide requirement for an archaeological assessment before development or site alteration takes place (MMM Group 2014: 4, 41). However, the plan outlines how the County of Dufferin has a policy of deferring the preparation of detailed archaeological management plans to each of the individual towns and municipalities within the County of Dufferin (MMM Group 2014: 41).

It must be further noted that there are no relevant plaques associated with the study area, which would suggest an activity or occupation within, or in close proximity to, the study area that may indicate potential for associated archaeological resources of significant CHVI.

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 significance 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 significance to a site that is atypical for the immediate vicinity. The requisite archaeological sites data of previously registered archaeological sites was collected from the MHSTCI 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).

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 MHSTCI. As a result it was determined that no (0) archaeological sites relating directly to Pre-Contact 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 Pre-Contact 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 lies approximately 180 metres east of an unnamed stream. The unnamed stream is a tributary of the Boyne River, and is a source of potable water. 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 1 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 as a very broad outline to illustrate the relationships of broad cultural groups and time periods.

TABLE 1 PRE-CONTACT 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 MHSTCI. As a result it was determined that no (0) archaeological sites relating directly to Post-Contact habitation/activity had been formally registered within the immediate vicinity of the study area.

5.3.3 PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS

AMICK Consultants Ltd. in 2018-2019 completed a Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment on the lands adjacent to the study area. The current assessment discussed within this report refers to lands that were added on to the lands discussed under P058-1726-2018. During this assessment, no archaeological features or sites were found. Below is the executive summary of the assessment and the resulting recommendations:

This report describes the results of the 2018-2019 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 636040 Prince of Wales Road West, Part of Lot 1 and Part of Lot 2, Concession 2 West of Hurontario Street (Geographic Township of Mulmur), Township of Mulmur, County of Dufferin, conducted by AMICK Consultants Limited. This study was conducted under Professional Archaeologist License #P058 issued to Michael Henry by the Minister of Heritage, Sport, Tourism, and Culture Industries for the Province of Ontario. This assessment was undertaken as a requirement under the Planning Act (RSO 1990) and the Provincial Policy Statement (2014) in order to support a Site Plan 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 Heritage, Sport, Tourism, and Culture Industries (MHSTCI). 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 and by high intensity pedestrian survey at an interval of 5 metres between individual transects on 23 & 24 October 2018 and 6 & 7 May 2019. 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 Heritage, Sport, Tourism, and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) on behalf of the government and citizens of Ontario.

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.*

(AMICK Consultants Ltd. 2019:2)

5.3.4 LOCATION AND CURRENT CONDITIONS

The study area is described as 506243 & 506249 Ontario Highway 89, Part of the East Half of Lot 1, Concession 2 West of Hurontario Street (Geographic Township of Mulmur, County of York), Township of Mulmur, County of Dufferin. The study area was subject to this assessment as a requirement under the Planning Act (RSO 1990) and the Provincial Policy Statement (2020) in order to support a Draft Plan of Subdivision application as part of the pre-submission process. The current study area is an addition to lands that were assessed under PIF P058-1726-2018.

The present use of the study area is as commercial property. The study area is roughly 1.91 hectares in area. The study area includes within it mostly disturbed lands. The Shelburne Motel is located in the southwest of the study area and contains mainly asphalt parking lot and a narrow gravel driveway to the west of the motel. Steven's Restaurant (now unoccupied) is located in the southeast of the study area. The majority of the southern part of the study area is paved asphalt with some small sections of lawn. The northwest of the study area is lawn. The northeast of the study area has a small section of corn crop along the border of the study area and the rest is overgrown meadow. The study area is bounded on the north by farmland, on the east by farmland and commercial property, on the west by farmland and on the south by Ontario Highway 10/89. The study area is approximately 180 metres to the west of the intersection of Prince of Wales Road West and Ontario Highway 10/89. A plan of the study area is included within this report as Map 4. Current conditions encountered during the Stage 1-2 Property Assessment are illustrated in Maps 5 & 6.

5.3.5 PHYSIOGRAPHIC REGION

The study area is situated within the Horseshoe Moraines physiographic region. The surface is composed of two chief landform components (a) the irregular stony knobs and ridges which are composed mostly of till with some sand and gravel deposits (kames) and (b) the more or less pitted sand and gravel terraces and swampy valley floors. Huron clay is the most representative soil type. The average depth is 18-20 inches and it is generally susceptible to erosion. The general elevation is from 800 to 1700 feet a.s.l. (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 127-129).

5.3.6 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 resource 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 lies approximately 180 metres east of an unnamed stream. The unnamed stream is a tributary of the Boyne River, and is a source of potable water. 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. This stream is not seen on either historic map included in this report as Maps 2 & 3.

5.3.7 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:

5.3.7.1 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 two buildings (Shelburne Motel and Steven's Restaurant) in the southern portion of the study area. The study area also contains a small gazebo for the motel guests. Maps 5 & 6 of this report illustrate the locations of these features.

5.3.7.2 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.

The study area contains areas of disturbance due to the presence of the paved asphalt driveway and parking lots as well as a narrow gravel driveway to the west of the Shelburne Motel. There are also areas of disturbance to the north of the Shelburne motel most likely from grading during construction of the building. Maps 5 & 6 of this report illustrate the locations of these features.

5.3.7.3 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.

The study area does not contain low-lying and wet areas.

5.3.7.4 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.

The study area does not contain areas of steep slope.

5.3.7.5 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 study area does not contain any wooded areas.

5.3.7.6 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 contain a very small section of ploughable land in the northeast corner of the study area. At the time of the assessment, there was corn crop planted within the ploughable area. The area was ploughed, disked, and extremely weathered with corn stalks high enough to assess within the cornrows with unobstructed views of the ground within each row when walked at 1-metre intervals (every other row). Maps 5 & 6 of this report illustrate the locations of these features.

5.3.7.7 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 contains small sections of lawn and meadow. These areas do not warrant ploughing as they are too small and are yard areas surrounded by existing structures. Maps 5 & 6 of this report illustrate the locations of these features.

5.3.8 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. Background research also suggests potential for archaeological resources of Post-Contact origins based on proximity to a historic roadway, and proximity to areas of documented historic settlement.

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 and areas under pavement. 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, by test pit survey at a ten metre interval to confirm disturbance and by high intensity pedestrian survey at an interval of one-metre between individual transects on 4 August 2020.

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 5 & 6 of this report. Upon completion of the property inspection of the study area, it was determined that select areas would require Stage 2 Property Assessment.

It must be noted that AMICK Consultants Limited has been retained to assess lands as specified by the proponent. As such, AMICK Consultants Limited is constrained by the terms of the contract in place at the time of the Archaeological Assessment and can only enter into lands for which AMICK Consultants Limited has received consent from the owner or their agent(s). The proponent has been advised that the entire area within the planning application must be subject to archaeological assessment and that portions of the planning application may only be excluded if they are of low potential, are not viable to assess, or are subject to planning provisions that would restrict any such areas from any form of ground altering activities.

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 select features were photographed as a representative sample of each area defined within Maps 5 & 6. 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 5 & 6 of this report.

6.2 PEDESTRIAN SURVEY

In accordance with the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists, pedestrian survey is required for all portions of the study area that are ploughable or can be subject to

cultivation. This is the preferred method to utilize while conducting an assessment. This report confirms that the conduct of pedestrian survey within the study area conformed to the following standards:

1. *Actively or recently cultivated agricultural land must be subject to pedestrian survey.*
[All actively or recently cultivated agricultural land was subject to pedestrian survey.]
2. *Land to be surveyed must be recently ploughed. Use of chisel ploughs is not acceptable. In heavy clay soils ensure furrows are disked after ploughing to break them up further.*
[At the time of the assessment, there was corn crop planted within the ploughable area. The area was ploughed, disked, and extremely weathered with corn stalks high enough to assess within the cornrows with unobstructed views of the ground within each row when walked at 1-metre intervals (every other row).]
3. *Land to be surveyed must be weathered by one heavy rainfall or several light rains to improve visibility of archaeological resources.*
[All land was weathered by rainfall.]
4. *Provide direction to the contractor undertaking the ploughing to plough deep enough to provide total topsoil exposure, but not deeper than previous ploughing.*
[Direction was given to the contractor undertaking the ploughing to plough deep enough to provide total topsoil exposure, but not deeper than previous ploughing]
5. *At least 80 % of the ploughed ground surface must be visible. If surface visibility is below 80% (e.g. due to crop stubble, weeds, young crop growth), ensure the land is re-ploughed before surveying.*
[Roughly 85% of the ploughed field surface was exposed and visible.]
6. *Space survey transects at maximum intervals of 5m (20 survey transects per hectare)*
[All transects were conducted at an interval of 1 metre between individual transects. Due to the tall growth of the corn, pedestrian survey was conducted at 1-metre intervals (or every other row) to ensure that the peripheral area could be scanned twice.]
7. *When archaeological resources are found, decrease survey transects to 1m intervals over a minimum of a 20m radius around the find to determine whether it is an isolated find or part of a larger scatter. Continue working outward at this interval until full extent of the surface scatter has been defined.*
[Not Applicable – No archaeological resources were encountered.]

8. *Collect all formal artifact types and diagnostic categories. For 19th century archaeological sites, collect all refined ceramic sherds (or, for larger sites collect a sufficient sample to form the basis for dating).*

[Not Applicable – No archaeological resources were encountered.]

9. *Based on professional judgment, strike a balance between gathering enough artifacts to document the archaeological site and leaving enough in place to relocate the site if it is necessary to conduct further assessment.*

[Not Applicable – No archaeological resources were encountered.]

(MTC 2011: 30-31)

The Guidelines contained within Section 2.1.1 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011: 30) allow some variation in the conduct of pedestrian survey depending upon conditions, as follows:

1. *When appropriate based on crop conditions, (e.g. corn fields where herbicides have prevented weed growth, young winter wheat without weed growth between the rows), survey transects at intervals of less than 5 m may be used to achieve the minimum 80% visibility.*

[Due to the high growth of the corn, a reduced survey transect of 1m between individual transects was used to achieve an survey coverage equivalent to an open field. Approximately 85% of the surface of the ground was visible between the planted rows and a reduced interval of 1 metre between individual transects was employed to compensate for a reduction in peripheral vision view of the ground surface due to the presence of tall corn without obstructive weed growth between the rows.

(MTC 2011: 30)

6.3 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*

[Not Applicable – The study area does not contain any wooded areas]

- 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.

[The study area is to be maintained for the present as a commercial area with landscape features including terraced lawn areas which are to be maintained; therefore ploughing, would damage or destroy these features. The study area is situated in an area where there are numerous underground services such as hydro, water, sanitary sewer, gas, communications, etc. Many of these services support the existing use of the study area. Ploughing of the affected portions of the study area would therefore damage or destroy these services. All areas where existing landscaping or infrastructure would be damaged were test pit surveyed 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 in undisturbed areas 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.*

[In disturbed areas test pits were placed at 10 metre intervals to confirm disturbance.]

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 topsoil was not present, test pits were excavated to ensure that suspected subsoils, if present, were not layers of fill or waterborne materials overlying buried topsoil. If these areas consisted of fill soils, test pits were also excavated below topsoil grade in order to ensure disturbance extended below even deep topsoil layers such as those encountered in agricultural fields to ensure that the depth of disturbance was sufficient to remove archaeological potential in most contexts. Where other evidence indicates locations of potentially significant archaeological sites that may include cultural deposits below fill soils, alternative strategies to explore beneath the fill layers found in some areas may be necessary to complete the Stage 2 Property Assessment. In such cases, further Stage 2 Property Assessment may be recommended following completion of the property survey under conventional methodologies.]
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)

“A combination of property inspection and test pitting may be used when initial Stage 2 results determine that all or part of the project area may in fact be disturbed. The Stage 2 survey may then consists of a detailed inspection (equivalent to Stage 1), combined with test pitting.”

1. *If it was not done as part of Stage 1, inspect and document the disturbed areas according to the standards described for Stage 1 property inspections.*
[The disturbed areas of the study area were inspected and documented as per the standards described for Stage 1 property inspections. Areas of suspected disturbance where test pit survey was viable were shovel tested as described]

below. These areas were limited to a small section north of the Shelburne Motel. This disturbance is most likely due to the grading and construction of the Motel.

Standard archaeological survey methodologies employed in Ontario for Stage 2 Archaeological Property Assessment (i.e. pedestrian survey and test pit survey) cannot determine if deeply buried cultural remains are or are not present. The purpose of Stage 2 Property Assessment is not to test for deeply buried deposits. The Standards and Guidelines for Consultants Archaeologists recognize this fact and have a whole separate section covering this specific issue. The only way to determine if deeply buried remains are present is to follow those standards not via a standard Stage 1-2 Archaeological Property Assessment.

In most cases, unless there is documentation or evidence to the contrary, areas where grading has exceeded topsoil depth are areas considered to have no or low archaeological potential because in most cases removal of the topsoil will remove archaeological sites. While archaeological sites are popularly thought of as being deeply buried, archaeological sites begin on the surface of the ground and for most of humanity's history involved no substantial excavations or significant landscape alterations. Only with the rise of urbanization and sedentary settlement do sites begin to accumulate depth. This is a result of continuous building and rebuilding over top of earlier settlements. Deep archaeological sites are created by adding to the surface of an area and building the landform up. Deeply buried archaeological deposits are relatively rare outside of urban environments in Ontario and even within urban contexts, this seldom occurs outside of the historic core of the community where redevelopment has occurred since initial settlement.

If an area was not occupied during a period of potential archaeological significance, there is no potential to locate deeply buried significant archaeological resources. There are only a few very rare exceptions related to historical significance that is not tied to the time period of activity or occupation of a site but to certain historical events and/or personalities.

Areas of suspected disturbance where test pit survey was viable were shovel tested as described below.

2. *Place Stage 2 test pits throughout the disturbed areas according to professional judgment (and where physically viable) as to confirm that these areas have been completely disturbed.*

[An area of suspected disturbance was identified during the Property Inspection conducted as part of the Stage 2 Property Assessment. This area consists of an area identified probable disturbance from the construction of the Shelburne Motel. Test pits were excavated every 10 metres across the entirety of this portion of the study area. The intensity of test pit survey conducted is far in excess of the minimum standard required. AMICK Consultants Limited tested the suspected disturbed area at a 10-metre interval to confirm disturbance in a manner consistent

with the objectives to ensure that the area is accurately delimited and properly identified. There is no requirement to systematically examine such areas. The Standards and Guidelines require only judgmental testing based on the professional judgment of the investigating archaeologist. In most typical archaeological assessments the entire area of presumed disturbance will be written off as an area of no archaeological potential without thorough testing to demonstrate that the entire area is disturbed or it will be tested at subjective, irregular and inconsistent intervals, and consequently such testing cannot verify that the entire area contained within the presumed limits of disturbance are, in fact, disturbed. The methodology employed here by AMICK Consultants Limited exceeds any requirements of the Standards and Guidelines and that which is generally applied within the industry.

The excavated soil and the profiles of these test pits were examined to determine if each represented an area of disturbance. Test pits were excavated a minimum of 30 cm below grade in order to ensure that test pits were excavated to depths below the surrounding natural grade. This procedure demonstrated that the entire study area consists of fill deposited within a deeply disturbed context. There is no archaeological potential within this area.]

(MTC 2011: 38)

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: one sketch map, one page of photo log, one page of field notes, and 28 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 current study area is an addition to lands that were assessed under PIF P058-1726-2018, in which no sites were found. The entirety of the study area was subject to property inspection and photographic documentation concurrently with the Stage 2 Property Assessment on 4 August 2020, consisting of high-intensity test pit survey at an interval of five metres between individual test pits, test pit survey at ten metres between individual test pits to confirm disturbance, and high intensity pedestrian survey at an interval of one metre between individual transects. 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 Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) 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, MHSTCI 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.

There is an unnamed stream approximately 180 metres to the west of the study area that is a tributary of the Boyne River and is a source of potable water.

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.

There are no identified secondary water sources within 300 metres of the study area.

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 no identified features indicating past water sources within 300 metres of the study area.

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.

There are no shorelines within 300 metres of the study area.

5) Elevated Topography

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


There are no identified features of elevated topography within the study area.

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 light brown sandy loam over light gold clay sand subsoil, which is consistent with the wider area surrounding the property.

The image below (Kuhlmann, Stacy 2017) shows the consistencies of soil types and how they compare to one another. The lower percentage of clay allows the soil to break up from the action of ploughing alone when not compacted or bound by extensive root masses.



(Kuhlmann, Stacy 2017)

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 structure and post office 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 100 metres of an early settlement road that appears on the Historic Atlas Map of 1871 and 1881. This historic road corresponds to the road presently known as Ontario Highway 10/89, which is adjacent to the study area.

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 evidence to suggest that major landscaping operations involving grading below topsoil were ever carried out within the study area. Surfaces within the study area are paved with asphalt and loose gravel, which are 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.

There are two buildings within the study area. These are the Shelburne Motel and Steven's Restaurant. There is also a small gazebo in the lawn to the south of the Shelburne Motel.

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 evidence to suggest that below ground services have resulted in impacts to a 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 although they may be excluded from Stage 2 Property Assessment, test pits were still placed at 5 metre intervals in these suspected areas.

“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 Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) 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, proximity to historic settlement structures, and the location of an early historic settlement road adjacent to the study area.

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.)		N		If Yes, potential determined
2c	Past water source within 300 m. (beach ridge, river bed, relic creek, etc.)		N		If Yes, potential determined
2d	Accessible or Inaccessible shoreline within 300 m. (high bluffs, marsh, swamp, sand bar, etc.)		N		If Yes, potential determined
3	Elevated topography (knolls, drumlins, eskers, plateaus, etc.)		N		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.	Y			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.)	Y			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 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:

4. *No further archaeological assessment of the study area is warranted;*

5. *The Provincial interest in archaeological resources with respect to the proposed undertaking has been addressed;*
6. *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 Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries 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

- Belden, H. & Co. (1881). *Simcoe Supplement in Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada*. H. Belden & Co.: Toronto.
- 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.
- Esri. "Topographic" [basemap]. Scale Not Given. "World Topographic Map". April 12, 2018. <http://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=30e5fe3149c34df1ba922e6f5bbf808f>. (August 6 2020).
- 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]. (2020). 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.
- Hogg, John. (1871). *Hogg's Map of the County of Simcoe* [map]. John Hogg, Collingwood. Retrieved January 23, 2017, from the Ontario Historical County Maps Project in association with University of Toronto Map and Data Library URL: <http://maps.library.utoronto.ca/hgis/countymaps/simcoe/index.html>.
- Kuhlmann, Stacy. (2017). *Types of Soil*. Diagram of Soil Types available from <http://www.tes.com/lessons/AKChU3fbfZKo9g/types-of-soil>.
- MMM Group. (2014). *The Official Plan for the County of Dufferin*. MMM Group., Ottawa.
- 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).

ORIGINAL 02 March 2021 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 506243 & 506249 Ontario Highway 89, Part of the East Half of Lot 1, Con. 2 W.H.S. (Geographic Township of Mulmur, County of York), Township of Mulmur, County of Dufferin (AMICK File #2020122/MHSTCI File #P038-1006-2020)

Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture (MTC). (2011). *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologist*. (Programs and Services Branch: Culture Programs Unit, Toronto).

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

Provincial Policy Statement (2020). Government of Ontario. (Queen's Printer, Toronto).


Smith, David G. (2002). "Ten Thousand Years: Aboriginal Heritage in Mississauga." In *Mississauga: The First 10,000 Years*. Frank Dieterman, Ed. Mississauga Heritage Foundation, Eastendbooks, Toronto.

Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville. (2010). *A Brief History of Whitchurch-Stouffville*. Retrieved April 29, 2010, from <http://www.townofws.com/history.asp>

Wikipedia. (2017). *Mono, Ontario* – *Wikipedia*. Retrieved 24 October 2017 from URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mono,_Ontario.


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 AND PREVIOUSLY ASSESSED LANDS
(GOOGLE EARTH 2020)**



**MAP 2 FACSIMILE SEGMENT OF TREMAINE'S MAP OF THE COUNTY OF SIMCOE
(HOGG 1871)**



MAP 3 FACSIMILE SEGMENT OF THE HISTORIC ATLAS MAP OF THE TOWNSHIP OF MULMUR (BELDEN, H. & Co 1881)


Page 43



MAP

AERIAL PHOTO OF THE STUDY AREA (GOOGLE EARTH 2011)

5



MAP 6 DETAILED PLAN OF THE STUDY AREA

13.0 IMAGES



IMAGE 1 STEVEN'S RESTAURANT AND ASPHALT



IMAGE 2 GRAVEL TO WEST OF MOTEL



IMAGE 3 LAWN TO SOUTH OF MOTEL



IMAGE 4 ASPHALT AND MOTEL



IMAGE 5 LAWN AND MOTEL SIGN



IMAGE 6 MEADOW AND CORN CROP



IMAGE 7 TEST PIT IN PROGRESS



IMAGE 8 DISTURBED TEST PIT



IMAGE 9 LAWN TO SOUTH OF RESTAURANT



IMAGE 10 CREW AT WORK AND LAWN



IMAGE 11 CORN CROP



IMAGE 12 PEDESTRIAN SURVEY SOIL CONDITIONS



IMAGE 13 PEDESTRIAN SURVEY SOIL CONDITIONS