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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Archeoworks Inc. was retained by Bayou Cable Park Inc. to conduct a Stage 1 AA in support of proposed wakeboard park consisting of 35.78 hectares (86.41 acres) at the southwest corner of Clark Street and Grey Road 2. This property will herein be referred to as the “study area.” The study area is located within the east part of Lot 30, Concession 9, in the Geographic Township of Collingwood, Town of the Blue Mountains, County of Grey, Ontario.

Stage 1 background research identified elevated potential for the recovery of archaeologically significant materials within the study area. To determine if the archaeological potential classification of the study area is relevant, a desktop review of ground conditions was undertaken using historical aerial photography and satellite imagery.

Based on the findings within this Stage 1 AA study, the following recommendations are presented:

1. As per Section 1.4.1, Standard 1.f and Section 1.4.2 of the 2011 S&G, areas that exhibit disturbed conditions need to be confirmed through an on-site property inspection during a Stage 2 AA.

2. As per Section 2.1, Standard 2.a of the 2011 S&G, lands evaluated as having no or low potential need to be confirmed through an on-site property inspection during a Stage 2 AA.

3. All identified areas which retain archaeological potential must be subjected to a Stage 2 AA. These areas must be subjected to test pit survey at five metre intervals in accordance with Section 2.1.2 of the 2011 S&G.

No construction activities shall take place within the study area prior to the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (Archaeology Programs Unit) confirming in writing that all archaeological licensing and technical review requirements have been satisfied.
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1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT

1.1 Objective

The objectives of a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (AA), as outlined by the 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (‘2011 S&G’) published by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport (MTCS) (2011), are as follows:

- To provide information about the property’s geography, history, previous archaeological fieldwork and current land condition;
- To evaluate in detail the property’s archaeological potential, which will support recommendations for Stage 2 survey for all or parts of the property; and
- To recommend appropriate strategies for Stage 2 survey.

1.2 Development Context

Archeoworks Inc. was retained by Bayou Cable Park Inc. to conduct a Stage 1 AA in support of proposed wakeboard park consisting of 35.78 hectares (86.41 acres) at the southwest corner of Clark Street and Grey Road 2. This property will herein be referred to as the “study area.” The study area is located within the east part of Lot 30, Concession 9, in the Geographic Township of Collingwood, Town of the Blue Mountains, County of Grey, Ontario (see Appendix A – Map 1). Currently, the Town of the Blue Mountains and the County of Grey do not have Archaeological Management Plans.

This study was triggered by the Planning Act. This Stage 1 AA was conducted pre-submission under the project direction of Ms. Sarah Henderson, under the archaeological consultant licence number P394, in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act (2009). Permission to investigate the study area was granted by Bayou Cable Park Inc. on March 29th, 2017.

1.3 Historical Context

To establish the historical context and archaeological potential of the study area, Archeoworks Inc. conducted a review of Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian settlement history, and a review of available historic mapping.

The results of this background research are documented below and summarized in Appendix B – Summary of Background Research.

1.3.1 Pre-Contact Period

The Pre-Contact Period of Southern Ontario includes numerous Aboriginal groups that progressed and developed within the environmental constraints they inhabited. Table 1 includes a summary of the Pre-Contact Aboriginal history of Southern Ontario highlighting the three main
Periods (Paleo-Indian, Archaic, Woodland and European Contact) and, where appropriate, the subperiods (Early Woodland, Middle Woodland, and Late Woodland: Early Ontario Iroquois, Middle Ontario Iroquois, and Late Ontario Iroquois).

Table 1: Pre-Contact Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Paleo-Indian      | ca. 11,000 to 7,500 B.C. | Small groups of nomadic hunter-gathers who utilized seasonal and naturally available resources; sites are rare; hunted in small family groups who periodically gathered into larger groups/bands during favourable periods in the hunting cycle; artifacts include fluted and lanceolate stone points, scrapers, dart heads.  
- Gainey, Barnes, Crowfield Fluted Points (Late Paleo-Indian)  
- Holcombe, Hi-Lo, Lanceolates (Early Paleo-Indian)  
(Ellis and Deller, 1990, pp.37-64; Wright, 1994, p.25). |
| Archaic           | ca. 7,800 to 500 B.C. | Descendants of Paleoindian ancestors; lithic scatters are the most commonly encountered site type; trade networks appear; artifacts include reformed fluted and lanceolate stone points with notched bases to attach to wooden shaft; ground-stone tools shaped by grinding and polishing; stone axes, adzes and bow and arrow.  
- Side-notched, corner-notched, bifurcate (Early Archaic)  
- Stemmed, Otter Creek/Other Side-notched, Brewerton side and corner-notched (Middle Archaic)  
- Narrow Point, Broad Point, Small Point (Late Archaic)  
| Early Woodland    | ca. 800 to 0 B.C. | Evolved out of Late Archaic Period; introduction of pottery (ceramic) where the earliest were coil-formed, under fired and likely utility usage; two primary cultural complexes: Meadowood (broad extent of occupation in southern Ontario) and Middlesex (restricted to Eastern Ontario); poorly understood settlement-subsistence patterns; Artifacts include cache blades, and side-notched points that were often recycled into other tool forms; primarily Onondaga chert; commonly associated with Saugeen and Point Peninsula complexes.  
- Meadowood side-notched  
(Spence et al., 1990, pp.125-142; Wright, 1994, pp.29-30; Ferris and Spence, 1995, p.89-97; Williamson, 2013, pp.48-61). |
| Middle Woodland   | ca. 200 B.C. to A.D. 900 | Three primary cultural complexes: Point Peninsula (generally located throughout south-central and eastern Southern Ontario), Saugeen (generally located southwestern Southern Ontario), and Couture (generally located in southwestern-most part of Ontario); introduction of large “house” structures; settlements have dense debris cover indicating increased degree of sedentism; burial mounds present; shared preference for stamped, scallop-edged or tooth-like decoration, but each cultural complex had distinct pottery forms.  
- Saugeen point (Saugeen)  
- Vanport point (Couture)  
- Snyder Point  
| Late Woodland     | ca. A.D. 900 to 1600 | Princess Point exhibits few continuities from earlier developments with no apparent processors; hypothesized to have migrated into Ontario; the settlement data is limited, but oval houses are present. Artifacts include ‘Princess Point Ware’ vessel that are cord roughened, with horizontal lines and |
### Periods | Date Range | Overview
--- | --- | ---
**Late Woodland (Early Ontario Iroquois Stage)** | Ca. A.D. 900 to 1300 | Two primary cultures: Glen Meyer (located primarily in southwestern Ontario from Long Point on Lake Erie to southwestern shore of Lake Huron) and Pickering (encompassed north of Lake Ontario to Georgian Bay and Lake Nipissing); well-made and thin-walled clay vessels with stamping, incising and punctation; multi-family longhouses and some small, semi-permanent palisade villages; increase in corn-yielding sites; crudely made smoking pipes, and worked bone/antler present; evolution of the ossuary burials. - Triangular-shaped, basally concave points, with downward projecting corners or spurs. (Williamson, 1990, pp.291-320; Ferris and Spence, 1995, pp.106-109).

**Late Woodland (Middle Ontario Iroquois Stage)** | Ca. 1300 to 1400 | Fusion of Glen Meyer and Pickering caused by conquest and absorption of Glen Meyer by Pickering. Two primary cultures: Uren (A.D. 1300-1350) and Middleport (A.D. 1350-1400); decorated clay vessels decrease; well developed clay pipe complex that includes effigy pipes; increase in village sizes (0.5 to 1.7 ha) and campsites (0.1 to 0.6 ha) appear with some palisades; classic longhouse takes form; increasing reliance on maize and other cultigens such as beans and squash. - Triangular and (side of corner or corner removed) notched projectile points - Middleport Triangular and Middleport Notched Points. (Dodd el al., 1990, pp.321-360; Ferris and Spence, 1995, pp.109-115).

**Late Woodland (Late Ontario Iroquois Stage)** | Ca. 1400 to 1600 | Ontario Iroquoian sites describes two major groups east and west of the Niagara Escarpment: the ancestral Neutral Natives to the west, and the ancestral Huron-Wendat and to the east; it has been theorized that ancestral Petun Natives arrived in the area between the Nottawasaga, Niagara Escarpment and Georgian Bay from ancestral Neutral Native territory and are derived from pre-contact Neutral Natives; origins still in question; ancestral Petun Natives arrived in the Blue Mountains area as early as A.D. 1580 and were not an in situ development; the Odawa (or ‘Ottawa’), an Algonquin speaking cultural group, arrived in the Beaver Valley area during the fifteenth century (Council of the Township of Collingwood, 1979, pp.25-27; Warrick, 2000, p. 446; Garrad, 2014, pp.1, 147-148).

### 1.3.2 Contact Period
The Contact Period of Southern Ontario is dominated by the European arrival, interaction and influence with the established Aboriginal communities of Southern Ontario. The Contact Period has been greatly documented by those early explorers, religious missionaries, and fur traders through a variety of mediums. **Table 2** includes a summary of some of the main historical events and developments that occurred during the Contact Period of Southern Ontario.

**Table 2: Contact Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Contact</td>
<td>Early 17th century</td>
<td>Petun Natives (Tionnontaté or Khionontateronon) located in Blue Mountain region; French arrival into Ontario; called Petun, a term of Brazilian origin meaning tobacco, by Samuel de Champlain who observed...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periods</td>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>them cultivating and trading tobacco; Recollect priest arrived in Petun territory and established the Mission of the Apostles to the Petun; portage routes include the Nottawasaga River and along the Beaver River near Clarksburg and Thornbury; similar in language, dress and religious beliefs to the neighbouring Huron-Wendat; Jesuit missionaries; disease reduced the population by 60%; the Odawa settled along western limit of Niagara Escarpment and west of the Petun; favoured the gravel ridge south of Clarksburg; small population and known to Samuel de Champlain as the Cheveux relevés or 'standing hairs'; settlement believed to be near Craigleith; shared resources of the Niagara Escarpment with the Petun, particularly the Scenic Caves near the Standing Rock 'Ekarenniondi'; artifacts on Odawa sites reflect long distance trade and travel (Bricker, 1934, p.58; Feest and Feest, 1978, p.772-786; Garrad and Heidenreich, 1978, pp.394-397; Council of the Township of Collingwood, 1979, pp.27-28; Fox, 1990b, pp.458, 473; Trigger, 1994, p.51; Flynn, 1999, p.10; Garrad, 2014, pp.148, 167-177, 215, 490).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Nation (Haudenosaunee) Arrival</td>
<td>Mid 17th century</td>
<td>The Five (later Six) Nations (or Haudenosaunee), originally located south of the Great Lakes, engaged in warfare with Huron-Wendat neighbours as their territory no longer yielded enough furs; attacked the Petun ca.1645 and caused their dispersal; the Petun migrated through Neutral Native territory prior to resettlement in America; the Odawa migrated to the northwest across Manitoulin Island; the former territory likely remained unoccupied for several decades; Haudenosaunee established settlements along strategic locations near the Lake Ontario shoreline, such as the Niagara River, Humber River and Rouge River, and used the Township of Collingwood as seasonal hunting ground for extensive fur trade; European fur trade and exploration continues (Robinson, 1965, pp.15-16; Garrad and Heidenreich, 1978, p.396; Schmalz, 1991, pp.12-34; Trigger, 1994, pp.53-59; Flynn, 1999, p.11; Garrad, 2014, pp.501-505).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anishinaabeg Arrival</td>
<td>Late 17th century and early 18th century</td>
<td>Algonquin-speaking and cultural groups within the Anishinaabeg (Ojibway, Chippewa, Odawa, etc.) began to challenge the Haudenosaunee dominance in the region; term 'Missisagua' was applied to those on the north shore of Lake Ontario; by 1690s, Haudenosaunee settlements were abandoned; successfully battles between the Anishinaabeg and the Haudenosaunee including along the Bruce Peninsula; by 1701, Haudenosaunee were defeated and the Anishinaabeg replaced the Haudenosaunee in Southern Ontario; gathered collectively as First Nations to participate in Great Peace negotiations; the Ottawa and Ojibwa resumed regular hunting, trapping and collecting along the Beaver Valley and Georgian Bay lakeshore (Council of the Township of Collingwood, 1979, p.29; Schmalz, 1991, p.27; Trigger, 1994, pp.57-59; Johnston, 2004, pp.9-10; Gibson, 2006, pp.35-41; Smith, 2013, pp.16-20; Williamson, 2013, p.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fur Trade Continues</td>
<td>Mid 18th century</td>
<td>The Anishinaabeg continued to trade with both the English and the French; Métis; Seven Years War between France and Britain resulted in French surrender of New France in 1763; Royal Proclamation of 1763 recognized First Nations land title; Beaver Wars between groups within the Haudenosaunee and groups within the Anishinaabeg against the British; Chippewas arrived in the Township of Collingwood; fur trade continued until Euro-Canadian settlement (Schmalz, 1991, pp.35-62, 81; Surtees, 1994, pp.92-97; Flynn, 1999, p.11; Johnston, 2004, pp.13-14).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3.4 Euro-Canadian Settlement Period (early 19th century to present)

The Township of Collingwood consisted of 69,500 acres and was originally named Alta Township (Belden, 1880, p.11; Marsh, 1931, p.38). The Township of Alta was renamed Township of Collingwood after Lord Collingwood, a commanding officer who served under Admiral Lord Nelson in the Battle of Trafalgar against Napoleon in 1805 (Flynn, 1999, p.13). The Township of Collingwood was the first township surveyed in Grey County and was completed by Charles Rankin in 1833 (Marsh, 1931, p.39). The first grants provided to private individuals in The Township of Collingwood were given to children of United Empire Loyalist and as pensions to retiring military personnel (Flynn, 1999, p. 14). After completing the survey of the Township of Collingwood, Charles Rankin constructed a log cabin along the lakeshore (Marsh, 1931, p. 41). The first settler in the Township of Collingwood was Richard McGuire. Much of the township was subjected to land speculators (Council of the Township of Collingwood, 1979, p.41). Subsequent settlers to arrive in the Township were primarily Irish and Highland Scotch immigrants who settled along the St. Vincent trail fronting the Lake Huron shoreline (Belden, 1880, p.11; Council of the Township of Collingwood, 1979, p.45).

From 1846 to 1850, Old Mill Road had been established and became the principal route for settlers arriving in the Township of Collingwood (Council of the Township of Collingwood, 1979, p.45). Municipal records were limited prior to 1854 and over the next two decades, the township grew. By Confederation in 1867, the township was well established and the area was well known for its apple orchards (Flynn, 1999, p.14; Council of the Township of Collingwood, 1979, p.52).

Small clusters of settlements began to develop within the Township of Collingwood, such as Clarksburg, located west of the study area. Clarksburg was initially settled by William Marsh and his son who established a mercantile business along Beaver River, south of the community of Thornbury in 1858. The following year, W. A. Clark arrived, purchased the water privilege and mill site, and constructed a woollen mill. Shortly afterwards, John Tyson purchased a water privilege from Mr. Clark and erected a grist mill adjoining the woollen mill. The community grew...
quickly and was named Clarksburg. The woollen mill became notable in Ontario for its quality of blankets, tweeds, flannel, and ‘full cloth.’ (Belden, 1880, p.11; Marsh, 1931, pp.48-50).

1.3.5 Past Land Use
To further assess the study area’s potential for the recovery of historic pre-1900 remains, several documents were reviewed in order to gain an understanding of the land use history.

A review of the 1880 Grey Supplement in the Illustrated Historical Atlas of the Dominion of Canada (see Map 2) revealed the study area falls within property owned by an unlisted individual. It should be kept in mind, however, that not all historic features within the Township of Collingwood may have been depicted as the Grey Supplement in the Illustrated Atlas required a paid subscription from the residents to be depicted in the Atlas (Benson, N.D., p.4). The Indian Brook was depicted traveling through the study area.

Additionally, the study area is located along present day Clark Street and Grey Road 2 which were originally laid out during the survey of the Township of Collingwood. In Ontario, the 2011 S&G considers areas of early Euro-Canadian settlements (e.g., pioneer homesteads, isolated cabins, farmstead complexes, early wharf or dock complexes, pioneer churches, and early cemeteries), early historic transportation routes (e.g., trails, passes, roads, railways, portage routes), and properties that local histories or informants have identified with possible archaeological sites, historical events, activities, or occupations, to be of elevated archaeological potential (per Section 1.3.1 of the 2011 S&G). Therefore, based on the proximity of historic transportation routes, there is elevated potential for the location of Euro-Canadian archaeological resources (pre-1900) within portions of the study area which lie within 100 metres of these historic features.

1.3.6 Present Land Use
The present land use of the study area is characterized as community industrial (Town of the Blue Mountains, 2005).

1.4 Archaeological Context
To establish the archaeological context and archaeological potential of the study area, Archeoworks Inc. conducted a comprehensive review of designated and listed heritage properties, commemorative markers and pioneer churches and early cemeteries in relation to the study area. Furthermore, an examination of registered archaeological sites and previous AAs within proximity to its limits, and a review of the physiography of the study area were performed.

The results of this background research are documented below and summarized in Appendix B – Summary of Background Research.

1.4.1 Designated and Listed Cultural Heritage Resources
Per Section 1.3.1 of the 2011 S&G, property listed on a municipal register or designated under the Ontario Heritage Act or that is a federal, provincial, or municipal historic landmark or site are
considered features or characteristics that indicated archaeological potential. No designated or listed heritage resources are located in or within 300 metres of the study area (Templeton, 2017). Therefore, this feature does not contribute in establishing the archaeological potential of the study area.

1.4.2 Heritage Conservation Districts
Per Section 1.3.1 of the 2011 S&G, heritage resources listed on a municipal register or designated under the Ontario Heritage Act are considered features or characteristics that indicated archaeological potential. The study area is not located in or within 300 metres of a Heritage Conservation District (MTCS, 2017a). Therefore, this feature does not contribute in establishing the archaeological potential of the study area.

1.4.3 Commemorative Plaques or Monuments
Per Section 1.3.1 of the 2011 S&G, commemorative markers of Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian settlements, which may include their history, local, provincial, or federal monuments, cairns or plaques, or heritage parks are considered features or characteristics that indicated archaeological potential. The study area is not located in or within 300 metres of a commemorative plaque or monument (Ontario Historical Plaques, 2017). Therefore, this feature does not contribute in establishing the archaeological potential of the study area.

1.4.4 Pioneer/Historic Cemeteries
Per Section 1.3.1 of the 2011 S&G, pioneer churches and early cemeteries are considered features or characteristics that indicated archaeological potential. The study area is not located in or within 300 metres of a pioneer/historic church or cemetery (Our Ontario, 2017; Town of Blue Mountains, 2017b). Therefore, this feature does not contribute in establishing the archaeological potential of the study area.

1.4.5 Registered Archaeological Sites
Per Section 1.3.1 of the 2011 S&G, previously registered archaeological are considered features or characteristics that indicated archaeological potential. Per Section 1.1, Standard 1 and Section 7.5.8, Standard 1 of the 2011 S&G, one archaeological site has been registered within one-kilometre of the study area; however, it is not located within 300 metres of the study area (MTCS, 2017b) (see Table 3).

Table 3: Registered Archaeological Sites within One-Kilometre of the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borden #</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Cultural Affiliation</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BdHc-14</td>
<td>Indian Brook</td>
<td>Lake Woodland</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, given that no registered archaeological sites are located within 300 metres of the study area, this feature does not contribute in establishing the archaeological potential of the study area.
1.4.6 Previous Archaeological Assessments
Per Section 1.1., Standard 1 of the 2011 S&G, to further establish the archaeological context of the study area, a review of previous AAs carried out within the limits of, or immediately adjacent (i.e., within 50 metres) to the study area (as documented by all available reports) was undertaken. One report was identified (see Table 4).

Table 4: Previous Archaeological Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Stage of Work</th>
<th>Relation to Current Study Area</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMICK Consultants Ltd., 2015</td>
<td>Stage 1 AA</td>
<td>Within the study area</td>
<td>Stage 2 AA recommended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4.7 Physical Features
The study area is located within the Beaver Valley physiographic region of Southern Ontario. This region is a small but well-defined region occupying a sharply cut indentation in the Niagara cuesta, opening upon Georgian Bay. At its widest point, the Beaver Valley is six and a half miles (or 10.5 kilometres) across. The upper rim of the valley is the edge of the Amabel Formation which appears as an almost vertical cliff, and below is the Manitoulin Formation which appears as a flat shelf. The wider, northern part of the Beaver Valley contains several tributary streams and one fair-sized stream, the Indian Brook, which has cut juvenile valleys into the shale below. The Beaver Valley exhibits considerable complexity of landforms including lake plains, beaches, moraines, steep valley sides, and vertical cliffs. The soils of the lake plains around Thornbury and Clarksburg resembles those in the broader area of the Algonquin plain in the southern part of Simcoe County. The boulders on the old wave-cut terraces have prevented cultivation of those soils and they are pastured or are covered with cedar thickets while rose briars and dogwood are present on stony pastures. The driest sand west of Thornbury produces heavy crops of apples when well fertilized. Mixed farming occurs on the slopes with emphasis on beef cattle (Chapman & Putnam, 1984: pp. 122-124).

A few native soil types are found within the study area: Brighton sand, Granby sand, and Bottom Lands. Most the study area is located in Brighton sand, while an area in the eastern portion of the study area falls within Granby sand. Bottom Lands is located along the Indian Brook. A description of their characteristics may be found in Table 5 (Ontario Agricultural College, 1981). The great variety in soil types further highlights the mixed landscape that the study area encompasses and supports the mixed nature of past subsistence practices and changing industries of early settlers in these areas. Soils more conducive to agriculture, such as good drainage and stonefree, has the potential for past settlement, support greater population density and subsequently elevated archaeological potential.
Table 5: Study Area Soil Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Series and Surface Texture</th>
<th>Great Soil Group</th>
<th>Soil Materials</th>
<th>Drainage</th>
<th>Topography and Surface Stoniness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brighton sand</td>
<td>Grey Brown Podzolic</td>
<td>Well sorted sandy outwash</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Gently sloping, essentially stone-free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom Lands</td>
<td>Alluvial</td>
<td>Various soil material</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granby sand</td>
<td>Dark Grey Gleisolic</td>
<td>Well sorted gravelly outwash</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Smooth, very gently sloping. Essentially stone-free</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hydrological features such as primary water sources (i.e. lakes, rivers, creeks, streams) and secondary water sources (i.e. intermittent streams and creeks, springs, marshes, swamps) would have helped supply plant and food resources to the surrounding area and are indicators of archaeological potential (per Section 1.3.1 of the 2011 S&G). The Indian Brook and a tributary of the Indian Brook are located within the study area. Therefore, this feature further elevates archaeological potential within portions of the study area that fall within 300 metres of this feature.

1.4.8 Current Land Conditions

The study area is situated within the rural area of the Town of the Blue Mountains, located at the southwest corner of Clark Street and Grey Road 2. The study area encompasses the former Cedar Run Horse Park that consists of a gravel driveway, manicured yardage, horse paddocks, overgrown vegetation (i.e., trees), and the Indian Brook watercourse and tributary. The topography within the study area gradually increases from north to south, with the elevation measuring between approximately 190 to 200 metres above sea level.

1.4.9 Date of Review

A desktop review of field conditions using historical aerial photography, current satellite imagery obtained through the Google Earth application, and photographic imagery obtained through the Google Street View application was undertaken on May 11th, 2017.

1.5 Confirmation of Archaeological Potential

Based on the information gathered from the background research documented in the preceding sections, elevated archaeological potential has been established within the study area boundary. Features contributing to archaeological potential are summarized in Appendix B.
2.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

In combination with data gathered from background research (see Sections 1.3 and 1.4) and an inspection of aerial photography, and satellite imagery, an evaluation of archaeological potential was performed.

2.1 Historical Imagery

To facilitate the evaluation of the established archaeological potential, a detailed review of an aerial photograph taken in 1954 (see Map 3), and satellite imagery taken in 2006 and 2016 (see Maps 4-5) was undertaken.

The 1954 aerial photograph shows that the study area consisted of agricultural fields, an animal paddock, and overgrown vegetation/wooded area situated around the Indian Brook (see Map 3). By 2006, the study area consisted of ploughed agricultural fields and an extant barn within the western portion of the study area and the eastern portion consisted of an area that had been clear-cut of trees that had been intersected by a gravel/dirt access route (see Map 4). A wooded area is located around the Indian Brook. In 2016, the study area consisted of manicured grass with horse paddocks within the western portion of the study area. The eastern portion consisted of fallow areas and wooded area situated around the Indian Brook. The barn within the western portion of the study area are no longer present (see Map 5).

2.2 Previous Archaeological Assessment

AMICK Consultants Ltd. (2015) undertook a Stage 1 AA of part of Lots 30 and 31, Concession 8 New Survey, and part of Lots 30 and 31, Concession 9 New Survey, in the Geographic Township of Collingwood, Town of Blue Mountains, County of Grey. This Stage 1 AA encompassed lands within the northeast portion of the study area, wherein it was recommended these lands be subjected to a Stage 2 test pit form of survey at five metre intervals.

2.3 Identified Deep and Extensive Disturbances

The study area was evaluated for extensive disturbances that have removed archaeological potential. Disturbances may include but are not limited to: grading below topsoil, quarrying, building footprints, or sewage and infrastructure development. Section 1.3.2 of the 2011 S&G considers infrastructure development among those “features indicating that archaeological potential has been removed.”

Obvious disturbances include the existing gravel/dirt roads, paddocks, stormwater management ponds, and a former barn (see Map 6). The construction of these features would have resulted in severe damage to the integrity of any archaeological resources which may have been present within their footprints. However, the areas of deep and extensive disturbances should only be
considered as *likely* not requiring Stage 2 survey (*see Map 6*). A visual inspection is still required to provide on-site confirmation and documentation of the actual condition and exact extent of the disturbance.

### 2.4 Physiographic Features of No or Low Archaeological Potential

The study area was evaluated for physical features of no or low archaeological potential. These usually include but are not limited to: permanently wet areas, exposed bedrock, and steep slopes (greater than 20°) except in locations likely to contain pictographs or petroglyphs, as per *Section 2.1, Standard 2.a.* of the 2011 S&G.

Physical features of low or no archaeological potential include low-lying areas and permanently wet areas associated with Indian Brook and a tributary of the Indian Brook (*see Map 6*). However, the areas of no or low archaeological potential should only be considered as *likely* not requiring Stage 2 survey (*see Map 6*). A visual inspection is still required to provide on-site confirmation and documentation of the actual condition and exact extent of these features.

### 2.5 Identified Areas of Archaeological Potential

Portions of the study area that exhibit neither extensively disturbed conditions nor contain physical features of no or low archaeological potential are considered to have archaeological potential. These areas include, but are not limited to, areas of overgrown vegetation, manicured grassed areas, and woodlots (*see Map 6*). Given the established potential to recover archaeological resources within these identified areas, a Stage 2 AA will be required.

All areas where ploughing is not possible or viable must be subjected to test pit survey at five metre intervals in accordance with *Section 2.1.2* of the 2011 S&G.
3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Considering the findings detailed in preceding sections, the following recommendations are presented:

1. As per Section 1.4.1, Standard 1.f and Section 1.4.2 of the 2011 S&G, areas that exhibit disturbed conditions need to be confirmed through an on-site property inspection during a Stage 2 AA.

2. As per Section 2.1, Standard 2.a of the 2011 S&G, lands evaluated as having no or low potential need to be confirmed through an on-site property inspection during a Stage 2 AA.

3. All identified areas which retain archaeological potential must be subjected to a Stage 2 AA. These areas must be subjected to test pit survey at five metre intervals in accordance with Section 2.1.2 of the 2011 S&G.

No construction activities shall take place within the study area prior to the MTCS (Archaeology Programs Unit) confirming in writing that all archaeological licensing and technical review requirements have been satisfied.
4.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION

1. This report is submitted to the MTCS 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 that are 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 MTCS, 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.

2. 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 Archaeology Reports referred to in Section 65.1 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

3. 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 consultant archaeologist to carry out archaeological fieldwork, in compliance with Section 48 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.
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Map 1: Topographical map 1:30000, NTS 041A09 Nottawasaga Bay (Government of Canada, 2013) identifying the Stage 1 AA study area.
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Map 6 Stage 1 AA Results
### APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature of Archaeological Potential</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Known archaeological sites within 300 m?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Features</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Is there water on or adjacent to the property?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a Presence of primary water source within 300 metres of the study area (lakes, rivers, streams, creeks)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b Presence of secondary water source within 300 metres of the study area (intermittent creeks and streams, springs, marshes, swamps)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c Features indicating past presence of water source within 300 metres (former shorelines, relic water channels, beach ridges)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d Accessible or inaccessible shoreline (high bluffs, swamp or marsh fields by the edge of a lake, sandbars stretching into marsh)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Elevated topography (knolls, drumlins, eskers, plateaus, etc.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes to two or more of 3-5 or 7-10, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Pockets of well-drained sandy soil, especially near areas of heavy soil or rocky ground</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes to two or more of 3-5 or 7-10, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Distinctive land formations (mounds, caverns, waterfalls, peninsulas, etc.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes to two or more of 3-5 or 7-10, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Features</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Is there a known burial site or cemetery that is registered with the Cemeteries Regulation Unit on or directly adjacent to the property?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Associated with food or scarce resource harvest areas (traditional fishing locations, food extraction areas, raw material outcrops, etc.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes to two or more of 3-5 or 7-10, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Indications of early Euro-Canadian settlement (monuments, cemeteries, structures, etc.) within 300 metres</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes to two or more of 3-5 or 7-10, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Associated with historic transportation route (historic road, trail, portage, rail corridor, etc.) within 100 metres of the property</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes to two or more of 3-5 or 7-10, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property-specific Information</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Contains property designated under the Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Local knowledge (aboriginal communities, heritage organizations, municipal heritage committees, etc.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Recent ground disturbance, not including agricultural cultivation (post-1960, extensive and deep land alterations)</td>
<td>X – parts of the study area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, low archaeological potential is determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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