



1.0 PROJECT REPORT COVER PAGE

LICENSEE INFORMATION:

Contact Information:

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

Licensee:

Ontario Archaeology Licence:

Michael B. Henry CD BA FRAI FRSA
P058

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Corporate Project Number:

18536

MTCS Project Number:

P058-1654-2018

Investigation Type:

Stage 1-2 Archaeological Property Assessment

Project Name:

211 Eliza Street, Arthur.

Project Location:

211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of
Wellington North, County of Wellington

Project Designation Number:

Not Currently Available

MTCS FILING INFORMATION:

Site Record/Update Form(s):

N/A

Date of Report Filing:

October 16, 2018

Type of Report:

ORIGINAL

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report describes the results of the 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1 (Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington, conducted by AMICK Consultants Limited. This study was conducted under Professional Archaeologist License #P058 issued to Michael B. Henry by the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport for the Province of Ontario. This assessment was undertaken as a requirement under the Planning Act (RSO 1990b) and the Provincial Policy Statement (2014) in order to support a Draft Plan application and companion Zoning By-law Amendment application as part of the pre-submission process. Within the land use planning and development context, Ontario Regulation 544/06 under the Planning Act (1990b) requires an evaluation of archaeological potential and, where applicable, an archaeological assessment report completed by an archaeologist licensed by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS). Policy 2.6 of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS 2014) addresses archaeological resources. All work was conducted in conformity with Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture (MTC) Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011), the Ontario Heritage Act (RSO 1990a).

AMICK Consultants Limited was engaged by the proponent to undertake a Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of lands potentially affected by the proposed undertaking and was granted permission to carry out archaeological fieldwork. The entirety of the study area was subject to property inspection and photographic documentation concurrently with the Stage 2 Property Assessment high intensity test pit methodology at a five-metre interval between individual test pits, by high intensity pedestrian survey at an interval of five metres between individual transects and by intensified pedestrian survey at an interval of one metre between individual transects on 23-24 May 2018. All records, documentation, field notes, photographs and artifacts (as applicable) related to the conduct and findings of these investigations are held at the Lakelands District corporate offices of AMICK Consultants Limited until such time that they can be transferred to an agency or institution approved by the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) on behalf of the government and citizens of Ontario.

As a result of the property Assessment of the study area, seven isolated Pre-Contact flakes and nine isolated historic finds were identified. Based on the characteristics of these sites and the analysis of artifacts, the following recommendations are made:

- 1. The Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI) of all of the isolated finds have been completely documented and the items have been removed from the study area. Some of the finds were close enough that they are possibly related, but since there was a lack of a more intensified distribution of artifacts following an intensified assessment, there is insufficient data to determine if the material (either as an aggregate or as isolated finds) qualifies for further investigation. This indicates there is likely no remaining CHVI for this location. No further archaeological assessment of the isolated find is warranted;*

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	4
5.0	PROJECT CONTEXT	5
6.0	FIELD WORK METHODS AND WEATHER CONDITIONS	15
7.0	RECORD OF FINDS	19
8.0	ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS	21
9.0	RECOMMENDATIONS	31
10.0	ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION	33
11.0	BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES	34
12.0	MAPS	36
13.0	IMAGES	41
	APPENDIX A ISOLATED FIND IMAGES	43

4.0 PROJECT PERSONNEL

AMICK CONSULTANTS LIMITED PARTNERS

Michael Henry (MTCS Professional Archaeologist Licence #P058)
Marilyn Cornies (MTCS Professional Archaeologist Licence #P038)

AMICK CONSULTANTS LIMITED BUSINESS MANAGER

Melissa Maclean BBA email mmaclean@amick.ca

PROJECT COORDINATOR

Melissa Maclean

PROJECT LICENSEE ARCHAEOLOGIST

Michael Henry (MTCS Professional Archaeologist Licence #P058)

PROJECT FIELD DIRECTORS

Mike Golloher (MTCS Applied Research Archaeologist License #R1037)

PROJECT FIELD ASSISTANTS

Brian Ellis William MacDonald Kristopher Hiltz

PROJECT REPORT PREPARATION

Nick Kaluzny

PROJECT HISTORIC ARTIFACT ANALYSES

Mike Golloher (MTCS Applied Research Archaeologist License #R1037)

PROJECT PRE-CONTACT ARTIFACT ANALYSES

Mike Golloher (MTCS Applied Research Archaeologist License #R1037)

PROJECT GRAPHICS

Nick Kaluzny

PROJECT PHOTOGRAPHY

Mike Golloher (MTCS Applied Research Archaeologist License #R1037)

5.0 PROJECT CONTEXT

5.1 DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

This report describes the results of the 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1 (Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington, conducted by AMICK Consultants Limited. This study was conducted under Professional Archaeologist License #P058 issued to Michael B. Henry by the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport for the Province of Ontario. This assessment was undertaken as a requirement under the Planning Act (RSO 1990b) and the Provincial Policy Statement (2014) in order to support a Draft Plan application and companion Zoning By-law Amendment application as part of the pre-submission process. Within the land use planning and development context, Ontario Regulation 544/06 under the Planning Act (1990b) requires an evaluation of archaeological potential and, where applicable, an archaeological assessment report completed by an archaeologist licensed by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS). Policy 2.6 of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS 2014) addresses archaeological resources. All work was conducted in conformity with Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture (MTC) Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011), the Ontario Heritage Act (RSO 1990a).

AMICK Consultants Limited was engaged by the proponent to undertake a Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of lands potentially affected by the proposed undertaking and was granted permission to carry out archaeological fieldwork. The entirety of the study area was subject to property inspection and photographic documentation concurrently with the Stage 2 Property Assessment high intensity test pit methodology at a five-metre interval between individual test pits, by high intensity pedestrian survey at an interval of 5 metres between individual transects and by intensified pedestrian survey at an interval of 1 metre between individual transects on 23-24 May 2018. All records, documentation, field notes, photographs and artifacts (as applicable) related to the conduct and findings of these investigations are held at the Lakelands District corporate offices of AMICK Consultants Limited until such time that they can be transferred to an agency or institution approved by the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) on behalf of the government and citizens of Ontario.

At the time of writing this report a development plan has not been provided to AMICK Consultants Limited. Instead a property parcel map was provided which showed the boundaries of the subject property. A preliminary plan of the proposed development has been submitted together with this report to MTCS for review and reproduced within this report as Map 3.

5.2 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

5.2.1 GENERAL HISTORICAL OUTLINE

***ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)***

In 1837 by Act of Parliament the new District of Wellington was formed and a court house and jail in the town of Guelph were authorized. The District was named after England's Duke of Wellington and initially included the counties of Wellington, Waterloo, Grey and parts of Dufferin (Wikipedia 2017).

By January 1854, Wellington County became an individual entity. At the time, it included the Townships and Towns of Amaranth, Arthur, Eramosa, Erin, Guelph, Guelph (Town), Garafraxa, Maryborough, Nichol, Peel, Pilkington, and Puslinch. Other municipalities were added between 1857 and 1881. Guelph separated in 1879 and was incorporated as a City; it lost representation on the County Council. Orangeville and Garafraxa East were annexed by Dufferin County (Wikipedia 2017).

The former Township of West Luther was originally in the possession of the Mississauga Indians but became part of a tract of land signed over by them to the government in 1818. In 1854, George McPhillips surveyed the land. At the same time he was surveying Melancthon Township and he decided that they were the worst two townships he had ever surveyed and being a Roman Catholic, named the townships after Martin Luther and Philip Melancthon, two of the leaders of the Protestant Reformation. It is a good story; however, Luther received its name several years before McPhillips surveyed the area (Township of Wellington North 2018).

Progress of the Township was very slow because Luther was almost covered completely with timber and swamps. In the early 1870s, during a dry summer, fires broke out over the Township, which burnt off the muck and leveled most of the timber, which improved development. The township developed rapidly once the Toronto; Grey & Bruce Railway was built in 1871 (Township of Wellington North 2018).

Map 2 is a facsimile segment of the Township of Luther map reproduced from The Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wellington (Walker & Miles 1877). Map 3 illustrates the location of the study area and environs as of 1877. The study area is shown to belong to S. Gourd; there are no structures within or near to the study area. In addition, this map illustrates two settlement roads as adjacent to the study area to the south and west. These roads are the current County Road 109 and Eliza Street, respectively.

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

5.2.2 CURRENT CONDITIONS

The present use of the study area is as agricultural land. The study area is roughly 15.92 hectares in area. The study area includes within it mostly ploughable lands. There is the foundation footprint for a house and a barn in the western half of the study area, but the

buildings were demolished before the property assessment was completed. The land around the demolished barn is disturbed. There is another disturbed patch to the north of the demolished house, and a gravel road that enters the study area from the western boundary and travels east towards the demolished barn. There are two small low-lying and wet patches, to the south of the demolished house and barn. There is an area of steep slope to the southwest of the demolished house, adjacent to the southern boundary of the study area, and a second area of slope along the eastern boundary of the study area. There is a grass lawn around the demolished house and barn at the west end of the study area, with two smaller field patches at the northeast and southwestern corner of the ploughed field. The remainder of the study area is a large ploughed field that makes up the majority of the property. The study area is bounded on the north by residential properties and open field, on the east by agricultural field, on the west by Eliza Street and woodland and on the south by Wellington County Road 109 and woodlot. The study area is approximately 150 metres to the south of the intersection of Eliza Street and Eastview Drive. A plan of the study area is included within this report as Map 3. Current conditions encountered during the Stage 1-2 Property Assessment are illustrated in Maps 4 & 5.

5.2.3 SUMMARY OF HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The brief overview of documentary evidence readily available indicates that the study area is situated within an area that was close to the historic transportation routes and as such has potential for sites relating to early Post-contact settlement in the region.

5.3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

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

On the basis of information supplied by MTCS, no archaeological assessments have been conducted within 50 metres of the study area. AMICK Consultants Limited assumes no responsibility for the accuracy of previous assessments, interpretations such as cultural affiliation, or location information derived from the Archaeological Sites Database administered by MTCS. In addition, it must also be noted that the lack of formerly documented previous assessments does not indicate that no assessments have been conducted.

**ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)**

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

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

(MTCS 2011: 126 Emphasis Added)

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

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

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

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

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

(Emphasis Added)

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

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

5.3.1 PRE-CONTACT REGISTERED SITES

**ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)**

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

A stream known as Brandy Creek flows around the eastern and southern boundaries of the study area. This stream 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 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 MTCS. ~~As a result it was determined that there is one (1) archaeological site relating directly to Post-~~

**ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)**

contact habitation/activity formally registered within the immediate vicinity of the study area. All previously registered Post-contact sites are briefly described below in Table 2:

TABLE 2 POST-CONTACT SITES WITHIN 1KM

Site Name	Borden #	Site Type	Cultural Affiliation
	AlHd-2	Midden	Post-Contact

None of the above noted archaeological sites are situated within 300 metres of the study area. Therefore, they have no impact on determinations of archaeological potential for further archaeological resources related to Post-contact activity and occupation with respect to the archaeological assessment of the proposed undertaking.

5.3.3 LOCATION AND CURRENT CONDITIONS

The study area is described as 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1 (Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington, conducted by AMICK Consultants Limited. This assessment was undertaken as a requirement under the Planning Act (RSO 1990b) and the Provincial Policy Statement (2014) in order to support a Draft Plan application and companion Zoning By-law Amendment application as part of the pre-submission process.

The present use of the study area is as agricultural land. The study area is roughly 15.92 hectares in area. The study area includes within it mostly ploughable lands. There is the foundation footprint for a house and a barn in the western half of the study area, but the buildings were demolished before the property assessment was completed. The land around the demolished barn is disturbed. There is another disturbed patch to the north of the demolished house, and a gravel road that enters the study area from the western boundary and travels east towards the demolished barn. There are two small low-lying and wet patches, to the south of the demolished house and barn. There is an area of steep slope to the southwest of the demolished house, adjacent to the southern boundary of the study area, and a second area of slope along the eastern boundary of the study area. There is a grass lawn around the demolished house and barn at the west end of the study area, with two smaller field patches at the northeast and southwestern corner of the ploughed field. The remainder of the study area is a large ploughed field that makes up the majority of the property. The study area is bounded on the north by residential properties and open field, on the east by agricultural field, on the west by Eliza Street and woodland and on the south by Wellington County Road 109 and woodlot. The study area is approximately 150 metres to the south of the intersection of Eliza Street and Eastview Drive. A plan of the study area is included within this report as Map 3. Current conditions encountered during the Stage 1-2 Property Assessment are illustrated in Maps 4 & 5.

5.3.4 PHYSIOGRAPHIC REGION

The study area is situated within the Stratford Till Plain physiographic region. It is an area of ground moraine interrupted by several terminal moraines. The overall slope is toward the southwest from 1,500 to 900 feet a.s.l. throughout this area, the till is fairly uniform, being brown calcareous silty clay whether on the ridges or the more level ground moraine. The soils of the Stratford Plain may almost all be classified in the Huron catena based on the heavy textured calcareous till which is so widespread in the region once covered by the Huron ice lobe (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 133-135).

5.3.5 SURFACE WATER

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

There is a stream course flowing around the eastern and southern boundaries of the study area, within 300 metres of the study area. This stream is Brandy Creek and is a source of potable water, which indicates potential for archaeological resources of a Pre-Contact origin.

5.3.6 CURRENT PROPERTY CONDITIONS CONTEXT

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

5.3.6.1 BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURAL FOOTPRINTS

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

evidence to suggest that there are likely archaeological resources situated beneath the disturbance, alternative methodologies may be recommended to study such areas.

There is the foundation footprint for a house and a barn in the western half of the study area, but the buildings were demolished before the property assessment was completed. Maps 4 & 5 of this report illustrate the locations of these features.

5.3.6.2 DISTURBANCE

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

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

(Goel 2013)

***ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)***

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 land around the demolished barn is disturbed. There is another disturbed patch to the north of the demolished house, and a gravel road that enters the study area from the western boundary and travels east towards the demolished barn. Maps 4 & 5 of this report illustrate the locations of these features.

5.3.6.3 LOW-LYING AND WET AREAS

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

There are two small low-lying and wet patches, to the south of the demolished house and barn. Maps 4 & 5 of this report illustrate the locations of these features.

5.3.6.4 STEEP SLOPE

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

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

***ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)***

There is an area of steep slope to the southwest of the demolished house, adjacent to the southern boundary of the study area, and a second area of slope along the eastern boundary of the study area. Maps 4 & 5 of this report illustrate the locations of these features.

5.3.6.5 WOODED AREAS

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

The study area does not contain any wooded areas.

5.3.6.6 PLOUGHABLE AGRICULTURAL LANDS

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

The majority of the study area is a large ploughed field, located centrally. Maps 4 & 5 of this report illustrate the location of this feature.

5.3.6.7 LAWN, PASTURE, MEADOW

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

There is a grass lawn around the demolished house and barn at the west end of the study area, with two smaller field patches at the northeast and southwestern corner of the ploughed field. Maps 4 & 5 of this report illustrate the locations of these features.

5.3.7 SUMMARY

***ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)***

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.

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 demolished structures, areas under gravel driveway and disturbed land, and areas that are not accessible due to the presence of steep slopes and low-lying and wet areas. A significant proportion of the study area does exhibit archaeological potential and therefore a Stage 2 Property Assessment is required.

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

6.0 FIELD WORK METHODS AND WEATHER CONDITIONS

This report confirms that the study area was subject to Stage 2 Property Assessment by high intensity test pit methodology at a five-metre interval between individual test pits, by high intensity pedestrian survey at an interval of 5 metres between individual transects and by intensified pedestrian survey at an interval of 1 metre between individual transects on 23-24 May 2018.

The fieldwork undertaken as a component of this study was conducted according to the archaeological fieldwork standards and guidelines (including weather and lighting conditions). Weather conditions were appropriate for the necessary fieldwork required to complete the Stage 2 Property Assessment and to create the documentation appropriate to this study. The locations from which photographs were taken and the directions toward which the camera was aimed for each photograph are illustrated in Maps 4 & 5 of this report. Upon completion of the property inspection of the study area, it was determined that select areas would require Stage 2 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 photographed. Observations made of conditions within the study area at the time of the inspection were used to inform the requirement for Stage 2 Property Assessment for portions of the study area as well as to aid in the determination of appropriate Stage 2 Property Assessment strategies. The locations from which photographs were taken and the directions toward which the camera was aimed for each photograph are illustrated in Maps 4 & 5 of this report.

6.2 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.*
[All land was recently ploughed.]
- 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 90% 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 5m between individual transects.]

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.*

[Survey transects were reduced to 1m intervals over a minimum of 20m radius around finds]

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).*

[All formal artifact types and diagnostic categories were collected.]

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.*

[Based on professional judgment, all of the artifacts were collected as part of a controlled surface pickup (CSP).]

(MTC 2011: 30-31)

6.3 CONTROLLED SURFACE PICK-UP (CSP)

In all cases where artifacts were found pedestrian survey intervals were reduced to one metre between individual transects and all artifacts found on the surface were marked with numbered flags. The artifacts were collected and bagged according to the numbered location where each was found. Every find location was individually recorded using GPS with an accuracy of 5 metres or less. All artifacts were collected. As a result of the completion of CSPs on all archaeological locations, this component of Stage 3 Site-specific Assessment has been completed and is not required for subsequent investigations of these sites.

6.4 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]

**ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)**

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

[The study area contained multiple field areas around the ploughed field that could not be ploughed and were test pit surveyed at an interval of 5m between individual test pits.]

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.

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

f. narrow (10 m or less) linear survey corridors (e.g., water or gas pipelines, road widening). This includes situations where there are planned impacts 10 m or less beyond the previously impacted limits on both sides of an existing linear corridor (e.g., two linear survey corridors on either side of an existing roadway). Where at the time of fieldwork the lands within the linear corridor meet the standards as stated under the above section on pedestrian survey land preparation, pedestrian survey must be carried out. Space test pits at maximum intervals of 5 m (400 test pits per hectare) in areas less than 300 m from any feature of archaeological potential.

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

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

[All test pits were spaced at an interval of 5m between individual test pits]

3. *Space test pits at maximum intervals of 10 m (100 test pits per hectare) in areas more than 300 m from any feature of archaeological potential.*

[The entirety of the test pitted areas of the study area were assessed using high intensity test pit methodology at an interval of 5 metres between individual test pits]

4. *Test pit to within 1 m of built structures (both intact and ruins), or until test pits show evidence of recent ground disturbance.*

[Not Applicable]

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 a minimum of 30cm in depth 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 a minimum of 30 cm below 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)

Approximately 85% of the study area consisted of ploughed field that underwent pedestrian survey at an interval of 5 metres between individual transects. Approximately 5% of the study area consisted of ploughed field that underwent pedestrian survey at an interval of 1 metre between individual transects. Approximately 5% of the study area was grass field that was test pit surveyed at an interval of 5 metres between individual test pits. Approximately 5% of the study area was not assessable due to the presence of structural footprints, gravel driveways, disturbed patches, steep slopes and low-lying and wet areas.

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

As a result of the Property Assessment of the study area, seven isolated Pre-Contact lithic flakes and nine historic earthenware fragments were encountered. The number and types of artifacts collected from the study area are listed below in Table 3. The isolated find spots are described below. The photographs of the finds, each numbered is appended to the end of this report in Appendix A. A detailed description of the location of these finds can be found in the supplementary information package of this report filed under separate cover with the Ministry of Tourism culture and Sport.

7.1.1 ISOLATED FINDS

Pre-Contact Lithic Flakes

Isolated Finds 1-7 consist of a collection of flakes made of Collingwood Chert. The precise time period of these flakes could not be determined. One of the flakes (Isolated Find #5) shows signs of being retouched. Images of these finds are included as Images A-C in Appendix A at the end of this report.

Historic Finds

Isolated Finds 8-16 consist of a collection of earthenware fragments. Eight of the fragments (Isolated Finds #8-15) consist of refined white earthenware, while the ninth fragment (Isolated Find #16) is red earthenware. An image of these finds is included as Image D in Appendix A at the end of this report.

**ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)**

TABLE 3 ALL ISOLATED FINDS FROM THE STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT

CAT #	DESCRIPTION	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
1	Collingwood Chert Flake	6	37.5%
2	Collingwood Chert Flake (Retouched)	1	6.25%
3	Refined White Earthenware	8	50%
4	Red Earthenware	1	6.25%
	Total	16	100%

The collection of artifacts from this assessment is packaged in a single banker's box and housed at the Port McNicoll office of AMICK Consultants Limited until such time as an appropriate permanent location, as approved by MTCS, is located and appropriate arrangements for the transfer of the collection and associated responsibilities for the material is made.

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 42 digital photographs.

8.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

AMICK Consultants Limited was engaged by the proponent to undertake a Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of lands potentially affected by the proposed undertaking and was granted permission to carry out archaeological fieldwork. The entirety of the study area was subject to property inspection and photographic documentation concurrently with the Stage 2 Property Assessment on 23-24 May 2018, consisting of high-intensity test pit survey at an interval of five metres between individual test pits, high intensity pedestrian survey at an interval of five metres between individual transects and intensified 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 Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) on behalf of the government and citizens of Ontario.

8.1 STAGE 1 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

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

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

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

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

(MTC 2011: 17)

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

“ - *previously identified archaeological sites*

- *water sources (It is important to distinguish types of water and shoreline, and to distinguish natural from artificial water sources, as these features affect site locations and types to varying degrees.):*
 - *primary water sources (lakes, rivers, streams, creeks)*
 - *secondary water sources (intermittent streams and creeks, springs, marshes, swamps)*
 - *features indicating past water sources (e.g., glacial lake shorelines indicated by the presence of raised sand or gravel beach ridges, relic river or stream channels indicated by clear dip or swale in the topography, shorelines of drained lakes or marshes, cobble beaches)*
 - *accessible or inaccessible shoreline (e.g., high bluffs, swamp or marsh fields by the edge of a lake, sandbars stretching into marsh)*
- *elevated topography (e.g., eskers, drumlins, large knolls, plateaux)*
- *pockets of well-drained sandy soil, especially near areas of heavy soil or rocky ground*
- *distinctive land formations that might have been special or spiritual places, such as waterfalls, rock outcrops, caverns, mounds, and promontories and their bases. There may be physical indicators of their use, such as burials, structures, offerings, rock paintings or carvings.*
- *resource areas, including:*
 - *food or medicinal plants (e.g., migratory routes, spawning areas, prairie)*
 - *scarce raw materials (e.g., quartz, copper, ochre or outcrops of chert)*
 - *early Post-contact industry (e.g., fur trade, logging, prospecting, mining)*
- *areas of early Post-contact settlement. These include places of early military or pioneer settlement (e.g., pioneer homesteads, isolated cabins, farmstead complexes), early wharf or dock complexes, pioneer churches and early cemeteries. There may be commemorative markers of their history, such as local, provincial, or federal monuments or heritage parks.*
- *Early historical transportation routes (e.g., trails, passes, roads, railways, portage routes)*
- *property listed on a municipal register or designated under the Ontario Heritage Act that is a federal, provincial or municipal historic landmark or site*

***ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)***

- *property that local histories or informants have identified with possible archaeological sites, historical events, activities, or occupations”*
(MTC 2011: 17-18)

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

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

(MCC & MOE 1992: 6-7)

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

(MTC 2011: 17)

In addition, archaeological sites data is also used to determine if any archaeological resources had been formerly documented within or in close proximity to the study area and if these same resources might be subject to impacts from the proposed undertaking. This data was also collected in order to establish the relative cultural heritage value or interest of any resources that might be encountered during the conduct of the present study. For example, the relative rarity of a site can be used to assign an elevated level of cultural heritage value or interest to a site that is atypical for the immediate vicinity. The requisite archaeological sites data of previously registered archaeological sites was collected from the Programs and Services Branch, Culture Programs Unit, MTCS and the corporate research library of AMICK Consultants Limited. The Stage 1 Background Research methodology also includes a review of the most detailed available topographic maps, historical settlement maps, archaeological management plans (where applicable) and commemorative plaques or monuments. When previous archaeological research documents lands to be impacted by the proposed undertaking or archaeological sites within 50 metres of the study area, the reports documenting this earlier work are reviewed for pertinent information. AMICK Consultants Limited will often modify this basic methodology based on professional judgment to include additional research (such as, local historical works or documents and knowledgeable informants).

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

***ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)***

- 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 are identified primary water sources within 300 metres of the study area. Brandy Creek flows around the eastern and southern boundaries of the study area. This stream is a source of potable water and indicates potential for archaeological resources of a Pre-Contact origin.

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 medium brown loamy sand, which is consistent with the wider area surrounding the property. Therefore, the presence of this soil has no impact on potential within the study area, as the wider area is not known for clay soils or exposed bedrock.

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.

**ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)**



(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 not situated in close proximity to any historic structures identified on the historic atlas map.

10) Early Historical Transportation Routes

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

**ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)**

The study area is situated within 100 metres of two early settlement roads that appear on the Historic Atlas Map of 1877. These historic roads correspond to the roads presently known as Eliza Street and County Road 109.

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

A gravel road enters the study area from the western boundary and travels east towards the demolished barn

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 building footprints within the study area, one from a house and one from a barn. Both are at the western end of the study area, but both buildings were demolished before the archaeological assessment was conducted.

4) *Sewage and Infrastructure Development*

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

There is no evidence to suggest that substantial below ground services of any kind have resulted in significant impacts to any significant portion of the study area. Major utility lines are conduits that provide services such as water, natural gas, hydro, communications, sewage, and others. These major installations should not be confused with minor below ground service installations not considered to represent significant disturbances removing archaeological potential, such as services leading to individual structures which tend to be comparatively very shallow and vary narrow

***ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)***

corridors. Areas containing substantial and deeply buried services or clusters of below ground utilities are considered areas of disturbance, and may be excluded from Stage 2 Property Assessment.

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

(MTC 2011: 18)

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

(MTC 2011: 18)

SUMMARY

Table 4 below summarizes the evaluation criteria of the Ministry of Tourism and Culture together with the results of the Stage 1 Background Study for the proposed undertaking. Based on the criteria, the property is deemed to have archaeological potential on the basis of proximity to water, and the location of early historic settlement roads adjacent to the study area.

**ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)**

TABLE 4 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.		N		If Yes, and Yes for any of 3-6, 8-9, potential determined
8	Historic Transportation route within 100 m. (historic road, trail, portage, rail corridors, etc.)	Y			If Yes, and Yes for any 3-7 or 9, potential determined
9	Contains property designated and/or listed under the Ontario Heritage Act (municipal heritage committee, municipal register, etc.)		N		If Yes and, Yes to any of 3-8, potential determined
APPLICATION-SPECIFIC INFORMATION					
10	Local knowledge (local heritage organizations, Pre-contact, etc.)		N		If Yes, potential determined
11	Recent disturbance not including agricultural cultivation (post-1960-confirmed extensive and intensive including industrial sites, aggregate areas, etc.)		N		If Yes, no potential or low potential in affected part (s) of the study area.

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

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

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

8.2 STAGE 2 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

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

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

As a result of the property assessment of the study area, 16 isolated artifacts were collected during the Controlled Surface Pickup (CSP); seven Pre-Contact lithic flakes and nine historic artifacts. However, these isolated finds were too spread out to qualify as archaeological resources, and it has been determined that the study area does not hold any further Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI).

9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 STAGE 1 RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

9.2 STAGE 2 RECOMMENDATIONS

***ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)***

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 property Assessment of the study area, seven isolated Pre-Contact flakes and nine isolated historic finds were identified. Based on the characteristics of these sites and the analysis of artifacts, the following recommendations are made:

1. *The Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI) of all of the isolated finds have been completely documented and the items have been removed from the study area. Some of the finds were close enough that they are possibly related, but since there was a lack of a more intensified distribution of artifacts following an intensified assessment, there is insufficient data to determine if the material (either as an aggregate or as isolated finds) qualifies for further investigation. This indicates there is likely no remaining CHVI for this location. No further archaeological assessment of the isolated find is warranted;*

10.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION

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

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

11.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES

- Chapman, L.J. & D.F. Putnam. (1984). *The Physiography of Southern Ontario (Third Edition)*. Ontario Geological Survey, Special Report #2. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Toronto.
- Esri. "Topographic" [basemap]. Scale Not Given. "World Topographic Map". April 12, 2018. <http://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=30e5fe3149c34df1ba922e6f5bbf808f>. (April 12, 2018).
- Goel, Tarun (2013). Road Construction: History and Procedure. Bright Hub Engineering. Retrieved 24 May 2015 from URL: <http://www.brighthubengineering.com/structural-engineering/59665-road-construction-history-and-procedure/>
- Google Earth (Version 6.0.3.2197) [Software]. (2009). Available from <http://www.google.com/earth/index.html>.
- Google Maps. (2012). Available from: http://maps.google.ca/?utm_campaign=en&utm_source=en-ha-na-ca-bk-gm&utm_medium=ha&utm_term=google%20maps.
- Kuhlmann, Stacy. (2017). *Types of Soil*. Diagram of Soil Types available from <http://www.tes.com/lessons/AKChU3fbfZKo9g/types-of-soil>.
- Ontario Heritage Act, RSO 1990a, Government of Ontario. (Queen's Printer, Toronto).
- Ontario Heritage Amendment Act, SO 2005, Government of Ontario. (Queen's Printer, Toronto).
- Ontario Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation (OMCzCR). (1993). *Archaeological Assessment Technical Guidelines, Stages 1-3 and Reporting Format*. (Queen's Printer for Ontario 1993)
- Ontario Ministry of Culture (MCL). (2005). *Conserving a Future for Our Past: Archaeology, Land Use Planning & Development in Ontario (An Educational Primer and Comprehensive Guide for Non-Specialists)*. (Heritage & Libraries Branch, Heritage Operations Unit: Toronto).
- Ontario Ministry of Culture and Communications (MCC) & Ministry of Environment (MOE). (1992). *Guideline for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments*. (Cultural Programs Branch, Archaeology and Heritage Planning: Toronto).
- Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture (MTC). (2011). *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologist*. (Programs and Services Branch: Culture Programs Unit, Toronto).
- Ontario Planning Act, RSO 1990b, Government of Ontario. (Queen's Printer, Toronto).
- Provincial Policy Statement (2014). Government of Ontario. (Queen's Printer, Toronto).
- Township of Wellington North. (2018). *History of Wellington North*. Retrieved 26 April 2018 from URL: <https://wellington-north.com/visiting/history-of-wellington-north>


***ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)***

Walker & Miles. (1877). *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wellington*. Walker & Miles: Toronto.

Wikipedia. (2017). *Wellington County, Ontario*. Retrieved 29 August, 2017 from URL:
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wellington_County,_Ontario#History


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 (ESRI 2018)

*ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)*



**MAP 2 FACSIMILE SEGMENT OF THE HISTORIC ATLAS MAP OF THE TOWNSHIP OF LUTHER
(WALKER & MILES 1877)**

*ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)*




MAP 3 PROPERTY PLAN (N. P., N. D.)

**ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)**



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

*ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)*



MAP 5 DETAILED PLAN OF THE STUDY AREA

**ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)**

13.0 IMAGES

	
<p>IMAGE 1 DEMOLISHED BARN FOOTPRINT (24)</p>	<p>IMAGE 2 GRAVEL ROAD (36)</p>
	
<p>IMAGE 3 LOW-LYING AND WET AREA (11)</p>	<p>IMAGE 4 FORMER HOUSE LOCATION (30)</p>
	
<p>IMAGE 5 AREA OF STEEP SLOPE (6)</p>	<p>IMAGE 6 TEST PIT SURVEY IN PROGRESS (37)</p>

**ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)**



IMAGE 7 PEDESTRIAN SURVEY CONDITIONS (12)

IMAGE 8 PEDESTRIAN SURVEY IN PROGRESS (16)

APPENDIX A ISOLATED FIND IMAGES



Image A: Isolated Finds 1-3 (Collingwood Chert, Cat # 1)



Image B: Isolated Find 4 (Collingwood Chert, Cat #1) and Isolated Find 5 (Retouched Collingwood Chert, Cat #2)

*ORIGINAL 2018 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 211 Eliza Street, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1
(Geographic Township of Luther), Township of Wellington North, County of Wellington
(AMICK File #18536/MTCS File #P058-1654-2018)*



Image C: Isolated Finds 6-7 (Collingwood Chert, Cat # 1)




Image D: Isolated Finds 8-15 (Refined White Earthenware, Cat #3) and Isolated Find 16
(Red Earthenware, Cat #4)