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1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of a Stage I-II archaeological/heritage assessment of a parcel of land (ca. 125 acres) proposed for development as a quarry in Part Lots 20 & 21, Concession A, Township of Osprey, Municipality of Grey Highlands (Former County of Grey), Ontario (Figures 1-3; Plate 1).

FIGURE 1 LOCATION OF THE STUDY AREA IN RELATION TO (TOP) SOUTHCENTRAL ONTARIO AND (BOTTOM) THE COMMUNITY OF SINGHAMPTON.
1.1 PROJECT DURATION AND STAFF

The Stage I-II archaeological/heritage assessment described below was carried out at the request of David S. White, Q.C., Barrister and Solicitor, 89 Dunlop Street East, Suite 301, Barrie, Ontario, L4M 1A7, and John McDermott, Land Use and Environmental Planner, on behalf of the Project Proponent, M.A.Q. Aggregates Inc.

The contract was awarded to York North Archaeological Services (YNAS) on May 10, 2004. The Contract Information Form (CIF) was submitted to the Ministry of Culture (MOC) for review on October 22, 2004 and was reviewed by Roshan Jussawalla (License Administrator), that same day.

The Stage I historic background research was conducted by Gordon Dibb. The Stage II field investigations were conducted on October 23, 24, and 25, 2004 under the field direction of Gordon Dibb. The field crew consisted of Gordon Dibb, Patricia Dibb, Etienne Jacobson, Amy Keiser, Christianne Hawken, Adam Pollock, Dwayne James, and Krissy Nichols. The report was prepared by Gordon Dibb, Patricia Dibb and Karen Blackbourn.

During the course of the project, written and verbal communications were conducted with David S. White (Q.C. Barrister and Solicitor), John McDermott (Project Planner), and from the Ministry of Culture (MOC), Roshan Jussawalla (Licence Administrator), and Robert von Bitter (Data Coordinator).
2.0 SITE LOCATION ANALYSIS

Legally, the study area is described as Part Lots 20 & 21, Concession A, Township of Osprey, Municipality of Grey Highlands (Former Township of Grey), Ontario (Figures 1-3). The two main entrances to the study area are located along the west side of Highway 91, to the north of Singhampton (Figures 1, 3; Plate 1).

2.1 BEDROCK AND QUATERNARY GEOLOGY

The Ordovician Georgian Bay Formation is the oldest bedrock in Osprey Township. It consists of a blue-grey and greenish-grey shales with thin beds of limestone and siltstone. This rock is estimated to be about 122 meters thick. The Queenston Formation, also of Ordovician age, overlies the Georgian Bay Formation and consists of red shales. It is estimated to be about 84 meters thick (ARIP 1984:11-12).

The Silurian formations of the Clinton and Cataract Groups overlie the Queenston Formation shales, and can only be seen at the Niagara Escarpment. The Amabel Formation overlies the latter formations, and forms the caprock of the Niagara Escarpment, which is erosion-resistant. This formation is very hard, and resists weathering. The formation consists of light grey to blue-grey, medium crystalline dolostone. It is well suited for construction aggregates, and is estimated to be 23 meters thick (ARIP 1984:12).

To the West, the Amabel Formation is overlain by the Guelph Formation, which is the youngest of the bedrock formations. This bedrock is softer, less durable, and erodes easily. The bedrock consists of light brown, medium-crystalline dolostone (ARIP 1984:12).

Siegfried Township was heavily impacted by glacial activity during the Late Wisconsin, between 23,000 ad 10,000 years ago. This period of time was marked by the advancement and melting back of massive, continental ice sheets (ARIP 1984:9).

The major glacial physiographic characteristics in the township were the result of the ice advancement from the north and northeast, out of the Georgian Bay basin (Chapman and Putnam 1966). The major feature is the Singhampton Moraine, which was deposited along the margins of the Georgian Bay Lobe. The moraine stretches across the township diagonally from the southwest to the northeast (ARIP 1984:9). The moraine divides the township into 2 main physiographic regions. To the north lies the Horseshoe Moraine, which consists of till ridges, kame moraines, outwash plains, small lakes, and swampy areas (Chapman and Putnam 1966). The Dundalk Till Plain lies to the south of the Singhampton Moraine. This plain area is elevated and is marked by eskers, drumlins, swamps, and bogs. The till is comprised of a clayey to gritty silt, and is poorly drained (ARIP 1984:9).

The third physiographic region in the Township is the Niagara Escarpment. The Escarpment crosses the farthest northeast corner of the township, exposing four different
layers of bedrock. Osprey Township is almost completely underlain by Silurian dolostones, excluding the northeast corner where the Niagara escarpment reveals Ordovician shales (ARIP 1984:9-10).

### 2.2 TOPOGRAPHY

The elevations in the study area range between 512.3 to 532.1 amsl. The lowest area of elevation is found in the northern-east corner of the south half of Lot 21. The highest area of elevation, in the study area is in the middle of the southern edge of the south half of Lot 20. The northeast corner of the study area is approximately 512.3 amsl, the southeast corner is 523 amsl, the southwest corner is slightly lower at 512 amsl, and the northwest corner of the study area reaches elevations of 526 amsl. The terrain is for the most part steady, but it does range from irregular, moderately sloping to very steeply sloping. Steep slopes are encountered quickly in the south half of Lot 21, a large swamp is also situated in the middle of the study area, in the north half of Lot 20 (Tatham & Associates Ltd. 2004).

### 2.3 DRAINAGE

Drainage on the property is good, despite a large swampy area present in the middle of the study area. The study area drains into the swamp, which in turn drains eastward towards a small creek, off the study area. The creek flows north-east, and drains into the Pretty River, which in turns drains into Nottawasaga Bay at Collingwood.

### 2.4 SOILS

The subject property lies on soils known as the Osprey series. These are well drained, stony, loamy soils with a shallow profile, and are alkaline in reaction (Chapman and Putnam 1966:199). The Osprey series, is classified as transitional between the Brown Forest Soil and Grey-Brown Podzolic Great Soil Group. However, it is more heavily represented by the Brown Forest Soil. Osprey Loam is the most popular soil throughout the study area. Osprey Sandy Loam is present in a pocket area at the west end of the south half of Lot 20. The Sandy Loam differs in texture from the Loam, in that it is less fertile, and retains less moisture. The Osprey Loam itself is well drained. Osprey Loam is medium-texture derived from dolomitic limestone till, characterized as stony to very stony in areas. The profile of the Osprey Loam consists of 4 inches of dark brown loam, over 2-4 inches of brown loam, over 2 inches of brown clay loam, over grey-brown stony calcareous till (Gillespie and Richards 1954:34-36).

### 2.5 LAND USE

Where possible the subject property had been recently ploughed and allowed to weather prior to the field inspection by the YNAS crew. The eastern side of the study area and two fields nearer the centre of the study area consist of workable agricultural lands. Most of the balance of the property consists of either mature trees and/or reforested
plantations of conifers in various states of maturity. Portions of the reforested area are impossible to traverse due to their density and maturity (Plates 2 & 16).

3.0 **ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND RESEARCH AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE POTENTIAL**

3.1 **ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND RESEARCH**

A search of the MOC archaeological/heritage database reveals that there are no recorded archaeological sites within a 2 km radius of the study area.

A Stage I-II archaeological survey of lands directly opposite the study area (east side of the Osprey/Clearview Townline), in Part Lots 25 & 26, Concessions 11 & 12, Township of Clearview, Simcoe County for Georgian Aggregates & Construction Inc. failed to locate significant archaeological resources (Archaeological Assessments Ltd. 2005).

3.2 **HISTORICAL BACKGROUND RESEARCH**

Osprey Township was surveyed and laid out into lots and concessions by Charles Rankin in 1850 as a prelude to the Crown issuing land patents (Winearls 1991:548).

![Figure 2](image-url)  
**FIGURE 2** LOCATION OF THE STUDY AREA AS SHOWN ON RANKIN’S (1851) MAP OF OSPERY TOWNSHIP.
The original patent for Lot 20, Concession A, was issued to John McDonald on January 22, 1870, and consisted of 50 acres in the north half, and 60 acres in the south half. It was bequeathed to Jane McDonald and her son Alexander McDonald in 1874. The south half of the property was patented to Jane and Alexander McDonald. In 1882, they sold the west 10 acres of the south half of Lot 20, to Richard Fisher for $200.00.

Richard Fisher granted 10 acres to Hugh McKinney in 1888, who in turn, granted the 10 acres to John Dyer, who then granted the land to Albert Sampson in 1922.

In 1898, Alex McDonald granted the north and south half of Lot 20 (100 acres), to Neil McDonald for $1.00. In March of 1921, the widow of Neil McDonald, Lucinda, deeded her property to John D. McDonald for $1,100.00.

In 1933, Albert Sampson, deeded the 10 acres of the south half of lot 20, to Mary Sampson, for 1 dollar. Mary, in turn, granted the property to Charles Oval Ellis in 1940.

In May 1959, John D. McDonald sold the north and south holdings of Lot 20 to Wm. Aubrey MacDonald for $4,000.00. In 1976, Wm. Aubrey MacDonald et ux deeded the property to Ann Kekanovich, where it remains today.

In 2000, the 10 acres of the south half of Lot 20 was granted to Susan Rooks for $250,000 after changing hands many times before.

The Crown patented 120 acres of Lot 21, Concession A, in 1868 to Alexander Currie and William Gibson. In 1904, Alexander Currie granted the land to Joseph Johnston, for $2,725.00. In 1910, Joseph Johnston sold this land to Angus and John MacDonald for $3,500.00. The 120 acres remained in the MacDonald family until 1942, when Gilbert MacDonald granted the property to Henry Norman Habgood, for $1,000.00.

The 120 acres was granted to William Aubrey MacDonald et ux, for $2,000.00, in 1960, by the executors of Henry Norman Habgood's estate. It remained in the MacDonald family until 1976, when it was granted to Jim Kekanovich for $5,000.00.

In 1993, Jim Kekanovich transferred Parts 2, and 4, to his wife Ann Kekanovich, for the amount of $2.00.00. The Township of Osprey was granted an easement in Parts 1, 3, and 5 of Lot 21, for highway widening. In 1996, Jim and Ann Kekanovich granted Part 2, Lot 21, to 856454 Ontario Limited for the amount of $87, 000.00.

856454 Ontario Limited sold the property to Willard G. Hallman Lumber Ltd., in 1996 for $2.00 and, in turn, it was sold to Susan Speakman for $65,000.00 later the same year.

The above land title information is taken from abstracts on file at the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations land registry office in Owen Sound.
3.3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE POTENTIAL

The archaeological potential for the discovery of prehistoric archaeological resources is mostly moderate to low, given that the study area is generally more than 100 meters from sources of potable water. There is a small stream located slightly over 100 meters to the south of the study area, in the north half of Lot 19. There is a high to moderate potential for prehistoric isolated finds near the swampy area, which is located in the middle of the north half of Lot 20 (Plate 2).

PLATE 2  AIR PHOTOGRAPH OF THE STUDY AREA SHOWING THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL AND THE SURVEY METHODOLOGIES USED.

There is a moderate to high potential that historic period archaeological resources may be encountered, along the eastern boundary of the study area, as a late 19th century farmhouse remains standing near the south-east corner of Lot 20 (Figure 2). At a meeting on March 31, 2006 with Shari Prowse (Archaeological Planner) and Michael Johnson (Archaeological Unit Manager), it was agreed that the shingle sided house does not represent a structure of archaeological significance (Plates 9 & 10).

4.0 SURVEY METHODOLOGIES AND RESULTS

4.1 SURVEY METHODOLOGIES

The survey methodologies involved pedestrian survey at 5.0 intervals, wherever possible, along with shovel testing (Plate 2). Shovel testing was undertaken throughout the south half of Lot 21, which is a woodlot. It was also employed in the north half of Lot 20, to the east of the swamp. The south half of Lot 20, was also shovel tested at 5.0 meter
intervals, the fill from the shovel test units was trowel sorted through .25 in (6mm) hardware screens in order to locate possible artifacts. The three large farmer's fields located adjacent to the road along the northeast side of the property were pedestrian surveyed at 5.0 meter intervals, as well as the two ploughed fields to the north and west of the swamp area, in the middle of the study area. The owners ploughed between rows of Christmas tree where ever possible. The tree farm is overgrown and has not been thinned in several years making walking between the trees in this area virtually impossible. This pine plantation was shovel tested at 5 meter intervals wherever possible in small clearings and along lane and/or pathways. The large field directly to the west of the “A” frame (the current owners residence) was not ploughed because; they did not want the young saplings turned under and loose their income. This area was shovel tested at 10 meter intervals as this represents an area of low potential owing to the lack of potable water in the area. Plates 3 to 15 provide views of areas shovel tested, pedestrian surveyed and standing structures located within the confines of the study area.

PLATE 3  VIEW OF PLOUGHED FIELD LOCATED IN THE CENTRE OF THE PROPERTY LOOKING WEST FROM IT’S SOUTH EAST EDGE

PLATE 4  VIEW OF WOODLOT LOCATED ALONG THE NORTH EDGE OF THE STUDY AREA.
PLATE 5  VIEW OF WOODLOT SHOWING SLIGHT RAVINE LOCATED IN CENTRE OF WOODLOT.

PLATE 6  VIEW OF EXPOSED BEDROCK KNOB LOCATED AT THE WESTERN EDGE OF SWAMP, LOOKING WEST
PLATE 7  VIEW OF WESTERN EDGE OF SWAMP LOCATED EAST OF CENTRE FIELD, LOOKING EAST.

PLATE 8  VIEW OF EXPOSED BEDROCK IN THE NORTH EAST SECTION OF NORTHERN WOODLOT, LOOKING NORTH.
PLATE 9  VIEW OF THE EAST SIDE OF THE 20\textsuperscript{TH} CENTURY CLAPBOARD HOUSE LOCATED AT THE EXTREME EASTERN BOUNDARY OF THE STUDY AREA.

PLATE 10  VIEW OF WESTERN SIDE OF LATE 20\textsuperscript{TH} CENTURY WOODEN SHINGLE SIDED HOUSE LOCATED AT THE EXTREME EASTERN EDGE OF STUDY AREA.
PLATE 11  VIEW OF THE “A FRAME” HOUSE (CURRENT OWNERS’ RESIDENCE), LOOKING NORTHWEST.

PLATE 12  VIEW OF SMALLEST PLOUGHED FIELD LOCATED IN CENTRE OF STUDY AREA LOOKING EAST FROM EDGE OF SWAMPY AREA LOCATED IN THE CENTRE OF STUDY AREA.
PLATE 13  VIEW OF PLOUGHED AREA BETWEEN CHRISTMAS TREES AND FIELD EDGE.

PLATE 14  VIEW OF SHOVEL TESTING CONDUCTED IN THE EASTERN HALF OF THE STUDY AREA
PLATE 15  VIEW OF SHOVEL TESTING CONDUCTED IN THE EASTERN HALF OF THE STUDY AREA.

PLATE 16  VIEW OF DENSITY OF THE CHRISTMAS TREES IN THE PLANTATION LOCATED IN THE CENTRE THIRD, TO THE WEST OF 20TH CENTURY FARMHOUSE, LOCATED AT THE EASTERN EDGE OF THE STUDY AREA.
4.2 SURVEY RESULTS

Prehistoric artifacts were not located during the course of the 2004 YNAS survey of the study area in Lots 20 & 21, Concession A, Township of Osprey Municipality of Grey Highlands (former County of Grey). A historic, late 19th century farmhouse was recorded in the south half of Lot 20, Concession A (Plates 9 & 10).

The split shingle or ‘riven’ sided house in the southeast corner of Lot 21 is a good example of a very rudimentary style of walling. The shingles protect the underlying log structure and make rethinking unnecessary. This type of exterior house surface treatment can be conducted at the building site by using small wooden blocks (McIlwraith 1997:80-81; Figure 5.7)

“Though much more common on seacosts than in Ontario, shingle siding appears on many buildings in mid-19th century settlements on the Canadian Shield and reappeared as a decorative feature of eclectic revivals in the 1880s and 1890s (Fram 1988:137).”

Quantities of 20th century refuse associated with the single farmhouse, included a dilapidated shed and garbage pile, and scrap metal. All of the shovel test pits near the house were sterile. A small amount of early to mid-20th century historic refuse (undecorated white earthenware, bottle glass and agricultural related metal) was found in the plowed field to the immediate west of the house. A collection was not made of this material.

The existing Christmas tree operation was not assessed owing to the dense, impenetrable conditions at the time of YNAS's survey. During the March 31, 2006 meeting between Gordon Dibb of YNAS and Shari Prowse and Michael Johnson (MOC), Dibb was of the opinion that it was virtually impossible to properly shovel test the dense sections of largely dead evergreens (Plate 13 – right side & Plate 16). Michael Johnson and Shari Prowse did not offer an opinion as to issuing clearance of this section of the study area and passed the decision regarding clearance on to John MacDonald (MOC – London). Subsequent inquiries to all three ministry personal have, as June 20, 2006, not been responded to. Thus, it is the opinion of YNAS that due diligence has been conducted, and without a response from MOC staff it is recommended that clearance of the archaeological condition be granted for the areas shown in red, on Plate 2, as not having been shovel tested based upon the dense nature of the woodlots in question.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the archaeological/historical background research and field investigations, evidence of significant prehistoric and/or historic heritage resources were not found within the confines of the sections of the study area that were assessed. The area of the existing Christmas tree plantation is so dense that it is impossible to properly shovel
test. This plantation area does not possess a very large potential. While the potential for the discovery of native sites owing to the lack of potable water, having only a low to moderate potential for the discovery of isolated find spots. The removal of the tree plantations using a bulldozer would almost certainly damage existing tree root systems and push topsoil to other areas destroying any form of context that still may exist for cultural resources, even if they do happen to exist.

5.2 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

On the basis of the above described investigations significant heritage resources were not encountered in the areas, which were assessed. **It is therefore recommended that MOC issue a clearance of the archaeological/heritage condition in order to permit the project proponent, M.A.Q. Aggregates to proceed with proposed quarry development development.**

Should deeply buried archaeological remains be found within the study area during the course of site preparation and/or quarry related activities MOC should be notified/

In the event that human remains and/or deeply buried archaeological features are encountered during extraction activities associated with the development proposal, the proponent should immediately contact both MOC and the Registrar or Deputy Registrar of the Cemeteries Regulation Unit of the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations at 1-(416)-326-9382.
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APPENDIX I

YORK NORTH ARCHAEOLOGICAL SERVICES: 1264 BATHURST STREET, PETERBOROUGH, ONTARIO, K9H 6X8. [TEL: 1-(705)-742-7301; FAX: 1-(705)-740-9095].

GORDON DIBB: the owner and senior researcher associated with York North Archaeological Services has been involved in archaeological fieldwork in Ontario since 1974. In 1986 he completed his M.A at Trent University, producing a fieldwork-based thesis on the Late Palaeo-Indian occupation of the Keswick-Queensville area of southcentral Ontario. Gordon Dibb has been licensed by the Province of Ontario to conduct archaeology since 1978.

Since 1986 Dibb has been involved in archaeological field projects that have spanned the gauntlet of southern Ontario prehistory, ranging from Early Palaeo-Indian (10,500 ybp) to Historic EuroCanadian (mid-20th century) in scope. Prior to starting Y.N.AS. Dibb directed field projects (both independently funded and for institutions such as the Royal Ontario Museum, Trent University and the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority) that have included both survey and excavation related research.

Listed below are examples of a number of projects that Y.N.AS. has conducted over the past decade.

[1] HIGHWAY AND/OR BRIDGE ASSESSMENTS:

- County of Peterborough (County 2 Road)
- County of Peterborough and The Greer Galloway Group Inc. (Archaeological Potential Assessment of the Bridgenorth By-Pass)
- The Greer Galloway Group Inc. (The Parkway Widening Project)
- The Greer Galloway Group Inc. (4 Bridge Assessments between Geralton and Longlac) with Old and In the Way.
- The Greer Galloway Group Inc. (Orangeville By-Pass)
- The Greer Galloway Group Inc. (Highway 26, Simcoe County)
- The Greer Galloway Group Inc. (Vandorf Sideroad & St. John's Sideroad, R.M. York)
- The Greer Galloway Group Inc. (Bancroft/Crowe River Bridge Replacement)

[2] GRAVEL AND/OR CLAY PITs & STONE QUARRIES:

- Township of Mariposa (Oakwood Pit)
- Township of Percy (Chang Pit)
- Township of Smith-Ennismore (Lakefield Pit)
- CBM (Cannington Pit Assessment)
- Sargeant Aggregates Ltd. (Mitigation of 3 Archaeological Sites in Oro and Flos Townships) Cliff Varcoe Ltd. (Dalston and Oro Pits)
- James Dick Construction Ltd. (Caledon and Oro Quarry and Pit)
- Royel Paving Ltd. (Cameron Pit, Glamorgan Quarry)
- Floyd Preston Sand and Gravel (Bethesda Pit)
- Doughty Aggregates (Lakefield Pit, Preston Pit)
- Gerald Finlay Construction (Harwood Pit)
- Hart Pit (Richmond Township)
- Warren Paving Ltd. (Haldimand, Cramahe and Hope Townships)
- Warren Paving Ltd. (Proposed Kirkfield Expansion)
- 5 Wayside Pits for MTO in Victoria and Durham Counties
- Regis Resources (Vermiculite Quarry, Cavendish Township)
- Young Pit (Manvers Township)
- Lloyd Squire Pit (Oro Township)
- Lamb Quarry (Ramara Township)

[3] **PUBLIC INTEREST GROUPS**

- Lakefield Marsh Association
- Georgina Against Garbage (Assessment of Area Proposed for Potential Landfill)

[4] **ARCHAEOLOGICAL MASTER PLANS**

- East Gwillimbury (Prepared Historical Section and Directed Field Research)

[5] **SUBDIVISION ASSESSMENTS (PRIVATE SECTOR)**

- Cambrian Holdings (Baysville)
- Runnymede Development Corp. (6 Projects - Pickering)
- John Boddy Developments (Pickering)
- O'Shanter Development Co. (Pickering/Ajax)
- Claudex Inc. (Port Sydney)
- Bill Waterhouse Developments (Dorset)
- Metrus Development (Keswick)
- Northland Planning (Doe Lake, Muskoka and Garden Island, Lake Nipissing)
- C. Fortier (North Bay)
- Greenwood Bros. (Pittsburg)
- International Trillium (Gravenhurst)
- CN/CP (McTier)
- Bigwin Resort and Dev. Corp. (Bigwin Island)
- Tribute Homes (2 Projects, Ajax)
- Victorian Homes (Claremont)
- Cougs Investments (Ajax)
- J. Paxton (Ennismore and Uxbridge)
- G. Meharg (Tyrone)
- Aitcheson and Bolotenko (Oshawa)
- Ontario Independent Crematoriums (Bowmanville)
- Barry Bryan Associates (Brooklin)

[6] **MUNICIPAL WATERSYSTEM UPGRADES:**

- The Greer Galloway Group Inc.
  - Washburn Island
  - Bicroft
  - Grafton (nearing completion)
  - Carrying Place
  - Oshawa Zone 3 Reservoir
  - Clarington Reservoir
  - Wilberforce

[7] **PROVINCIAL AGENCIES:**

- Ministry of Government Services:
  - Darch Subdivision (Bowmanville)
  - OPP Station (Campbellford)
  - Phases 1-2 of Portage Place Subdivision (Peterborough)
  - MNR Site Clean-up (Peterborough)
January 11, 2008

Gordon Dibb
York North Archaeological Services
1264 Bathurst Street
Peterborough, ON K9H 6X8

Dear Gordon,

Re: Project Name/No. A Stage I-II archaeological/heritage assessment of a proposed aggregate quarry: located in part Lots 20 & 21, Concession A, Township of Osprey, Municipality of Grey Highlands (former County of Grey), Ontario

CIF/PIF P054-053

I have had the opportunity to review the information provided in your report of June 20, 2006 for the above noted project area. The report indicates that the property consists mainly of areas of moderate potential, with a small central area of high potential. No cultural heritage materials were discovered in any of the surveyed areas.

A thick forest was present covering approximately ¼ of the property. Assessment in this area was impossible due to the density of the vegetation. The un-surveyed area includes a small portion marked as high potential. The report recommends that the quarry development be allowed to go forward as a result of these investigations. The Ministry of Culture accepts this report and concurs with the recommendations of the consultant archaeologist, with the added condition that if the quarry operations are to include the area marked as “Dense pine tree plantation” (coloured red) on the report map “PLATE 2”, that an archaeologist should be brought in after the land is cleared of trees, but before other ground disturbance commences in order that the remainder of the property can be checked for archaeological materials, whether in context or not. Artifacts not found in context still have value, and these areas, if disturbed, must be examined as well.

Please note that concurrences and evaluations of low potential made by this Ministry do not remove the proponent’s obligations under the Ontario Heritage Act (R.S.O. 1990, c. O. 18) or the Cemeteries Act (R.S.O. 1990, c. C. 4). For this reason, two standard conditions will continue to apply to the approval of this application.

1. Should human remains be identified during operations, all work in the vicinity of the discovery will be suspended immediately. Notification will be made to the Ontario Provincial
Police, or local police, who will conduct a site investigation and contact the district coroner. Notification must also be made to this office and the Registrar of Cemeteries, Ministry of Government Services.

2. Should other cultural heritage values (archaeological or historical materials or features) be identified during operations, all activity in the vicinity of the recovery will be suspended and the Ministry of Culture archaeologist contacted. This condition provides for the potential for deeply buried or enigmatic local site areas not typically identified in evaluations of potential.

Please feel free to contact me regarding this project should you have any questions.

Yours,

Paige Campbell
Acting Archaeology Review Officer

cc Roshan Jussawalla, Archaeology Licensing Coordinator, MCL
    David S. White, Q.C.