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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) was retained by the Macaulay Shiomi Howson Ltd. to conduct a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment and Aboriginal Engagement Program for the Secondary Plan and Infrastructure Master Plans project for the annexed lands located in the City of Barrie, Ontario. The study area consists of two parcels of land comprised of approximately 2,293 hectares.

The East section of the study area is located to the east of Highway 400. It is bounded by Big Bay Point Road and Mapleview Drive East to the north, 20th Sideroad to the east, Lockhart Road to the south, and the former City boundary east of 10th Sideroad/Huronia Road on the west. Yonge Street, formerly Highway 11, runs north to south through the approximate centre of the East section of the study area, with the Barrie GO line generally following the east side of Yonge Street.

The West Section of the study area straddles Highway 400 with most of its lands located on the west side of the highway. The boundaries of the study area are as follows:

- North
  - Mid concession in the block bounded by Mapleview Drive to the north, 5th Sideroad/Veterans Drive to the east, Salem Road to the south and Simcoe County Road 27 to the west; and,
  - Salem/Lockhart Road between the 5th and 10th Sideroads;
- East
  - 10th Sideroad/Huronia Road
- South
  - Mid concession south of Mackay Road between 10th Sideroad/Huronia Road and Simcoe County Road 27
- West
  - Simcoe County Road 27

The Stage 1 archaeological assessment revealed that three archaeological sites, Cleary (BbGw-10), Paisley (BbGw-14) and McDonald (BcGv-11), had previously been registered within the limits of the study area and an additional 21 sites had been registered within one kilometre of its limits. Additionally, a review of the general physiography and local nineteenth century land use within the study area suggested that it exhibited archaeological site potential.
The field review determined that with the exception of wet areas, roads and other small areas which have been impacted by residential and commercial developments, the study area consisted of undisturbed agricultural fields and woodlots which exhibit archaeological site potential. Based on application of generic modelling criteria, approximately 60.8% of the study area exhibits archaeological potential.

An Aboriginal Engagement Program was also undertaken simultaneously whereby representatives of interested Aboriginal communities met with staff from the City of Barrie and ASI. Three separate meetings were held to disseminate information regarding the study and attendees had the opportunity to express their concerns and thoughts about the proposed plans within the study area. In light of these results, the following recommendations are made concerning the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment and the Aboriginal Engagement Program:

1. The Cleary site (BbGw-10), Paisley site (BbGw-14) and McDonald site (BcGv-11) are considered to be archaeological resources of high heritage value, in that each may provide significant insights into the pre-contact Aboriginal occupation of the area. It is therefore recommended that each site be subject to Stage 3 archaeological assessment in order to more fully identify the character, extent and significance of the archaeological deposits, in accordance with the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTCS 2011).

The Stage 3 test excavations should commence with a controlled surface collection to determine the precise extent of each site and to document any surface artifacts that may be present. This work will require that the site areas be ploughed and allowed to weather a least one substantial rainfall prior to commencing with this work.

At each of the sites, the controlled surface collection should be followed by the placement of multiple grids over all areas of artifact concentration indicating possible plough-disturbed middens. A series of one metre by one metre units should be excavated across these grids at five metre intervals. An equal number of additional test units should be placed and excavated across the remainder of the site, either in a systematic grid or in focused areas, to recover a sample of topsoil deposits (Standards and Guidelines Section 3.2.3, Table 3.1). The test units should be excavated five centimetres into the sterile subsoil and soil fills screened through 6 mm wire mesh to facilitate artifact recovery. The sterile subsoil should be troweled and all soil profiles examined for undisturbed cultural deposits.

Additional strategies as suggested in Section 3.3.2 of the Standards and Guidelines may also be employed for the Cleary (BbGw-10) and McDonald (BcGv-11) sites which are large in size. Test unit strategies outlined above may not be sufficient to accurately define their extent since there may often not be a close correspondence between the artifact scatter and the underlying settlement pattern surviving in the subsoil. To help define the extent of these large sites, the topsoil may be removed mechanically to excavate test trenches beyond the site limits established by the surface artifact scatter and positive test units. Trenches should be excavated as follows:

- Topsoil should be mechanically removed from trenches no more than 5 m in width with no more than 20 m intervals between trenches.
- Trenches should not be excavated where site limits are defined by physical constraints such as steep slopes and low wet areas.
- The trenches should be excavated inwards towards the site from a minimum of 20 m outside the limit of the previously mapped extent of artifacts.
The trenches should be excavated until cultural features are identified or until the excavations reach the limits of the previously mapped extent of artifacts. If cultural features are identified, excavating in towards the site should be stopped.

- Trenches must be sterile for a minimum of 20 m outwards from the outermost cultural feature encountered or from the limits of the previously mapped extent of artifacts. This will establish the limits of the 20 m buffer area where that may be required for avoidance and protection.
- Any cultural features uncovered in the trenches should not be excavated but the exposed plan of the feature should be recorded. Geotextile fabric should be placed over the unit floor and backfilled.

The results of the Stage 3 assessments will be used to evaluate the significance of the sites and to develop a series of recommendations concerning any further mitigative options that may be necessary. Aboriginal engagement at this phase is also required, specifically with the Huron-Wendat First Nation, given the cultural affiliation of the sites with ancestral Wendat population. It is recommended that engagement occur with Luc Lainé and Mme. Heather Bastien from the Huron-Wendat First Nation as well as their lawyer David Donnelly, Donnelly Law.

Please note that archaeological sites recommended for further archaeological field work or protection remain subject to Section 48(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act and may not be altered, nor may artifacts be removed from them, except by a person holding an archaeological license.

2. The Lougheed site (BbGw-13), most likely extends into the study area, and it is considered to be an archaeological resources of high heritage value, in that it may provide significant insights into the pre-contact Aboriginal occupation of the area. It is therefore recommended that the portion of the site within the study area should be subject to Stage 3 archaeological assessment in order to more fully identify the character, extent and significance of the archaeological deposits, in accordance with the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTCS 2011).

The Stage 3 test excavation should commence with a controlled surface collection to determine the precise extent of the site and to document any surface artifacts that may be present. This work will require that the site area be ploughed and allowed to weather a least one substantial rainfall prior to commencing with this work.

The controlled surface collection should be followed by the placement of multiple grids over all areas of artifact concentration indicating possible plough-disturbed middens. A series of one metre by one metre units should be excavated across these grids at five metre intervals. An equal number of additional test units should be placed and excavated across the remainder of the site, either in a systematic grid or in focused areas, to recover a sample of topsoil deposits (Standards and Guidelines Section 3.2.3, Table 3.1). The test units should be excavated five centimetres into the sterile subsoil and soil fills screened through 6 mm wire mesh to facilitate artifact recovery. The sterile subsoil should be troweled and all soil profiles examined for undisturbed cultural deposits.

The results of the Stage 3 assessment will be used to evaluate the significance of the site and to develop a series of recommendations concerning any further mitigative options that may be necessary. Aboriginal engagement at this phase is also required, specifically with the Huron-Wendat First Nation, given the cultural affiliation of the sites with ancestral Wendat population. It
is recommended that engagement occur with Luc Lainé and Mme. Heather Bastien from the Huron-Wendat First Nation as well as their lawyer David Donnelly, Donnelly Law.

Please note that archaeological sites recommended for further archaeological field work or protection remain subject to Section 48(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act and may not be altered, nor may artifacts be removed from them, except by a person holding an archaeological license.

3. Developments within the Secondary Plan area must be preceded by a Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment. Such assessments must be conducted in accordance with the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (2011). This work is required prior to any land disturbing activities in order to identify any archaeological remains that may be present.

It should be noted that the Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment of any proposed development (e.g., a draft plan of subdivision) must be carried out on all lands within that particular subject property, not simply those lands identified as exhibiting potential in this study.

4. Should any Aboriginal archaeological resource be identified in the course of future, more extensive archaeological assessments of the study area, meaningful engagement with those Aboriginal groups who have an active interest in these resources and their treatment should be conducted during subsequent phases of the project.

In addition the following conditions apply:

- This report is submitted to the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, RSO 1990, c 0.18. The report is reviewed to ensure that it complies with the standards and guidelines that are issued by the Minister, and that the archaeological field work and report recommendations ensure the conservation, preservation and protection 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, Culture and Sport, 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.

- 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 field work on the site, submitted a report to the Minister stating that the site has no further cultural heritage value or interest, and the report has been filed in the Ontario Public Register of Archaeology Reports referred to in Section 65.1 of the Ontario Heritage Act.

- Should previously undocumented archaeological resources be discovered, they may be a new archaeological site and therefore subject to Section 48 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act. The proponent or person discovering the archaeological resources must cease alteration of the site immediately and engage a licensed consultant archaeologist to carry out archaeological fieldwork, in compliance with sec. 48 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act.

remains must immediately notify the police or coroner and the Registrar of Cemeteries, Ministry of Consumer Services.

- The documentation related to this archaeological assessment will be curated by Archaeological Services Inc. until such a time that arrangements for their ultimate transfer to Her Majesty the Queen in right of Ontario, or other public institution, can be made to the satisfaction of the project owner(s), the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, and any other legitimate interest groups.

- 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.
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1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT

1.1 Development Context

Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) was retained by the Macaulay Shiomi Howson Ltd. to conduct a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment and Aboriginal Engagement Program for the Secondary Plan and Infrastructure Master Plans project for the annexed lands located in the City of Barrie, Ontario. The study area consists of two parcels of land comprised of approximately 2,293 hectares (Figure 1).

The East section of the study area is located to the east of Highway 400. It is bounded by Big Bay Point Road and Mapleview Drive East to the north, 20th Sideroad to the east, Lockhart Road to the south, and the former City boundary east of 10th Sideroad/Huronia Road on the west. Yonge Street, formerly Highway 11, runs north to south through the approximate centre of the East section of the study area, with the Barrie GO line generally following the east side of Yonge Street.

The West Section of the study area straddles Highway 400 with most of its lands located on the west side of the highway. The boundaries of the study area are as follows:

- **North**
  - Mid concession in the block bounded by Mapleview Drive to the north, 5th Sideroad/Veterans Drive to the east, Salem Road to the south and Simcoe County Road 27 to the west; and,
  - Salem/Lockhart Road between the 5th and 10th Sideroads;

- **East**
  - 10th Sideroad/Huronia Road

- **South**
  - Mid concession south of Mackay Road between 10th Sideroad/Huronia Road and Simcoe County Road 27

- **West**
  - Simcoe County Road 27

This assessment was conducted under the project management of Ms. Beverly Garner and Dr. Ronald Williamson and project direction of Ms. Debbie Steiss (MTCS PIF P049-623-2010 and P049-630-2011). All activities carried out during this assessment were completed in accordance with the terms of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists. This report on the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment and the Aboriginal Engagement Program has been prepared for submission to the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport for archaeological licensing purposes only.

Permission to carry out all activities necessary for the completion of the assessment was granted by Macaulay Shiomi Howson Ltd. in November, 2010.

1.2 Archaeological Context

A Stage 1 archaeological assessment involves research to describe the known and potential archaeological resources within the vicinity of a study area. The background research for such an assessment incorporates a review of previous archaeological research, physiography, and nineteenth and twentieth-century development for the study area. Background research was completed to identify any archaeological sites in the study area and to assess its archaeological potential.
In order that an inventory of archaeological resources could be compiled for the study area, three sources of information were consulted: site record forms for registered sites housed at the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS); published and unpublished documentary sources, and the files of Archaeological Services Inc.

In Ontario, information concerning archaeological sites is stored in the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database (O.A.S.D.), a database maintained by the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport. This database contains archaeological sites registered within the Borden system. Under the Borden system, Canada has been divided into grid blocks based on latitude and longitude. A Borden block is approximately 13 kilometres east to west, and approximately 18.5 kilometres north to south. Each Borden block is referenced by a four-letter designator, and sites within a block are numbered sequentially as they are found. The study area is located in Borden Blocks BbGw, BcGv and BcGw.

A total of 21 sites had been registered within a one kilometre radius of the study area. An additional three sites exist within the study area. The information available about all of the sites has been summarized in Table 1. The cultural/temporal categories of Southern Ontario are outlined in Table 2.

Table 1: Registered Archaeological Sites within the Study Area and within One Kilometre of the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borden</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Cultural/Temporal Affiliation</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Proximity to Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BbGw-6</td>
<td>IF 1</td>
<td>Undetermined Pre-contact</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>G. Warrick</td>
<td>Within one km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BbGw-7</td>
<td>IF 2</td>
<td>Undetermined Pre-contact</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>G. Warrick</td>
<td>Within 300 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BbGw-9</td>
<td>Hubbert</td>
<td>Ancestral Huron-Wendat</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>J. Hunter</td>
<td>Within 300 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G. Warrick</td>
<td>1976; G. Warrick; ASI*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BbGw-10</td>
<td>Cleary</td>
<td>Ancestral Huron-Wendat</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>A. Hunter</td>
<td>Within study area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1890s; OAS**</td>
<td>1963; G. W. Warrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BbGw-14</td>
<td>Paisley</td>
<td>Ancestral Huron-Wendat</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>G. Warrick</td>
<td>Within study area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BbGw-15</td>
<td>Veterans Drive</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
<td>ASI</td>
<td>Within 300 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BbGw-19</td>
<td>Sun Valley</td>
<td>Mid-to-Late Archaic</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>ASI</td>
<td>Within 300 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BbGw-20</td>
<td>Zachary</td>
<td>Ancestral Huron-Wendat</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>ASI</td>
<td>Within one km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BbGw-22</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Homestead, Church</td>
<td>MPA**** 1991; ASI 1992, 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BbGw-23</td>
<td>Talls Trees</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
<td>MPA</td>
<td>Within one km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BbGw-29</td>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Late Archaic</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>R. Sutton</td>
<td>Within 300 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BcGv-4</td>
<td>McBride</td>
<td>Ancestral Huron-Wendat</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>J. Hunter</td>
<td>Within one km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BcGv-6</td>
<td>MNR Innisfil</td>
<td>Ancestral Huron-Wendat</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>J. Hunter</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within one km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BcGv-11</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Ancestral Huron-Wendat</td>
<td>Village, burial</td>
<td>Ian Clark 50; J. Warnica 1963; J. Hunter 1977; G. W. Warrick 1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BcGv-15</td>
<td>Fennell</td>
<td>Ancestral Huron-Wendat</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>J. Marsh</td>
<td>Within 300 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BcGv-20</td>
<td>Heritage Glen</td>
<td>Ancestral Huron-Wendat</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>D. Poulton</td>
<td>Within 300 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BcGv-21</td>
<td>Little Heritage Glen</td>
<td>Mid-to-Late Iroquoian</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>D. Poulton</td>
<td>Within one km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within one km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within one km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within one km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BcGv-26</td>
<td>Quantz</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
<td>D. Poulton</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BcGv-29</td>
<td>Innis-Shore 1</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
<td>P. Woodley</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within one km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Outline of Southern Ontario Prehistory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Archaeological Material Culture</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Lifeways/Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PALEO-INDIAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Gainey, Barnes, Crowfield</td>
<td>9000 - 8500 BC</td>
<td>Big game hunters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Holcombe, Hi-Lo, lanceolate</td>
<td>8500 - 7500 BC</td>
<td>Small nomadic groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHAIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Nettling, Bifurcate-base</td>
<td>7800 - 6000 BC</td>
<td>Nomadic hunters and gatherers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Kirk, Stanly, Brewerton, Laurentian</td>
<td>6000 - 2000 BC</td>
<td>Transition to territorial settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Lamoka, Genesee, Crawford Knoll, Innes</td>
<td>2500 - 500 BC</td>
<td>Polished/ground stone tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(small stemmed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Meadowood</td>
<td>800 - 400 BC</td>
<td>Introduction of pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Point Peninsula, Saugeen</td>
<td>400 BC - AD 800</td>
<td>Incipient horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Algonkian, Iroquoian</td>
<td>AD 800 - 1300</td>
<td>Transition to village life and agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Algonkian, Iroquoian</td>
<td>AD 1300 - 1400</td>
<td>Establishment of large palisade villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Algonkian, Iroquoian</td>
<td>AD 1400 - 1600</td>
<td>Tribal differentiation and warfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Huron, Neutral, Petun, Odawa, Ojibwa</td>
<td>AD 1600 - 1650</td>
<td>Tribal displacements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Six Nations Iroquois, Ojibwa</td>
<td>AD 1650 - 1800’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euro/Canadian</td>
<td>AD 1800 - present</td>
<td>European settlement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three sites located within the limits of the study area are the Cleary site (BbGw-10), the Paisley site (BbGw-14) and the McDonald site (BcGv-11).

**Cleary Site (BbGw-10)**

The Cleary site (BbGw-10) is a 4.6 hectare ancestral Huron-Wendet village located on the south half of Lot 7, Concession 10 in the former Innisfil Township. Originally recorded by Andrew Hunter in the 1890s, the site has been subject to a series of investigations including two excavations by the Ontario Archaeological Society (OAS) in 1963 and 1964. Additional artifacts were recovered by an unknown collector in the early 1980s. In 1985, Dr. Gary Warrick undertook extensive investigations at the site involving surface collections and test pitting to determine the locations of middens. In total, 1,051 artifacts were recovered from the surface and 18 middens identified dating to the Late Iroquoian period, *circa* A.D. 1420 to 1450 (Warrick 1988:49-54).

**Paisley Site (BbGw-14)**

The Paisley site (BbGw-14) was registered by Dr. Garry Warrick in 1986 and is located on the south half of Lot 8, Concession 7 in the former Innisfil Township. Warrick undertook an extensive surface collection over an area of one hectare and collected 540 artifacts dating to the Late Iroquoian ancestral Huron-Wendet period, *circa* A.D. 1480 to 1500. Warrick thought that given that the site is located approximately 800 metres northeast of the Cleary site (BbGw-10), it was probable that it was established on the outskirts of the earlier occupation taking advantage of remnant resources such as trees to construct the new village (Warrick 1988:64-70). Alternatively, as the corn field system of Paisley may have extended beyond 800 m in all directions, such a suggestion could only be confirmed through excavation and settlement modelling.

**McDonald Site (BcGv-11)**

First noted by Andrew Hunter towards the end of the nineteenth century, the McDonald site (BcGv-11) is located on Lot 20, Concessions 11 and 12 in the former Innisfil Township. The site was investigated by means of surface collection and test pitting between the 1950s to 1970s by John K. Warnica and James Hunter (J. Hunter 1978). Warrick further investigated the site in 1986 and based on the surface scatter, the
site was estimated to be 3.4 hectares with a probable 19 middens. Artifacts recovered suggest that the site was a Late Iroquoian ancestral Huron-Wendat occupation, dating to circa A.D. 1430 to 1480 (Warrick 1988:39-44). The O.A.S.D. records also suggest possible burials at the site.

There are an additional 11 sites located within 300 metres of the study area including five ancestral Huron-Wendat villages: Lougheed site (BbGw-13), Hubbert site (BbGw-9), MNR Innisfil site (BcGv-6), Fennell site (BcGv-15) and Heritage Glen site (BcGv-20), one campsite: Zachary site (BbGw-20), three pre-contact findspots: IF 2 site (BbGw-7), Sun Valley site (BbGw-19) and Timothy site (BbGw-29) and two Euro-Canadian homesteads: Veterans Drive site (BbGw-15) and Quantz site (BcGv-26). An excavated portion of the Lougheed site (BbGw-13) is located within 50 m of the study area.

**Lougheed Site (BbGw-13)**

The Lougheed site (BbGw-13) was also researched by Warrick in 1985 and 1986 when two intensive surface collections were undertaken. During the course of the survey, human remains belonging to an adult and an infant attributed to a “plough-disturbed grave in an extra-village cemetery” (Warrick 1988:58) were also found. Dating to circa A.D. 1450 to 1500, this Iroquoian ancestral Huron-Wendat village is approximately 0.6 ha in size and consists of three middens (Warrick 1988:58-64). In 1996, the northern portion of the site was subject to additional Stage 2 by Ontario Archaeological Consulting Services and Stage 4 salvage excavation by Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. (ARA 2003). During the salvage excavation, three longhouses and portions of three other longhouses and palisade were discovered. Human remains mixed with modern animal remains were also recovered. Given that the site was only partially excavated and that it is located immediately north of the current study area, the southern portion of the site extends into the study area.

The study area is a largely rural landscape that appears to have undergone minimal construction and development impacts. A field review of the study area was carried out in order to confirm the assessment of Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian archaeological site potential observed from the visual inspection of maps and aerial photos. The field review also attempted to determine the degree to which construction and development and landscape alteration may have affected that potential and the integrity of the rural landscape. The field review was conducted on April 20, 2011 by Mr. Martin Cooper and Ms. Zeeshan Abedin (R355). The weather was overcast with rain and visibility was excellent.

### 1.2.1 Physiography and Assessment of Pre-contact Context

The majority of the study area is within the Peterborough Drumlin Field physiographic region of southern Ontario (Chapman and Putnam 1984:169-172). Lying between the Oak Ridges Moraine and the area of shallow overburden on the limestones of the Gull River Formation there is a rolling till plain with an area of about 1,750 square miles, which contains approximately 3,000 distinct drumlins in addition to many other drumlinoid hills and surface flutings of the till sheet. A small portion of the eastern parcel of the study area is situated within the Simcoe Lowlands physiographic region of southern Ontario (Chapman and Putnam 1984:177-181). Simcoe lowlands refer to the lowlands bordering Georgian Bay and Lake Simcoe. Together they cover an area of about 1,100 square miles. Various types of sandy loam soils are present within the study area.

Potable water is the single most important resource necessary for any extended human occupation or settlement. Since water sources have remained relatively stable in south-central Ontario after the Pleistocene era, proximity to water can be regarded as a useful index for the evaluation of archaeological site potential. Indeed, distance from water has been one of the most commonly used variables for
predictive modeling of site location. Peoples would have been attracted to the creeks and waters especially during the spring, by the abundance of fish, as well as by other important aquatic resources.

The MTCS’s *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (2011:17) stipulates that primary water sources (lakes, rivers, streams, creeks, etc.), secondary water sources (intermittent streams and creeks, springs, marshes, swamps, etc.), ancient water sources (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, etc.), as well as accessible or inaccessible shorelines (high bluffs, swamp or marsh fields by the edge of a lake, sandbars stretching into marsh, etc.) are characteristics that indicate archaeological potential. Water sources present within the study area include tributaries of Bear Creek, Lovers Creek and its associated tributaries, several unnamed creeks flowing into Lake Simcoe, various springs and marshes. Areas within 300 m of these water sources are deemed to have archaeological potential. According to the Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority (NVCA), much of the study area is also within the Lake Simcoe watershed (NVCA 2011).

Other geographic characteristics that can indicate archaeological potential include: 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. Resource areas are also considered to be characteristics that indicate archaeological potential (MTCS 2011:17-18).

Therefore, due to the presence of water sources as well as topographic features conducive to site location, it may be concluded that there is potential for the recovery of pre-contact archaeological remains within the study area depending on the degree of previous land disturbance (Figure 2).

### 1.2.2 Assessment of Historic Archaeological Potential: Summary Review of Historical Mapping

The study area is located within the former Township of Innisfil, Simcoe County and comprises Lots 1 to 10, Concessions 9 and 10, Lots 1 to 5, 12 to 20, Concession 11, and Lots 19 and 20, Concession 12. Simcoe County, known as the “Cradle of Ontario History” (Mika and Mika, 1983:394), was named after Colonel John Graves Simcoe, the first Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada. Originally established as part of the Home District in 1798, Simcoe became a separate District in 1843 and a County in 1850 (Mika and Mika, 1983:394).

Innisfil Township was named after the word “Innisfail” meaning Ireland and it was surveyed from February 1 to March 15, 1820 by Richard Birdsall (Mika and Mika 1981:347; A. Hunter 1909:41-42). As the contractor for the survey, James Pearson held the patent and received 3,800 acres as his payment (A. Hunter 1909:42). Soon the Township began to be settled with the majority of the immigrants coming from Scotland and Ireland (A. Hunter 1909:63-65).

Essa Road and Yonge Street were two of the earliest and most influential colonization roads in Upper Canada with Yonge Street running from Toronto all the way to Penetanguishene (Figures 3 and 4). The portion of Yonge Street in Innisfil was constructed in the 1820s through an effort made by local settlers, officially opening in 1827 (A. Hunter 1909:86-87).

The 1881 *Simcoe Supplement in Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada* which is the earliest general map that provides detailed representations of nineteenth-century settlement features in Simcoe County was reviewed to determine the potential for the presence of historic archaeological remains on the subject.
property (Figure 5). Table 3 presents lists of property owners and historical features illustrated within the study area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conc.</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Owner(s)/Tenant(s)</th>
<th>Historic Feature(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>S. R. Mannear</td>
<td>Steam saw mill; section of the Hamilton and North Western Railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>S. R. Mannear</td>
<td>Steam saw mill; section of the Hamilton and North Western Railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>William T. Hunter</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>James Simpson</td>
<td>Part of Essa Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>William Armstrong</td>
<td>Homestead; part of Essa Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>David J. Terry</td>
<td>One homestead, one watercourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>William Summers</td>
<td>One homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Thomas D. Minnikin &amp; Hugh Gillespie</td>
<td>Two homesteads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>One watercourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>One watercourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Aaron Bowman &amp; Samuel Reynolds</td>
<td>Three homesteads; one watercourse; section of the Hamilton and North Western Railway; Vine Post Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Two watercourses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>George Brooks</td>
<td>One watercourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Robert M. Srigley</td>
<td>One watercourse; part of Essa Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Thomas Laugheed</td>
<td>One homestead; one watercourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Frederick Quantz</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>John Collins</td>
<td>One homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Peter Wice &amp; W. J. Coulter</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>W. J. Coulter, ---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Northern Railway; church and cemetery; school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It should be noted that not all features of interest were mapped systematically in the 1881 Atlas, given that they were financed by subscription, and subscribers were given preference with regard to the level of detail provided on the maps. Moreover, not every feature of interest would have been within the scope of this atlas. Nevertheless, for the Euro-Canadian period, the majority of early nineteenth century farmsteads (i.e., those which are arguably the most potentially significant resources and whose locations are rarely recorded on nineteenth century maps) are likely to be captured by the basic proximity to the water model outlined above, since these occupations were subject to similar environmental constraints. The 1881 Atlas indicates at least 13 homesteads within the study area, as well as one church, a school house and a steam saw mill.

An added factor, however, is the development of the network of concession roads through the course of the nineteenth century. Accordingly, undisturbed lands within 100 m of the early settlement roads may also be considered to have potential for the presence of Euro-Canadian archaeological sites, including the north-south roadways extending through the study area (Essa Road, Country Road 27, Veterans Drive, Huronia Road, Yonge Street and Sideroad 20) as well as the east-west concession roadways (10th Line, Salem Road/Lockhart Road, Mapleview Drive East/West and Big Bay Point Road). In particular, 10th Line would have serviced the Vine Post Office and the settlements of Stroud and Craigvale, located just east and south of the study area. Mapleview Drive East, Big Bay Point Road and Yonge Street would have serviced the settlement of Painswick located north of the study area, and the settlement of Holly, located north of the study area, would have been serviced by Mapleview Drive West and Essa Road.

The MTCS’s Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (2011:18) stipulates that areas within 300 m of early Euro-Canadian settlement (pioneer homesteads, isolated cabins, farmstead complexes), early wharf or dock complexes, pioneer churches and early cemeteries, are considered to have archaeological potential. There may be commemorative markers of their history, such as local, provincial, or federal monuments or heritage parks. Early historical transportation routes (trails, passes, roads, railways, portage routes), properties listed on a municipal register or designated under the Ontario Heritage Act or a federal, provincial, or municipal historic landmark or site, and properties that local histories or informants have identified with possible archaeological sites, historical events, activities, or occupations are also considered to have archaeological potential.

Thus, based on the presence of historical features, transportation routes and water sources within the study area, as well as the proximity to settlement centres of Holly, Stroud, Craigvale and Painswick, there is potential for the identification of historical archaeological remains within the study area (Figure 6).

2.0 FIELD METHODS

2.1 Field Review

A field review of the study area was carried out in order to confirm the assessment of Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian archaeological site potential observed from the visual inspection of maps and aerial photos. The field review also attempted to determine the degree to which construction and development and landscape alteration may have affected that potential and the integrity of the rural landscape.

The study area is bisected by large arterial roads that link urban commercial and residential developments within the City of Barrie. These include Essa Road, Huronia Road, Yonge Street, County Road 27, and Sideroad 20 (Figure 7; Plates 1 to 2). These roads have been in use since the area was settled in the nineteenth century but have since undergone massive improvements involving extensive grading and the
construction of asphalt shoulders and culverts. Thus the original soil below the roads and immediately adjacent to it (shoulders) have been either removed or heavily disturbed and therefore, they have little to no archaeological potential. The smaller thoroughfares such as Salem Road have also undergone improvements, but to a lesser degree (Figure 7; Plate 3). The construction of Highway 400 would have also disturbed lands adjacent to it and thus they would retain no archaeological potential (Figure 7; Plate 4). Similarly, the lands below and immediately adjacent to the railway are also without archaeological potential (Figure 7; Plate 5).

Several small pockets of land have been impacted by residential and commercial developments. These developments have been built using modern construction techniques (deep excavation, extensive earth moving, concrete pads, subsurface utility lines) and these areas will have no potential for archaeological resources (Figure 7; Plates 6 to 11). Other areas associated with commercial activity such as quarries and a golf course that exists in the western parcel are also without archaeological potential (Figure 7; Plates 12 to 16).

The field survey confirmed that the majority of the study area is rural and appears to be largely undisturbed and therefore has potential for archaeological resources. This includes historic farm lots that, in spite of the likely disturbance to the soil immediately beneath the houses and farm buildings, still have potential for the presence of archaeological resources beyond the building footprints (Figure 7; Plates 17 to 28). The balance of the greenspace/agricultural lands do not exhibit indications of previous alteration or disturbance and have potential for archaeological resources (Figure 7; Plates 29 to 39).

A significant feature of the study area is that much of it is within the Lake Simcoe watershed. Several rivers and creeks that drain into Lake Simcoe traverse the study area. The tablelands and terraces adjacent to these have particularly high potential for the presence of archaeological resources (Figure 7; Plates 40 to 42).

In addition, the field review also inspected the current conditions of the Cleary site (BbGw-10) and the McDonald site (BcGv-11). It appears that both of the sites are intact as they appear to have not been subject to disturbance, other than typical agricultural practices, since Warrick’s survey in the 1980s (Figure 7; Plates 43 to 44). It was not possible to assess the current condition of the Paisley site (BbGw-14) as it was not visible from the road and we did not have permission to enter the property.

2.2 Summary of Archaeological Potential

Figure 8 provides a summary of the general distribution of lands exhibiting archaeological potential. These potential zones have been defined on the basis of standard Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport criteria (e.g., distance from water and other landscape features, soils, degree of slope), the locations of nineteenth-century features as plotted in the 1881 historical map, existing conditions and a general evaluation of landscape integrity. This “composite” zone of archaeological potential for the presence of pre-contact and Euro-Canadian archaeological resources covers approximately 60.8% of the study area.

3.0 ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT

An important component of any future archaeological assessment, planning and mitigation program for the secondary plan area is the development of an adequate Aboriginal engagement process in relation to the Aboriginal archaeological resources that may be present.
It is often assumed that the Aboriginal community that is geographically closest to the project is the most suitable group with whom to consult, particularly when the issues at stake are those of archaeological resources and human remains. However, the complex histories of the Aboriginal people of southern Ontario, both before and after European contact and settlement, means that such assumptions can be simplistic and detrimental to the success of the entire engagement process. This can be complicated by the fact that many archaeological sites are of such antiquity, or may yield such sparse material remains (in terms of representing culturally of “ethnically” diagnostic material), that no conclusive identification of affiliation to modern communities is possible. The same may or may not be true of any sites discovered as a result of future Stage 2 assessments that are undertaken as part of the secondary planning process and subsequent development.

Under circumstances of this sort there should be an effort to identify all groups that are appropriate (on cultural-historical grounds) to act as the designated descendants of those who occupied the project area in the past, and who are willing to participate and ensure that cultural heritage remains are treated in an appropriate and seemly manner. This identification process is best achieved through discussions with a variety of communities in order that they may arrive at the final decision. It should also be noted that the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport has issued (and posted on-line) *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* in 2011 which includes a Unit that requires Aboriginal engagement prior to Stages 3 and 4 archaeological investigations on Aboriginal sites and recommends engagement before Stages 1 and 2. A draft technical document entitled *Engaging Aboriginal Communities in Archaeology* has also been issued (MTCS 2010). As the *Standards and Guidelines* have been finalized, engagement is now expected by Aboriginal communities.

Aboriginal discussion and engagement with regard to archaeological site mitigation strategies in similar planning contexts may be used to provide a general understanding of preferred Stage 4 mitigation priorities and actions. The following should not be taken as guidelines for site investigation until they are approved by the relevant Aboriginal communities in an engagement program. While there are different levels of concern for sites of various time periods and types, it should be noted that in all cases there is a presumption in favour of avoidance and preservation of any Aboriginal site that has not been disturbed by ploughing or other modern land uses. Any such site should be deemed to be of high heritage value. An additional complicating factor is that many sites may represent occupations of more than one general time period. The existence of such different components on a single site may or may not be apparent upon conclusion of a Stage 3 assessment. In such cases, the most conservative mitigative option should be preferred.

The logic underlying this discussion is that archaeological sites of heritage value are comparable to at least significant natural resource features, such as wetlands, in that they are scarce, fragile, and non renewable. They must therefore be managed in a similar manner and allowances for their existence and long term conservation must be made as early as is possible in the development planning process.

**Paleo-Indian** and **Early Archaic** sites, which on the basis of Stage 3 assessment are found to be more than a single isolated find, are deemed to be of high heritage value. Large sites of this period, e.g., tool stone acquisition sites and large base camps used on multiple occasions, or specialized sites such as caches or burials should be protected. Caches and burials *may* be identified on the basis of Stage 3 assessment through the recovery of a suite of diagnostic/unalusual artifacts. Smaller transitory camps or apparently single-occasion chert reduction events are also of high heritage value, but may be subject to salvage excavation, provided that the appropriate methodological approaches for such sites are applied (see MTCS Archaeological Fieldwork *Standards and Guidelines*).
Middle Archaic and Late Archaic sites, which on the basis of Stage 3 assessment are found to be more than a single isolated find, are deemed to be of high heritage value. Large sites of this period, e.g., tool stone acquisition sites and large base camps used on multiple occasions, or specialized sites such as caches, isolated burials, or cemeteries (which appear during the Late and Terminal Archaic) are of high value and should be protected. Caches, burials and cemeteries may be identified on the basis of Stage 3 assessment through the recovery of a suite of diagnostic/unusual artifacts. Sites that exhibit an unusual degree of preservation of organic materials are also of heightened value. Smaller transitory camps or apparently single-occasion chert reduction events are also of high heritage value, but may be subject to salvage excavation, provided that the appropriate methodological approaches for block excavation of such sites are applied (see MTCS Archaeological Fieldwork Standards and Guidelines).

It should be noted that many lithic sites that produce debitage, but lack formal diagnostic tools are assumed to be of generalized Archaic origin. Such sites may be of almost any size, although larger sites will be more likely to produce at least some formal tools that can be more specifically dated. Small lithic sites that cannot be ascribed a more specific date are generally regarded as having lower heritage value, at least in terms of their information potential, and are often not subject to any form of Stage 4 mitigation. Should such a site exhibit other unusual or unique attributes, however, preservation and/or salvage excavation would be required.

Early Woodland, Middle Woodland and Transitional Woodland sites, which on the basis of Stage 3 assessment are found to be more than a single isolated find, are deemed to be of high heritage value. Large sites of this period, e.g., tool stone acquisition sites and large base camps used on multiple occasions, or specialized sites such as caches, isolated burials or cemeteries should be protected. Caches, burials and cemeteries may be identified on the basis of Stage 3 assessment through the recovery of a suite of diagnostic/unusual artifacts. Sites that exhibit an unusual degree of preservation of organic materials are also of heightened value. Smaller transitory camps or locales marked by an apparently single chert reduction event or the breakage and discard of ceramic artifacts are also of high heritage value, but may be subject to salvage excavation, provided that the appropriate methodological approaches for block excavation (and potentially topsoil stripping) of such sites are applied (see MTCS Archaeological Fieldwork Standards and Guidelines).

Large Late Woodland and Contact period Aboriginal villages are deemed to be of high heritage value. Such sites should be protected. It is preferable that such sites be preserved through full avoidance, or a combination of avoidance and salvage excavation. There is a presumption that Late Woodland period settlements, in particular villages, exhibit a heightened potential for human burials. This can rarely be predicted on the basis of any Stage 3 assessment, but should be considered in determining an appropriate Stage 4 strategy, whereby avoidance is the preferred option where feasible. Should such a site be subject to salvage excavation, the appropriate methodological approaches for block excavation and topsoil stripping must be applied (see MTCS Archaeological Fieldwork Standards and Guidelines). Should one or more human burials be encountered during a Stage 4 salvage excavation, the disposition of the remains (preservation and avoidance versus exhumation and reburial elsewhere) must be negotiated between all relevant stakeholders.

Smaller Late Woodland and Contact period Aboriginal camps, cabins/hamlets and specialized resource extraction sites are deemed to be of high heritage value, depending on their size and characteristics. It is preferable that the larger sites be preserved through full avoidance or a combination of avoidance and salvage excavation provided that the appropriate methodological approaches for block excavation and topsoil stripping of such sites are applied (see MTCS Archaeological Fieldwork Standards and Guidelines). Smaller camps that evidently were only briefly occupied or marked by a limited range of activities are also of high heritage value, but may be subject to salvage excavation, provided that the
appropriate methodological approaches for block excavation (and potentially topsoil stripping) of such sites are applied (see MTCS Archaeological Fieldwork Standards and Guidelines). There is potential that some Late Woodland period sites provisionally identified as “camps” or “cabins” may have served as specialized burial sites. This can rarely be predicted on the basis of any Stage 3 assessment, but should be considered in determining an appropriate Stage 4 strategy.

Late Woodland and post-contact period Aboriginal ossuaries or cemeteries are deemed to be of high heritage value, and should under all possible circumstances be protected through avoidance. It must be acknowledged that the detection of cemeteries and/or ossuaries during Stage 2 archaeological assessment is virtually impossible. Moreover, it is difficult to predict the location of such features in more than a general manner. This is partially a reflection of the available data, although the data that do exist have not been rigorously examined by archaeologists in either the academic or cultural resource management context. Many of the cemeteries and ossuaries known to archaeologists were first discovered as a result of land clearance in the nineteenth century. The locations of these sites may or may not be well-documented. Modern discoveries of such sites are generally accidental results of large scale earth-moving or other construction activities. Upon discovery of such burial features during the course of construction some remedial documentation and excavation may be required, but avoidance and preservation through project redesign/revision should be the ultimate preferred alternative.

In areas where ossuary burial was not a traditional practice, or was only one of several contemporary practices, Late Woodland and Contact period Aboriginal cemeteries may be detected during Stage 3 assessment by the recovery of human bone and/or a suite of diagnostic/unalusual artifacts.

Upon confirmation that a Late Woodland or Contact period Aboriginal site served as a cemetery, preservation through avoidance through project redesign/revision should be the ultimate preferred alternative.

3.1 Aboriginal Engagement Program

An Aboriginal Engagement Program was designed and carried out for the Barrie Secondary Plan and Infrastructure Master Plans project.

3.1.1 Determining Interested Aboriginal Communities

The Ontario Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs (MAA) and Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) were contacted on January 26, 2011 regarding which Aboriginal groups should be engaged for this project. An email reply was received from INAC on January 27, 2011 suggesting the use of their website to determine who to engage. Based on our previous experience, the following Aboriginal groups were chosen to be engaged:

- Huron-Wendat First Nation
- Beausoleil First Nation (Christian Island)
- Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation
- Chippewas of Mnjikaning (Rama) First Nation
- Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO)
- Barrie Native Friendship Centre
On May 2, 2011, a letter reply was received from MAA suggesting that the following groups should be contacted:

- Beausoleil First Nation (Christian Island)
- Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation
- Chippewas of Mnjikaning (Rama) First Nation
- Georgian Bay Métis Council and the Métis Nation of Ontario

This letter confirmed that the Engagement Program was appropriately designed as it included all of the Aboriginal communities suggested by MAA. Additionally, the letter indicated that other communities may also have an interest in the project.

### 3.1.2 Initial Notification Letter

Initial notification letters were sent to the appropriate contacts at the Aboriginal communities by Mr. Eric Hodgins, Growth Management Coordinator at the City of Barrie in March, 2011. The letter provided an introduction and a summary of the project and invited the Aboriginal communities to start-up meetings in April, 2011.

### 3.1.3 Direct Contact and Engagement

Two separate start-up meetings were organized in April, 2011. The first meeting was held on April 7, 2011 with Beausoleil First Nation, Georgina Island First Nation and Mnjikaning (Rama) First Nation. Follow-up phone calls and emails were made with the invitees to confirm their attendance at the meetings. Although a representative of Beausoleil First Nation and Mnjikaning (Rama) First Nation was confirmed to attend, this meeting was attended by a representative of Georgina Island First Nation only. Draft minutes of this meeting were distributed to all attendees for their review on May 30, 2011. The final minutes were distributed on June 21, 2011 to all attendees and invitees.

The second meeting was held on April 20, 2011 with the Barrie Native Friendship Centre, Huron-Wendat First Nation and the Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO). Follow-up phone calls and emails were made to confirm attendance at this meeting and it was attended by a representative of Huron Wendat First Nation. Draft minutes of this meeting were distributed to all attendees for their review on May 30, 2011. The final minutes were distributed on June 21, 2011 to all attendees.

Representatives of the MNO were unable to attend the meeting on April 20, 2011 and per their request, a third meeting was held on May 16, 2011. Follow-up phone calls and emails were made to confirm attendance at this meeting and it was attended by two representatives of the MNO. Draft minutes of this meeting were distributed to all attendees for their review on June 8, 2011. The final minutes were distributed on June 21, 2011 to all attendees.

### 3.1.4 Result of the Engagement Program

The Aboriginal Engagement Program was designed to inform the relevant Aboriginal communities about the project and to listen to their thoughts and concerns about it. It was apparent that all Aboriginal community representatives who attended the meetings were interested in the natural and cultural heritage planning issues related to the project.
In summary, the representative of Georgina Island First Nation was interested in the effect of future developments within the study area on wildlife and the need to educate the general public about the effect their activities have on wildlife. It was also mentioned that while it is understood that not all archaeological sites can be protected, Aboriginal people are most concerned about burials and the need to protect the remains of their ancestors.

The representative of the Huron Wendat First Nation specifically requested that the archaeology policies of the Barrie Official Plan should mirror the policies of the City of Vaughan’s Official Plan. The latter Official Plan has specific policies related to significant archaeological sites including one that directs that ancestral Huron-Wendat villages will be removed from developable lands.

The two representatives of the Métis Nation of Ontario were interested in the effect of the future developments on birds and other animals and the environment in general. The City of Barrie has one of the largest Métis populations in Ontario and suggested that the City should contact the local Métis leaders to discuss this project. MNO representatives indicated that they would work with City staff to arrange a meeting after their Annual General Assembly takes place in late August, 2011.

The engagement program generated discussions amongst the City staff and Aboriginal representatives and it would appear that a meaningful relationship has been established for any future issues that may arise.

4.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) was retained by the Macaulay Shiomi Howson Ltd. to conduct a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment and Aboriginal Engagement Program for the Secondary Plan and Infrastructure Master Plans project for the annexed lands located in the City of Barrie, Ontario. The study area consists of two parcels of land comprised of approximately 2,293 hectares.

The East section of the study area is located to the east of Highway 400. It is bounded by Big Bay Point Road and Mapleview Drive East to the north, 20th Sideroad to the east, Lockhart Road to the south, and the former City boundary east of 10th Sideroad/Huronia Road on the west. Yonge Street, formerly Highway 11, runs north to south through the approximate centre of the East section of the study area, with the Barrie GO line generally following the east side of Yonge Street.

The West Section of the study area straddles Highway 400 with most of its lands located on the west side of the highway. The boundaries of the study area are as follows:

- **North**
  - Mid concession in the block bounded by Mapleview Drive to the north, 5th Sideroad/Veterans Drive to the east, Salem Road to the south and Simcoe County Road 27 to the west; and,
  - Salem/Lockhart Road between the 5th and 10th Sideroads;
- **East**
  - 10th Sideroad/Huronia Road
- **South**
  - Mid concession south of Mackay Road between 10th Sideroad/Huronia Road and Simcoe County Road 27
- **West**
  - Simcoe County Road 27
The Stage 1 archaeological assessment revealed that three archaeological sites, Cleary (BbGw-10), Paisley (BbGw-14) and McDonald (BcGv-11), had previously been registered within the limits of the study area and an additional 21 sites had been registered within one kilometre of its limits. Additionally, a review of the general physiography and local nineteenth century land use within the study area suggested that it exhibited archaeological site potential.

The field review determined that with the exception of wet areas, roads and other small areas that have been impacted by residential and commercial developments, the study area consisted of undisturbed agricultural fields and woodlots which exhibit archaeological site potential. Based on application of generic modelling criteria, approximately 60.8% of the study area exhibits archaeological potential.

An Aboriginal Engagement Program was also undertaken simultaneously whereby representatives of interested Aboriginal communities met with staff from the City of Barrie and ASI. Three separate meetings were held to disseminate information regarding the study and attendees had the opportunity to express their concerns and thoughts about the proposed plans within the study area.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the results, the following recommendations are made concerning the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment and the Aboriginal Engagement Program:

1. The Cleary site (BbGw-10), Paisley site (BbGw-14) and McDonald site (BcGv-11) are considered to be archaeological resources of high heritage value, in that each may provide significant insights into the pre-contact Aboriginal occupation of the area. It is therefore recommended that each site be subject to Stage 3 archaeological assessment in order to more fully identify the character, extent and significance of the archaeological deposits, in accordance with the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (MTCS 2011).

   The Stage 3 test excavations should commence with a controlled surface collection to determine the precise extent of each site and to document any surface artifacts that may be present. This work will require that the site areas be ploughed and allowed to weather at least one substantial rainfall prior to commencing with this work.

   At each of the sites, the controlled surface collection should be followed by the placement of multiple grids over all areas of artifact concentration indicating possible plough-disturbed middens. A series of one metre by one metre units should be excavated across these grids at five metre intervals. An equal number of additional test units should be placed and excavated across the remainder of the site, either in a systematic grid or in focused areas, to recover a sample of topsoil deposits (*Standards and Guidelines* Section 3.2.3, Table 3.1). The test units should be excavated five centimetres into the sterile subsoil and soil fills screened through 6 mm wire mesh to facilitate artifact recovery. The sterile subsoil should be troweled and all soil profiles examined for undisturbed cultural deposits.

   Additional strategies as suggested in Section 3.3.2 of the *Standards and Guidelines* may also be employed for the Cleary (BbGw-10) and McDonald (BcGv-11) sites which are large in size. Test unit strategies outlined above may not be sufficient to accurately define their extent since there may often not be a close correspondence between the artifact scatter and the underlying settlement pattern surviving in the subsoil. To help define the extent of these large sites, the
topsoil may be removed mechanically to excavate test trenches beyond the site limits established by the surface artifact scatter and positive test units. Trenches should be excavated as follows:

- Topsoil should be mechanically removed from trenches no more than 5 m in width with no more than 20 m intervals between trenches.
- Trenches should not be excavated where site limits are defined by physical constraints such as steep slopes and low wet areas.
- The trenches should be excavated inwards towards the site from a minimum of 20 m outside the limit of the previously mapped extent of artifacts.
- The trenches should be excavated until cultural features are identified or until the excavations reach the limits of the previously mapped extent of artifacts. If cultural features are identified, excavating in towards the site should be stopped.
- Trenches must be sterile for a minimum of 20 m outwards from the outermost cultural feature encountered or from the limits of the previously mapped extent of artifacts. This will establish the limits of the 20 m buffer area where that may be required for avoidance and protection.
- Any cultural features uncovered in the trenches should not be excavated but the exposed plan of the feature should be recorded. Geotextile fabric should be placed over the unit floor and backfilled.

The results of the Stage 3 assessments will be used to evaluate the significance of the sites and to develop a series of recommendations concerning any further mitigative options that may be necessary. Aboriginal engagement at this phase is also required, specifically with the Huron-Wendat First Nation, given the cultural affiliation of the sites with ancestral Wendat population. It is recommended that engagement occur with Luc Lainé and Mme. Heather Bastien from the Huron-Wendat First Nation as well as their lawyer David Donnelly, Donnelly Law.

Please note that archaeological sites recommended for further archaeological field work or protection remain subject to Section 48(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act and may not be altered, nor may artifacts be removed from them, except by a person holding an archaeological license.

2. The Lougheed site (BbGw-13), most likely extends into the study area, and it is considered to be an archaeological resources of high heritage value, in that it may provide significant insights into the pre-contact Aboriginal occupation of the area. It is therefore recommended that the portion of the site within the study area should be subject to Stage 3 archaeological assessment in order to more fully identify the character, extent and significance of the archaeological deposits, in accordance with the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTCS 2011).

The Stage 3 test excavation should commence with a controlled surface collection to determine the precise extent of the site and to document any surface artifacts that may be present. This work will require that the site area be ploughed and allowed to weather a least one substantial rainfall prior to commencing with this work.

The controlled surface collection should be followed by the placement of multiple grids over all areas of artifact concentration indicating possible plough-disturbed middens. A series of one metre by one metre units should be excavated across these grids at five metre intervals. An equal number of additional test units should be placed and excavated across the remainder of the site, either in a systematic grid or in focused areas, to recover a sample of topsoil deposits (Standards and Guidelines Section 3.2.3, Table 3.1). The test units should be excavated five centimetres into the sterile subsoil and soil fills screened through 6 mm wire mesh to facilitate artifact recovery.
The sterile subsoil should be troweled and all soil profiles examined for undisturbed cultural deposits.

The results of the Stage 3 assessments will be used to evaluate the significance of the sites and to develop a series of recommendations concerning any further mitigative options that may be necessary. Aboriginal engagement at this phase is also required, specifically with the Huron-Wendat First Nation, given the cultural affiliation of the sites with ancestral Wendat population. It is recommended that engagement occur with Luc Lainé and Mme. Heather Bastien from the Huron-Wendat First Nation as well as their lawyer David Donnelly, Donnelly Law.

Please note that archaeological sites recommended for further archaeological field work or protection remain subject to Section 48(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act and may not be altered, nor may artifacts be removed from them, except by a person holding an archaeological license.

3. Developments within the Secondary Plan area must be preceded by a Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment. Such assessments must be conducted in accordance with the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (2011). This work is required prior to any land disturbing activities in order to identify any archaeological remains that may be present.

It should be noted that the Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment of any proposed development (e.g., a draft plan of subdivision) must be carried out on all lands within that particular subject property, not simply those lands identified as exhibiting potential in this study.

4. Should any Aboriginal archaeological resource be identified in the course of future, more extensive archaeological assessments of the study area, meaningful engagement with those Aboriginal groups who have an active interest in these resources and their treatment should be conducted during subsequent phases of the project.

6.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION

- This report is submitted to the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, RSO 1990, c 0.18. The report is reviewed to ensure that it complies with the standards and guidelines that are issued by the Minister, and that the archaeological field work and report recommendations ensure the conservation, preservation and protection 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, Culture and Sport, 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.

- 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 field work on the site, submitted a report to the Minister stating that the site has no further cultural heritage value or interest, and the report has been filed in the Ontario Public Register of Archaeology Reports referred to in Section 65.1 of the Ontario Heritage Act.
- Should previously undocumented archaeological resources be discovered, they may be a new archaeological site and therefore subject to Section 48 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act. The proponent or person discovering the archaeological resources must cease alteration of the site immediately and engage a licensed consultant archaeologist to carry out archaeological fieldwork, in compliance with sec. 48 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act.


- The documentation related to this archaeological assessment will be curated by Archaeological Services Inc. until such a time that arrangements for their ultimate transfer to Her Majesty the Queen in right of Ontario, or other public institution, can be made to the satisfaction of the project owner(s), the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, and any other legitimate interest groups.

- 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.
7.0 REFERENCES CITED

Archaeological Research Associates
2003 Stage 3 and 4 Archaeological Assessment of Lougheed Site (BbGw-13), North Half of Lot 1, Concession 11, City of Barrie, County of Simcoe, Former Township of Innisfil. On file at the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport.

Belden, H.

Chapman, L.J., and D.F. Putnam

Hunter, A.

Hunter, J.

Libraries and Archives Canada (R12567-96-2-E)

MTCS (Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport)

Mika, Nick and Helma Mika.

NVCA (Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority)

Warrick, G.
8.0 PHOTOGRAPHS
(See Figure 7 for location of photographs)
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Plate 5: Looking southwest at the railway crossing the western parcel of the study area
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Plate 10: Area disturbed due to development

Plate 11: Developed land with no archaeological potential

Plate 12: Disturbed commercial area
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Plate 15: Area disturbed due to quarry-related activities

Plate 16: Golf course

Plate 17: Disturbance around historic farm lot

Plate 18: Historic homestead
Plate 19: Minimal disturbance around residence
Plate 20: Vine Post Office
Plate 21: Historic homestead
Plate 22: Residence with surrounding disturbed areas
Plate 23: Historic residence
Plate 24: Residence
Plate 25: Historic homestead
Plate 26: Landscaped area around residence
Plate 27: Farm complex
Plate 28: Residence
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Plate 32: Agricultural field

Plate 33: Agricultural field

Plate 34: Agricultural field

Plate 35: Agricultural field
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Plate 38: Woodlot

Plate 39: Woodlot

Plate 40: Unnamed Creek

Plate 41: Wet area, no archaeological potential

Plate 42: Wet creek bed, no archaeological potential
Plate 43: Approximate location and current condition of the Cleary site (BbGw-10)

Plate 44: Approximate location and current condition of the southern portion of the McDonald site (BcGv-11)
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Figure 5: Study area superimposed on the 1881 *Simcoe Supplement in Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada*
Figure 6: Historic potential of the study area
Figure 7: Location and direction of plates within study area
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