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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Ministry of Transportation (MTO) has received approval for Highway 400 transportation improvements that includes the replacement of the Sunnidale Road Bridge. The City of Barrie has been requested by the MTO to relocate the existing sanitary sewer that is presently located within the bridge super structure.

Archeoworks Inc. was retained by The City of Barrie to conduct a Stage 1 AA in support of the proposed sanitary sewer relocation alternatives along Eccles Street North, Highway 400, Sunnidale Road and within Sunnidale Park, in the City of Barrie. These locations will herein be referred to as the “study area.” The study area is located within part of Lots 22 and 23, Concession 5, in the Geographic Township of Vespra, in the historic County of Simcoe, now in the City of Barrie, Ontario.

Stage 1 AA background research established elevated potential for the recovery of archaeologically significant materials within the study area. To determine if the archaeological potential classification of the study area is relevant, a desktop review of ground conditions was undertaken using historical mapping, 20th century topographic maps and aerial photography. The desktop review identified parts of the study area as having archaeological potential removed and parts of the study area as having no or low archaeological potential. Two previous archaeological assessments were identified within the study area recommending further Stage 2 assessment. The remaining balance of the study area was identified as retaining archaeological potential.

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

1. Parts of the study area that were identified as having archaeological potential removed are exempt from requiring Stage 2 AA (extents of these areas to be confirmed during the Stage 2 AA).

2. Parts of the study area that were identified as having no or low archaeological potential are exempt from requiring Stage 2 AA (extents of these areas to be confirmed during the Stage 2 AA).

3. A Stage 2 archaeological assessment in the form of a test pit survey at five-metre intervals must be undertaken in the areas identified as still retaining archaeological potential, in accordance with the standards set within Section 2.1.2 of the 2011 S&G.

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

1.1 Objective

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

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

1.2 Development Context

“The Ministry of Transportation (MTO) has received Environmental Assessment approval for Highway 400 transportation improvements that include the replacement of the Sunnidale Road Bridge.” Effectively, the City of Barrie has been requested by the MTO to relocate the existing sanitary sewer that is presently located within the bridge super structure as it is desired that the replacement bridge be free of third party utilities. “The City of Barrie is undertaking a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) to study alternative alignments to relocate the existing sanitary sewer off of the Sunnidale Road Highway 400 bridge and assess the relative environmental, social, economical and cultural impacts (City of Barrie, 2018a).

Archeoworks Inc. was retained by The City of Barrie to conduct a Stage 1 AA in support of the proposed sanitary sewer relocation alternatives along Eccles Street North, Highway 400, Sunnidale Road and within Sunnidale Park, in the City of Barrie. These locations will herein be referred to as the “study area.” The study area is located within part of Lots 22 and 23, Concession 5, in the Geographic Township of Vespra, in the historic County of Simcoe, now in the City of Barrie, Ontario (see Appendix A – Map 1). Currently, the City of Barrie does not have an archaeological management plan.

This study was triggered by the Environmental Assessment Act. This Stage 1 AA was conducted pre-submission under the project direction of Ms. Kassandra Aldridge, under the archaeological consultant licence number P439, in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act (2009) and 2011 S&G. Permission to investigate the study area was granted by The City of Barrie on November 2nd, 2018.
1.3 Historic Context

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

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

1.3.1 Pre-Contact Period

The pre-contact period of Southern Ontario includes numerous Aboriginal groups that continually progressed and developed within the environments they inhabited. Table 1 includes an overview and summary of the pre-contact Aboriginal history of Southern Ontario in relation to the study area.

Table 1: Pre-Contact Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Overview and Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PALEO-INIAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>ca. 11000 to 8500 B.C.</td>
<td>Small groups of nomadic hunter-gathers who utilized seasonal and naturally available resources; sites are rare; hunted in small family groups who periodically gathered into larger groups/bands during favourable periods in the hunting cycle; artifacts include fluted and lanceolate stone points, scrapers and dart heads - Gainey, Barnes, Crowfield Fluted projectile points (Early Paleo-Indian) - Holcombe, Hi-Lo, Lanceolate projectile points (Late Paleo-Indian) (Ellis and Deller, 1990, pp.37-64; Wright, 1994, p.25).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>ca. 8500 to 7500 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHAIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>ca. 7800 to 6000 B.C.</td>
<td>Descendants of Paleo-Indian ancestors; lithic scatters are the most commonly encountered site type; trade networks appear; artifacts include reformed fluted and lanceolate stone points with notched bases to attach to a wooden shaft; ground-stone tools shaped by grinding and polishing; stone axes, adzes and bow and arrow - Side-notched, corner-notched, bifurcate projectile points (Early Archaic) - Stemmed, Otter Creek/Other Side-notched, Brewerton side and corner-Notched projectile points (Middle Archaic) (Ellis et al., 1990, pp.65-124; Wright, 1994, pp.26-28; Ellis, 2013, pp.41-46).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>ca. 6000 to 2000 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>ca. 2500 to 500 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evolved out of the Late Archaic Period; introduction of pottery (ceramic) where the earliest were coil-formed, under fired and likely utility usage; two primary cultural complexes: Meadowood (broad extent of occupation in southern Ontario) and Middlesex (restricted to Eastern Ontario); poorly understood settlement-subsistence patterns; artifacts include cache blades, and side-notched points that were often recycled into other tool forms; primarily Onondaga chert; commonly associated with Saugeen and Point Peninsula complexes - Meadowood side-notched projectile points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>ca. 800 to 0 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periods</td>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>Overview and Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Middle                              | ca. 200 B.C. to A.D. 700 | Three primary cultural complexes: Point Peninsula (generally located throughout south-central and eastern Southern Ontario), Saugeen (generally located southwestern Southern Ontario), and Couture (generally located in southwestern-most part of Ontario); introduction of large “house” structures; settlements have dense debris cover indicating increased degree of sedentism; burial mounds present; shared preference for stamped, scallop-edged or tooth-like decoration, but each cultural complex had distinct pottery forms  
- Saugeen projectile point (Saugeen)  
- Vanport projectile point (Couture)  
- Snyder Point projectile point (Spence et al., 1990, pp.142-170; Wright, 1994, pp.28-33; Ferris and Spence, 1995, p.97-102; Wright, 1999, pp.629-649; Williamson, 2013, pp.48-61). |
| Late (Transitional)                 | ca. A.D. 600 to 1000 | Princess Point exhibits few continuities from earlier developments with no apparent predecessors; hypothesized to have migrated into Ontario; the settlement data is limited, but oval houses are present; artifacts include ‘Princess Point Ware’ vessels that are cord roughened, with horizontal lines and exterior punctuation; smoking pipes and ground stone tools are rare; introduction of maize/corn horticulture; continuity of Princess Point and Late Woodland cultural groups  
- Triangular projectile points (Fox, 1990, pp.171-188; Ferris and Spence, 1995, pp.102-106). |
| Late (Early Ontario Iroquois Stage) | ca. A.D. 900 to 1300 | Two primary cultures: Glen Meyer (located primarily in southwestern Ontario from Long Point on Lake Erie to southwestern shore of Lake Huron) and Pickering (encompassed north of Lake Ontario to Georgian Bay and Lake Nipissing); well-made and thin-walled clay vessels with stamping, incising and punctuation; multi-family longhouses and some small, semi-permanent palisade villages; increase in corn-yielding sites; crudely made smoking pipes, and worked bone/antler present; evolution of the ossuary burials  
| Late (Middle Ontario Iroquois Stage) | ca. A.D. 1300 to 1400 | Fusion of Glen Meyer and Pickering caused by conquest and absorption of Glen Meyer by Pickering; two primary cultures: Uren (A.D. 1300-1350) and Middleport (A.D. 1350-1400); decorated clay vessels decrease; well developed clay pipe complex that includes effigy pipes; increase in village sizes (0.5 to 1.7 ha) and campsites (0.1 to 0.6 ha) appear with some palisades; classic longhouse takes form; increasing reliance on maize and other cultigens such as beans and squash  
- Triangular and (side of corner or corner removed) notched projectile points  
| Late (Late Ontario Iroquois Stage)  | ca. A.D. 1400 to 1600 | Ontario Iroquoian sites describe two major groups east and west of the Niagara Escarpment: the ancestral Neutral Natives to the west, and the ancestral Huron-Wendat to the east; Huron-Wendat “concentrations of sites occur in the areas of the Humber River valley, the Rouge and Duffin Creek valleys, the lower Trent valley, Lake Scugog, the upper Trent River and Simcoe County” (Ramsden, 1990, p.363); Nine-Mile Portage from Kempenfeldt Bay to Willow Creek, a branch of the Nottawasaga River that connected Lake Ontario to Lake Huron through Simcoe County; longhouse; villages enlarged to 100 longhouses clustered. |
### 1.3.2 Contact Period

The contact period of Southern Ontario is marked by the European arrival, interaction, and influence with the established Aboriginal communities of Southern Ontario. During this time, territorial boundaries were moveable and complicated further by migrations of groups, and the amalgamation of groups due to warfare and disease. **Table 2** includes an overview and summary of some of the main developments that occurred during the contact period of Southern Ontario as it relates to the study area.

**Table 2: Contact Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Overview and Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Contact</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1600s</td>
<td>The area “south of Lake Simcoe and along the north shore of Lake Ontario remained a no-man’s land, with no permanent settlements and traversed only by raiding parties from the north or from the south” (Robinson, 1965, p.11); multiple Huron-Wendat villages and campsites north of Lake Simcoe in and around the City of Barrie; trade relationship with Huron-Wendat and French established; trade goods begin to replace traditional tools/items; Jesuit missionaries; epidemics (Heidenreich, 1978, pp.368-388; Ramsden, 1990, pp.361-384; Ferris and Spence, 1995, pp.115-122; Rudychyk, N.D., p.2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Nation (Haudenosaunee) Arrival</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1650s</td>
<td>The Five (later Six) Nations (or Haudenosaunee), originally located south of the Great Lakes, engaged in warfare with Huron-Wendat neighbours as their territory no longer yielded enough furs; the Five Nations of Iroquois attacked and destroyed numerous Huron-Wendat villages in 1649-50; the small groups that remained became widely dispersed throughout the Great Lakes region, ultimately resettling in Quebec; the Five Nations of Iroquois established settlements along the north shoreline of Lake Ontario at strategic locations along canoe-and-portage routes and used this territory for extensive fur trade; the Five Nations of Iroquois believed to have established a settlement near Orillia after driving out the Huron-Wendat, but this is unconfirmed; European fur trade and exploration continues (Hunter, 1909a, p.10; Robinson, 1965, pp.15-16; Schmalz, 1991, pp.12-34; Trigger, 1994, p.53-59; Williamson, 2013, p.60).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anishinaabeg Arrival</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1650s to 1700s</td>
<td>Algonquin-speaking and cultural groups within the Anishinaabeg (Ojibway, Chippewa, Odawa, Mississauga and others) began to challenge the Five Nations of Iroquois dominance in the region; by 1690s, the Five Nations of Iroquois settlements were abandoned; battles fought throughout Southern Ontario; by 1701, the Five Nations of Iroquois were defeated and the Anishinaabeg replaced the Five Nations of Iroquois in Southern Ontario; gathered collectively as First Nations to participate in Great Peace negotiations; the Ojibway settled in the County of Simcoe around Lake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Overview and Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French vs. Britain/Fur Trade Continues</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1750s</td>
<td>The Anishinaabeg continued to trade with both the English and the French; introduction of Métis people; Seven Years War between France and Britain resulted in French surrender of New France in 1763; Royal Proclamation of 1763; Beaver Wars between groups within the (now) Six Nations of Iroquois and groups within the Anishinaabeg against the British; fur trade continued until Euro-Canadian settlement (Schmalz, 1991, pp.35-62, 81; Surtees, 1994, pp.92-97; Johnston, 2004, pp.13-14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Land Treaties, pt.1</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1750s to 1800s</td>
<td>American Revolution caused large numbers of United Empire Loyalists, military claimants, immigrants from the British Isle/European locations, and groups who faced persecution in the United States to arrive in Upper Canada; Treaty of Paris signed in 1784; in 1793 Lieutenant-Governor John Graves Simcoe arrived at Penetanguishene Bay and sought to establish a fort should the Americans provoke war; in 1798, William Claus, Superintendent of Indian Affairs, bargained on behalf of the British Government for a tract of land adjacent to the harbour of Penetanguishene, and purchased the tip of the peninsula for cloth, blankets and kettles valued at £101 of Quebec currency, known as Treaty No.5 (Hunter, 1909a, p.12; Surtees, 1994, p.109; Pencen Museum, 2013; Government of Ontario, 2014).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Land Treaties, pt.2</td>
<td>ca. 1800s to 1820s</td>
<td>In 1810, the North West Company, a fur trading company, complained about the American interference along the trade route from Lake Ontario, to the Niagara River, to Lake Erie and into the Detroit River; a proposed route utilizing existing native trails was suggested and would require the construction of a road from Lake Simcoe to Fort Penetanguishene; in 1811, an agreement was made with the Lake Simcoe Ojibwa, however, the War of 1812 broke out and the agreement was not finalized until 1815 and was known as Treaty 16; between 1815 and 1824 the non-Aboriginal population doubled as a result of heavy immigration from Britain; in 1818, William Claus, Superintendent of Indian Affairs, assembled an Ojibwa Council and asked for over a million hectares to the west and south of Lake Simcoe; William Claus advised that Euro-Canadian settlement in this area would take several years, and the government agreed to pay £1200 currency in goods; this became known as Treaty 18 (Surtees, 1994, pp.111-116; Hunter, 1909a, pp.15,84; N.A. 1891, pp.lviii, xxiv).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.3 Euro-Canadian Settlement Period (A.D. 1800s to present)
The Township of Vespra was surveyed by several individuals beginning in 1811 and completed by 1835. In 1811, Samuel S. Wilmot was instructed to survey a road leading from Kempenfeldt Bay to Penetanguishene Harbour and lay lots on either side of the road for settlement purposes. In 1820, James G. Chewett partially surveyed the Township of Vespra and in 1835, John Goessman continued the survey of the Township of Vespra. Consequently, the survey of the township was inconsistent with some half lots receiving more acres while others fell short (Anderson and Anderson, 1987, pp.25-26, 41).

The Township of Vespra contained 67,720 acres and settlement in the township did not occur until after the War of 1812. By 1819, a series of settlements were established along
Penetanguishene Road. Most of the Township of Vespra’s Euro-Canadian development is tied to the establishment of Barrie as a military port during the War of 1812 and the township did not progress until the 1830s. In 1847, a stage coach service was introduced utilizing Penetanguishene Road to allow passengers to commute from Holland’s Landing to Penetanguishene Harbour. By 1850, the Township of Vespra had doubled its population to 1,254 individuals, but the cultivated land did not increase proportionately. In 1859, the Township of Vespra became a separate municipality from the Townships of Flas and Sunnidale, and a new town hall was built in the community of Midhurst (Belden, 1881, pp.7-8; Anderson and Anderson, 1987, pp.55, 111-112; Smith, 1851, p.56).

The Town of Barrie, located on the shore of Kempenfeldt Bay, was primarily settled by Euro-Canadian settlers after the War of 1812. Sir George Head arrived at the head of Kempenfeldt Bay and erected a log house on the site of Barrie for himself and other French-Canadians who were part of the small detachment stationed with him (Hunter, 1909b, p.203). In 1818, the British Government established “two store-houses, one at Willow Creek end of the Nine-Mile portage, the other at Barrie” (Hunter, 1909b, p.204). In Barrie, a log structure was constructed and functioned as a depot for military supplies in transit to the Lake Huron and Georgian Bay areas and a temporary shelter for early pioneers (Hunter, 1909b, p.204; Belden, 1881, p.7). The following year, Penetanguishene Road was established from Kempenfeldt Bay to Georgian Bay by the British Government (Belden, 1881, p.7).

In 1830, the storehouse at Kempenfeldt Bay was abandoned by the British Government, but a small community had already formed in its wake. The town was named Barrie in honor of Sir Robert Barrie, a British naval officer who commanded a squadron at Kingston during the War of 1812. In 1833, town lots were surveyed, small wood shanties were constructed, and over the following three years, the community grew. By 1837, 28 families resided in Barrie and were principally English, Irish and Scottish. By 1846, all the town-lots within the old survey were owned by private landowners, while only a few lots within the new survey were occupied. By 1851, 800 individuals lived in the town and the town contained a tannery, a brewery, a newspaper office, Upper Canadian Bank, County Offices, four churches and a Grammar school (Hunter, 1909b, p.204; Belden, 1881, p.8; Brock, 2014; Smith, 1846, p.9; Smith, 1851, p.54).

In 1853, the Ontario, Simcoe and Huron Railway was constructed and extended to Barrie in 1865. The railway connected Barrie with Toronto and allowed for the transportation of people, agricultural goods and natural timber resources. After a series of devastating fires, the Town of Barrie continued to steadily grow throughout the remainder of the 19th century (Belden, 1881, p.8; Tourism Barrie, 2014; Downtown Barrie, 2014).

1.3.4.1 Pre-1900 Land Use

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

The 1871 Hogg’s Map of the County of Simcoe (see Map 2) identifies the study area to be within lands owned by an unlisted individual and within the Town of Barrie. No structures are depicted
in or within 300 metres of the study area. The former route of Sunnidale Road was depicted through the study area, traveling in an east-west direction.

The 1881 *Simcoe Supplement in the Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada* (see Map 3) reveals the lands associated with the study area were entirely located within the town lots of the Town of Barrie. Sunnidale Road had been relocated traversing the study area in a more north-south direction. It should be kept in mind, however, that not all historic features would have been depicted in the Township of Vespra as the Simcoe Supplement in the Illustrated Atlas required a paid subscription from the residents in the County of Simcoe (Benson, 1944, p.4).

Further, the study area encompasses Sunnidale Road, an early historic transportation route originally laid out during the survey of the Township of Vespra, and Eccles Street, a settlement road laid out during the survey of the Town of Barrie. In Ontario, the 2011 S&G considers areas of early Euro-Canadian settlements (e.g., pioneer homesteads, isolated cabins, farmstead complexes, early wharf or dock complexes, pioneer churches, and early cemeteries), early historic transportation routes (e.g., trails, passes, roads, railways, portage routes), and properties that local histories or informants have identified with possible archaeological sites, historical events, activities, or occupations, as features or characteristics that indicate archaeological potential (per Section 1.3.1 of the 2011 S&G). Therefore, based on the proximity of both early Euro-Canadian settlements and historic transportation routes, there is elevated potential for the location of Euro-Canadian archaeological resources (pre-1900) within portions of the study area which lie within 300 metres and 100 metres, respectively, of these historic features.

### 3.4.2 Post-1900 Land Use

To facilitate the evaluation of the established archaeological potential, a detailed review of topographical maps from 1928 and 1950 (see Maps 4 and 5), an aerial photograph from 1954 (see Map 6), and satellite images from 1989, 1997, 2002 and 2016 (see Maps 7-10) was undertaken.

The 1928 topographical map (see Map 4) depicts Sunnidale Road traversing through the study area while Wellington Street West lies immediately south. Lands flanking Sunnidale Road were wooded and the areas both north and south appeared to have been cleared of vegetation. Kidd’s Creek is depicting within the northern arm of the study area. The northern half also appears to have been within golf course lands. One structure is depicted in the study area while numerous additional structures and roadways are depicted within 300 metres. The study area remained relatively unchanged in 1950, with only minor development occurring outside the study area limits (see Map 5).

The most significant change occurs by 1954 with the construction of Highway 400, resulting in major disturbances within a portion of the study area. At this time, it appears as if much of the study area was wooded and the half west of the new highway appears to have been within an orchard (see Map 6).
By 1989, the construction of Highway 400 is complete, and Eccles Road has also been completed within the study area. Numerous structures have been constructed along these roadways. A Storm Water Management Facility (SWMF) berm (KD01) has been established over Kidd’s Creek within the now Sunnidale Park, also bordering Highway 400 (see Map 7). By 1997, additional disturbances are noted within the Highway 400 right-of-way (ROW) north of Sunnidale Road, and along the KD01 SWMF berm in Sunnidale Park (see Map 8).

The 2002 aerial orthophotograph shows Eccles Road, Sunnidale Road and Highway 400 within the study area. Numerous houses have been constructed along these roadways with yard areas exhibiting archaeological potential. Undisturbed wooded areas also exhibit archaeological potential. Kidd’s Creek is still depicted within the study area, however the KD01 SWMF berm has been constructed over top of it within Sunnidale Park (see Map 9). By 2016, the study area has remained relatively unchanged (see Map 10).

1.3.5 Present Land Use
The present land use of the study area can be categorized as Residential, Open Space and Environmental Protection Area (City of Barrie, 2017).

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

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

1.4.1 Designated and Listed Cultural Heritage Resources
Per Section 1.3.1 of the 2011 S&G, property listed on a municipal register or designated under the Ontario Heritage Act or that is a federal, provincial, or municipal historic landmark or site are considered features or characteristics that indicate archaeological potential. The study area is located within 300 metres of two designated heritage resources (see Table 3; City of Barrie, 2018b). Therefore, this feature further elevates the archaeological potential within portions of the study area that fall within 300 metres of these heritage resources.

Table 3: Heritage Resource within 300 metres of the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Heritage Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62 Shirley Avenue</td>
<td>Rev. Robert Boyle House</td>
<td>Designated – By-law 93-172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147 Toronto Street</td>
<td>Maple Hill</td>
<td>Designated – By-law 92-33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4.2 Heritage Conservation Districts
Per Section 1.3.1 of the 2011 S&G, heritage resources listed on a municipal register or designated under the Ontario Heritage Act are considered features or characteristics that indicate archaeological potential. The study area is not located in or within 300 metres of a Heritage Conservation District (MTCS, 2018a). Therefore, this feature does not contribute in establishing the archaeological potential of the study area.

1.4.3 Commemorative Plaques or Monuments
Per Section 1.3.1 of the 2011 S&G, commemorative markers of Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian settlements and history, which may include local, provincial, or federal monuments, cairns or plaques, or heritage parks are considered features or characteristics that indicate archaeological potential. The study area is located within 300 metres of a commemorative plaque (see Table 4; Ontario Historical Plaques, 2018; OHT, 2018) further establishing cultural heritage value or interest in proximity to the commemorative marker. However, due to the relatively late date and subject matter of the commemorative plaque, this feature does not contribute in establishing the archaeological potential of the study area.

Table 4: Commemorative Plaque Within 300 metres of the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On the south side of Ross Street, east of Highway 400 in Queen’s Park</td>
<td>William Edward Gallie, M.D. 1882-1959: “A master surgeon and teacher, Gallie was born in Barrie and educated at the University of Toronto. In 1906, after serving internships in Toronto and New York hospitals, he joined the staff of the Hospital for Sick Children in Toronto. There Gallie conducted extensive clinical research on tendon fixation, the repair of bone and the transplantation of tissue as ‘living sutures’, devising and perfecting revolutionary techniques now used all over the world. As Professor of Surgery (1929-47) and Dean of the Faculty of Medicine (1936-46) at the University of Toronto, he developed the first systematic training program for surgeons in Canada and produced many graduates who later gained renown. Well-regarded by his peers, Gallie received numerous honours for his outstanding contributions to medical science.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4.4 Pioneer/Historic Cemeteries
Per Section 1.3.1 of the 2011 S&G, pioneer churches and early cemeteries are considered features or characteristics that indicate archaeological potential. The study area is not located in or within 300 metres of a pioneer/historic church or cemetery (OGS, 2018). Therefore, this feature does not contribute in establishing the archaeological potential of the study area.

1.4.5 Registered Archaeological Sites
Per Section 1.3.1 of the 2011 S&G, previously registered archaeological sites are considered features or characteristics that indicate archaeological potential. Per Section 1.1, Standard 1 and Section 7.5.8, Standard 1 of the 2011 S&G, three archaeological sites have been registered within one-kilometre of the study area (MTCS, 2018) (see Table 5). Therefore, this feature does not contribute in establishing the archaeological potential of the study area.
Table 5: Registered Archaeological Sites within One-Kilometre of the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borden #</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Cultural Affiliation</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BcGw-20</td>
<td>Cundles Creek 2</td>
<td>Post-Contact, Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Earthwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BcGw-21</td>
<td>Cundles Creek 1</td>
<td>Late Woodland (Middleport), Iroquoian</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BcGw-22</td>
<td>Sunnidale Park</td>
<td>Late Woodland (Middleport), Iroquoian</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, site leads were provided by the Archaeological Site Coordinator at the MTCS. These site leads include sites that were discovered in the early 20th century by Andrew Hunter, a distinguished historian and archaeologist who explored and surveyed archaeological sites throughout Huronia (present day Simcoe County). During the 1980’s, an attempt was made to relocate some of the Hunter sites and this work was met with some moderate success; the location of these sites is estimated to be accurate to the quarter lot. As such, the Hunter Vespra Site 52 was identified as being situated within 300 metres of the study area, and the Hunter Vespra Site 42 was identified as being situated within one-kilometre of the study area. Therefore, this feature contributes in establishing the archaeological potential of the study area. As per the site leads, a description of the Hunter Vespra Sites that are within 300 metres and one-kilometre, respectively, of the study area is provided below.

Hunter Vespra Site 52 (No. 52) is described as a “bonepit, which the first settlers found here about the year 1840”. It became known as the “Tim Haggart Pit” and had a diameter of 20 feet and contained from 200 to 300 Aboriginal crania, and additional human bones in the main pit. Several skeletons were also found in single graves and two similar pits were also found around the main pit (Hunter, 1907, p.55).

Hunter Vespra Site 42 (No. 42) is described as consisting of “an acre or more of ground, on which there are blackened patches, and ashbeds with the usual fragmentary relics” and is situated at the head of the ravine (Hunter, 1907, p.54). The pottery had coarse-grained quartz for its central layer and was decorated. One of the camps was an arrowmaker’s workshop, where many broken flint chips, broken flint and two gouges were found. This site may represent “a tribe of a different period, or race [sic], from the early Hurons” (Hunter, 1907, p.54).

1.4.6 Previous Archaeological Assessments

Per Section 1.1, Standard 1 of the 2011 S&G, to further establish the archaeological context of the study area, a review of previous AAs carried out within the limits of, or immediately adjacent (i.e., within 50 metres) to the study area (as documented by all available reports) was undertaken. Five previous AA reports were identified (see Table 6):
### Table 6: Previous Archaeological Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Stage of Work</th>
<th>Relation to Current Study Area</th>
<th>Details + Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Assessments Ltd. (AAL), 2011</td>
<td>Stage 1 AA</td>
<td>Within the study area</td>
<td>Assessment of the Sunnidale Road and Highway 400 watermain crossing; the City of Barrie will be installing a transmission watermain from Letitia Street to Wellington Street with four different potential routes. Determined that four areas along the potential routes have the potential to recover archaeological resources. Recommended that the potentially undisturbed sections should be subject to a Stage 2 AA. The remaining sections of the subject area have been disturbed by previous development or consist of no or low archaeological potential due to low lying terrain and do not require further assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Research Associates (ARA), 2007</td>
<td>Stage 1 AA</td>
<td>Within the study area</td>
<td>Assessment of Sunnidale Park. Two areas of archaeological concern were identified to be integrated into the Sunnidale Park Master plan: 1) the presence of 3 registered archaeological sites (BcGw-20, BcGw-21 and BcGw-22) that are located on or adjacent to park lands, and 2) the high archaeological potential of the park for both pre-contact and historic archaeological resources. Several disturbances were noted within the subject area, however it is specified that it cannot be assumed that the existence of such disturbances removes all archaeological potential from the areas where they are present. Recommended that Stage 2 AA be conducted on any lands to be impacted by landscaping or construction activities within the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archeoworks Inc., 2017a</td>
<td>Stage 1 AA</td>
<td>Within 50 metres</td>
<td>Assessment for the City wide minor/major stormwater model development and Sophia Creek Class Environmental Assessment update within the City of Barrie. Background research identified elevated potential for the recovery of archaeological significant materials within portions of the subject area. Recommendations: previously assessed lands are recommended to be exempt from further assessment within the scope of the project, areas of low or no archaeological potential must be subject to an on-site visual survey to confirm disturbance, portions identified as potentially disturbed must be subjected to a judgmental Stage 2 test pit survey, any construction activities which impact areas identified as having archaeological potential will require stage 2 test pit survey, and the historic Town of Barrie will require a more detailed Stage 1 and 2 AA for any future proposed work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archeoworks Inc., 2017b (Draft)</td>
<td>Stage 1 AA</td>
<td>Within the study area</td>
<td>Drainage Master Plan (DMP) for the entire City of Barrie excluding the Sophia Creek Watershed, the Mulcaster Drainage Area and also excluding lands in...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ARCHEOWORKS INC.**
the southern part of the City of Barrie. Background research established elevated potential for the recovery of archaeologically significant materials within the subject area. A desktop review of ground conditions determined parts of the subject area had archaeological potential removed and the remaining balance was identified as retaining elevated and uncertain archaeological potential. Recommendations: lands subjected to previous AA must be reviewed, no intrusive activity may occur within the limits of any cemetery, further stage 3 mechanical topsoil stripping recommended for Barrie Union Cemetery, St. Mary’s Catholic Cemetery, the Whayne Family Grave, St. George’s Millennium Cemetery and the Gibbins Cemetery, the Gibbins Cemetery needs to be relocated, parts of the subject area determined to have archaeological potential removed and areas of low/no archaeological potential need to be confirmed through an on-site property inspection, Stage 2 AA recommended for areas of elevated or uncertain archaeological potential, and a detailed Stage 1 and 2 AA must be undertaken for future projects within the historic Town of Barrie.

Per this report, the entirety of the study area has been subject to a preliminary assessment; disturbances and areas of elevated archaeological potential requiring Stage 2 AA were noted. However, this report is still awaiting MTCS review and due to the generic nature of this report, a more specific Stage 1 AA is still necessary.

1.4.7 Physical Features
The study area is located within the Simcoe Uplands physiographic regions of Southern Ontario. The Simcoe Uplands is characterized by broad and rolling till plains that are separated by steep-sided and flat-floored valleys. These till plains and valleys are “encircled by numerous shorelines, indicating they were islands in Lake Algonquin” (Chapman and Putnam, 1984, p.181). The till is comprised primarily of Pre-Cambrian rock instead of limestone, providing a gritty loam texture that becomes sandier toward the north. Heavier, more calcareous till occurs near Lake Simcoe and Midland. The original forests of the land included hardwoods, mainly sugar maple and beech with white pine. Other common trees include yellow birch, basswood and hemlock. The agriculture can be classified as mixed farming based on a variety of products such as milk, cream, beef, veal, hogs, eggs and poultry. Over the years, the region generally saw a “moving away” from agriculture, as fewer farms existed within the area, however, those that did remain saw a great
increase in size and improvement. Although the uplands did not develop any market centres, it is connected by good highways to Barrie and Orillia, the major urban centres of the Lake Simcoe Basin, and in proximity to small ports by the Georgian Bay shore (Chapman and Putnam, 1984, pp.182-184).

A glacial shorecliff is located within 50 metres along the southern limits of the study area. After the final retreat of the North American Laurentide ice sheet approximately 15,000 years ago (13,000 B.C.), glacial meltwater expanded against the retreating ice boundary flooding Lake Huron and Georgian Bay and the Simcoe lowlands. Eventually the glacial flood waters merged forming glacial Lake Algonquin covering, “parts or all of Lake Huron, Lake Superior, and Erie basins, which included Lake Simcoe and Lake Couchiching” (Karrow and Warner, 1990, p.15; Frim, 2002, p.xi). The lessening ice load created isostatic rebound, causing abandoned shorelines to tilt northward towards the ice centre and water to accumulate along the southern shorelines. This formed the main glacial strandline of Lake Algonquin, which extended around the southern shore of Lake Simcoe (Karrow and Warner, 1990, p.15). The strandline is marked by a number of erosional and depositional features including high bluffs, off-shore bars, and limestone scarps where wave erosion cut into the bedrock (Storck, 1982, p.9). Gradually changing glacial outlets caused the draining of Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Basins which “exposed about half the present lake floor areas as dry land” (Larson and Schaetzl, 2001, p.532; Jackson et al, 2000, p.419). Along this shoreline and the beaches of Lake Algonquin, there is definitive evidence of human occupations corresponding to the Late Paleoindian Period of Southern Ontario (Storck, 1982, p.9; Karrow and Warner, 1990, pp.15-22; Stewart, 2013, p.28; Stewart, 2013, p.28).

Water levels continued to fluctuate with the most dramatic elevation increase occurring during the Nipissing high water phase. It is generally believed that during the Nipissing Phase, water levels achieved the same height as those of Lake Algonquin, thus creating one contiguous lake in the Lake Superior, Lake Michigan, and Lake Huron basins (Jackson et al, 2000, p.419). However, isostatic uplift in the north “meant that most of the Lake Simcoe area of south central Ontario flooded by Algonquin was not reoccupied by Nipissing waters” (Jackson et al, 2000, p.420). Gradually, the high water of the Nipissing phase retreated to current lake levels (Karrow and Warner, 1990, p.15-22; Jackson et al, 2000, p.419-420; Larson and Schaetzl, 2001, p.532; Jackson, 2004, p.38).

Several native soil types are found within the study area. The study area is found in a mixture of Tioga loamy sand and Vasey sandy loam. A description of their characteristics may be found in Table 7 (Ontario Agricultural College, 1959). The great variety in soil types further highlights the mixed landscape that the study area encompasses and supports the mixed nature of past subsistence practices and changing industries of early settlers in these areas. Soils more conducive to agriculture, such as good drainage and stone-free, have the potential for past settlement, support greater population density and subsequently have elevated archaeological potential.
### Table 7: Study Area Soil Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Series and Type</th>
<th>Great Soil Group</th>
<th>Drainage</th>
<th>Topography and Surface Stoniness</th>
<th>Soil Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tioga loamy sand</td>
<td>Podzol</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Smooth, gently to irregular, steeply sloping; stonefree to moderately stony</td>
<td>Grey, calcareous outwash sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasey sandy loam</td>
<td>Brown Podzolic</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Smooth, moderately to steeply sloping; moderately to very stony</td>
<td>Light grey, calcareous and non-calcareous, sandy loam till</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### 1.4.8 Current Land Conditions

The study area is situated within a suburban area located along Eccles Street North, Highway 400, Sunnidale Road, and in Sunnidale Park, in the City of Barrie. The study area encompasses several extant residential houses and paved driveways, a four-line paved roadway, paved sidewalks, manicured yardage dotted with trees and a wooded recreational park. The topography within the study area decreases from north to south, with a rise in elevation near Sunnidale Road, with an average elevation of 256 to 241 metres above sea level.

#### 1.4.9 Dates of Desktop and Field Reviews

A desktop review of study area conditions using information from 20th century topographic maps and aerial photography was undertaken on December 18th, 2018.

#### 1.5 Confirmation of Archaeological Potential

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

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

2.1 Previous Assessments

Several areas within the study area limits have already been subjected to an archaeological assessment (Archaeological Assessments Ltd., 2011; Archaeological Research Associates, 2007) (see Section 1.4.6, Table 6; Map 11). Due to an absence of clear mapping within the Archaeological Research Associates report (2007) demonstrating the extent of the subject area, this information was not included in the mapped results of the current Stage 1 AA.

The extent of all areas determined to exhibit disturbance and no or low archaeological potential within these reports will need to be confirmed during the Stage 2 AA. The extent of all areas determined to retain archaeological potential will also need to be confirmed during the Stage 2 AA.

2.2 Identified Deep and Extensive Disturbances

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

Obvious visual disturbances include but are not limited to the existing paved roadways (Eccles Street North, Sunnidale Road and Highway 400), driveways and rights-of-ways (pedestrian sidewalks, pavement, graded margins, artificial embankments, utilities and extensive landscaping), extant structures and the KD01 SWMF berm (see Map 11). The construction of these features would have resulted in severe damage to the integrity of any archaeological resources which may have been present within their footprints and, as such, are exempt from Stage 2 survey. On-site confirmation and documentation of the actual condition and exact extent of the disturbances will, however, be required during the Stage 2 AA.

2.3 Physiographic Features of No or Low Archaeological Potential

The study area was evaluated for physical features of no or low archaeological potential. These usually include but are not limited to: permanently wet areas, exposed bedrock, and steep slopes (greater than 20°) except in locations likely to contain pictographs or petroglyphs, as per Section 2.1, Standard 2.a of the 2011 S&G.
Physical features of low or no archaeological potential include the low-lying and permanently wet terrain associated with Kidd’s Creek (see Map 11). On-site confirmation and documentation of the actual condition and exact extent of this feature will, however, be required during the Stage 2 AA.

### 2.4 Identified Areas of Archaeological Potential

Portions of the study area that neither exhibit extensively disturbed conditions nor contain physical features of no or low archaeological potential are considered to retain the established archaeological potential. This includes wooded areas, areas of overgrown vegetation, manicured lawn and minor landscaping/gardening (see Map 11).

Given the established potential to recover archaeological resources within this identified area, a Stage 2 AA will be required. In areas where ploughing is not possible or viable due to the presence of overgrown vegetation, a Stage 2 test pit survey at five metre intervals must be performed, in accordance with the standards outlined in Section 2.1.2 of the 2011 S&G.
3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. Parts of the study area that were identified as having archaeological potential removed are exempt from requiring Stage 2 AA (extents of these areas to be confirmed during the Stage 2 AA).

2. Parts of the study area that were identified as having no or low archaeological potential are exempt from requiring Stage 2 AA (extents of these areas to be confirmed during the Stage 2 AA).

3. A Stage 2 archaeological assessment in the form of a test pit survey at five-metre intervals must be undertaken in the area identified as still retaining archaeological potential, in accordance with the standards set within Section 2.1.2 of the 2011 S&G.

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

1. This report is submitted to the MTCS as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c 0.18. The report is reviewed to ensure that it complies with the standards and guidelines that are issued by the Minister, and that the archaeological fieldwork and report recommendations ensure the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario. When all matters relating to archaeological sites within the project area of a development proposal have been addressed to the satisfaction of the MTCS, a letter will be issued by the ministry stating that there are no further concerns with regard to alterations to archaeological sites by the proposed development.

2. It is an offence under Sections 48 and 69 of the Ontario Heritage Act for any party other than a licensed archaeologist to make any alteration to a known archaeological site or to remove any artifact or other physical evidence of past human use or activity from the site, until such time as a licensed archaeologist has completed archaeological fieldwork on the site, submitted a report to the Minister stating that the site has no further cultural heritage value or interest, and the report has been filed in the Ontario Public Register of Archaeology Reports referred to in Section 65.1 of the Ontario Heritage Act.

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

Map 1: National Topographical Map 1:30 000, NTS Barrie 031D05 (Natural Resources Canada, 2013) identifying the Stage 1 AA study area.
Map 2: Stage 1 AA study area within the 1871 Hogg’s Map of the County of Simcoe – Township of Vespra (OHCMP, 2018).
Map 3: Stage 1 AA study area within the 1881 Simcoe Supplement in the Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada – Township of Vespra (McGill University, 2018).
Map 4: Stage 1 AA study area within the 1928 Topographic Map, Barrie, Ontario, Sheet 031D05 (ed. 1) (Department of National Defence, 1928).
Map 5: Stage 1 AA study area within the 1950 Topographic Map, Barrie, Ontario, Sheet 031D05 (ed. 6) (Department of National Defence, 1950).
Map 6: Stage 1 AA study area within a 1954 aerial photograph (University of Toronto, 2018).
Map 7: Stage 1 AA study area within a 1989 aerial orthophotograph (County of Simcoe Maps, 2018a).
Map 8: Stage 1 AA study area within a 1997 aerial orthophotograph (County of Simcoe Maps, 2018b).
Map 9: Stage 1 AA study area within a 2002 aerial orthophotograph (County of Simcoe Maps, 2018c).
Map 10: Stage 1 AA study area within a 2016 aerial orthophotograph (County of Simcoe Maps, 2018d).
Map 11: Stage 1 AA results.
## APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND RESEARCH

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

### Physical Features

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

### Cultural Features

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

### Property-specific Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contains property designated under the Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local knowledge (aboriginal communities, heritage organizations, municipal heritage committees, etc.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent ground disturbance, not including agricultural cultivation (post-1960, extensive and deep land alterations)</td>
<td>X – parts of the study area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, low archaeological potential is determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTARY AND MATERIAL RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document/Material</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Research/Analysis/Reporting Material</td>
<td>Digital files stored in: /2018/341-BA8104-18 - Sunnidale Road EA - Barrie/Stage 1</td>
<td>Archeoworks Inc., 16715-12 Yonge Street, Suite 1029, Newmarket, ON, Canada, L3X 1X4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under Section 6 of Regulation 881 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, *Archeoworks Inc.* will, “keep in safekeeping all objects of archaeological significance that are found under the authority of the licence and all field records that are made in the course of the work authorized by the licence, except where the objects and records are donated to Her Majesty the Queen in right of Ontario or are directed to be deposited in a public institution under subsection 66 (1) of the Act.”
The **purpose of the checklist** is to determine:

- if a property(ies) or project area:
  - is a recognized heritage property
  - may be of cultural heritage value

- it includes all areas that may be impacted by project activities, including – but not limited to:
  - the main project area
  - temporary storage
  - staging and working areas
  - temporary roads and detours

**Processes covered** under this checklist, such as:

- *Planning Act*
- *Environmental Assessment Act*
- *Aggregates Resources Act*
- *Ontario Heritage Act* – Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties

**Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER)**

If you are not sure how to answer one or more of the questions on the checklist, you may want to hire a qualified person(s) (see page 5 for definitions) to undertake a cultural heritage evaluation report (CHER).

The CHER will help you:

- identify, evaluate and protect cultural heritage resources on your property or project area
- reduce potential delays and risks to a project

**Other checklists**

Please use a separate checklist for your project, if:

- you are seeking a Renewable Energy Approval under Ontario Regulation 359/09 – [separate checklist](#)
- your Parent Class EA document has an approved screening criteria (as referenced in Question 1)

Please refer to the Instructions pages for more detailed information and when completing this form.
## SUNNIDALE ROAD - SANITARY SEWER RELOCATION

**CITY OF BARRIE**

**Proponent Name**

CITY OF BARRIE

**Proponent Contact Information**

705-739-4220 EXT. 5117

### Screening Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is there a pre-approved screening checklist, methodology or process in place?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Yes, please follow the pre-approved screening checklist, methodology or process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If No, continue to Question 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part A: Screening for known (or recognized) Cultural Heritage Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Has the property (or project area) been evaluated before and found not to be of cultural heritage value?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Yes, do not complete the rest of the checklist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proponent, property owner and/or approval authority will:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• summarize the previous evaluation and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• add this checklist to the project file, with the appropriate documents that demonstrate a cultural heritage evaluation was undertaken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The summary and appropriate documentation may be:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• submitted as part of a report requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• maintained by the property owner, proponent or approval authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If No, continue to Question 3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part B: Screening for potential cultural heritage value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the property (or project area):</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. identified, designated or otherwise protected under the *Ontario Heritage Act* as being of cultural heritage value?

b. a National Historic Site (or part of)?

c. designated under the *Heritage Railway Stations Protection Act*?

d. designated under the *Heritage Lighthouse Protection Act*?

e. identified as a Federal Heritage Building by the Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office (FHBRO)?

f. located within a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage Site?

If Yes to any of the above questions, you need to hire a qualified person(s) to undertake:

- a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report, if a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value has not previously been prepared or the statement needs to be updated

If a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value has been prepared previously and if alterations or development are proposed, you need to hire a qualified person(s) to undertake:

- a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) – the report will assess and avoid, eliminate or mitigate impacts

If No, continue to Question 4.
Part B: Screening for Potential Cultural Heritage Value

4. Does the property (or project area) contain a parcel of land that:
   a. is the subject of a municipal, provincial or federal commemorative or interpretive plaque? ☑
   b. has or is adjacent to a known burial site and/or cemetery? ☑
   c. is in a Canadian Heritage River watershed? ☑
   d. contains buildings or structures that are 40 or more years old? ☑

Part C: Other Considerations

5. Is there local or Aboriginal knowledge or accessible documentation suggesting that the property (or project area):
   a. is considered a landmark in the local community or contains any structures or sites that are important in defining the character of the area? ☑
   b. has a special association with a community, person or historical event? ☑
   c. contains or is part of a cultural heritage landscape? ☑

If Yes to one or more of the above questions (Part B and C), there is potential for cultural heritage resources on the property or within the project area.

You need to hire a qualified person(s) to undertake:
   • a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER)

If the property is determined to be of cultural heritage value and alterations or development is proposed, you need to hire a qualified person(s) to undertake:
   • a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) – the report will assess and avoid, eliminate or mitigate impacts

If No to all of the above questions, there is low potential for built heritage or cultural heritage landscape on the property.

The proponent, property owner and/or approval authority will:
   • summarize the conclusion
   • add this checklist with the appropriate documentation to the project file

The summary and appropriate documentation may be:
   • submitted as part of a report requirement e.g. under the Environmental Assessment Act, Planning Act processes
   • maintained by the property owner, proponent or approval authority
Instructions

Please have the following available, when requesting information related to the screening questions below:

- a clear map showing the location and boundary of the property or project area
- large scale and small scale showing nearby township names for context purposes
- the municipal addresses of all properties within the project area
- the lot(s), concession(s), and parcel number(s) of all properties within a project area

For more information, see the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s Ontario Heritage Toolkit or Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties.

In this context, the following definitions apply:

- **qualified person(s)** means individuals – professional engineers, architects, archaeologists, etc. – having relevant, recent experience in the conservation of cultural heritage resources.
- **proponent** means a person, agency, group or organization that carries out or proposes to carry out an undertaking or is the owner or person having charge, management or control of an undertaking.

### 1. Is there a pre-approved screening checklist, methodology or process in place?

An existing checklist, methodology or process may already be in place for identifying potential cultural heritage resources, including:

- one endorsed by a municipality
- an environmental assessment process e.g. screening checklist for municipal bridges
- one that is approved by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) under the Ontario government’s Standards & Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties [S.B.2.]

### Part A: Screening for known (or recognized) Cultural Heritage Value

#### 2. Has the property (or project area) been evaluated before and found not to be of cultural heritage value?

Respond ‘yes’ to this question, if all of the following are true:

A property can be considered not to be of cultural heritage value if:

- a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) - or equivalent - has been prepared for the property with the advice of a qualified person and it has been determined not to be of cultural heritage value and/or
- the municipal heritage committee has evaluated the property for its cultural heritage value or interest and determined that the property is not of cultural heritage value or interest

A property may need to be re-evaluated, if:

- there is evidence that its heritage attributes may have changed
- new information is available
- the existing Statement of Cultural Heritage Value does not provide the information necessary to manage the property
- the evaluation took place after 2005 and did not use the criteria in Regulations 9/06 and 10/06

**Note:** Ontario government ministries and public bodies [prescribed under Regulation 157/10] may continue to use their existing evaluation processes, until the evaluation process required under section B.2 of the Standards & Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties has been developed and approved by MTCS.

To determine if your property or project area has been evaluated, contact:

- the approval authority
- the proponent
- the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport

### 3a. Is the property (or project area) identified, designated or otherwise protected under the Ontario Heritage Act as being of cultural heritage value e.g.:

- designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*
  - individual designation (Part IV)
  - part of a heritage conservation district (Part V)
Individual Designation – Part IV

A property that is designated:

- by a municipal by-law as being of cultural heritage value or interest [s.29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*]
- by order of the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport as being of cultural heritage value or interest of provincial significance [s.34.5]. **Note:** To date, no properties have been designated by the Minister.

Heritage Conservation District – Part V

A property or project area that is located within an area designated by a municipal by-law as a heritage conservation district [s. 41 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*].

For more information on Parts IV and V, contact:

- municipal clerk
- *Ontario Heritage Trust*
- local land registry office (for a title search)

ii. subject of an agreement, covenant or easement entered into under Parts II or IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*

An agreement, covenant or easement is usually between the owner of a property and a conservation body or level of government. It is usually registered on title.

The primary purpose of the agreement is to:

- preserve, conserve, and maintain a cultural heritage resource
- prevent its destruction, demolition or loss

For more information, contact:

- *Ontario Heritage Trust* - for an agreement, covenant or easement [clause 10 (1) (c) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*]
- municipal clerk – for a property that is the subject of an easement or a covenant [s.37 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*]
- local land registry office (for a title search)

iii. listed on a register of heritage properties maintained by the municipality

Municipal registers are the official lists - or record - of cultural heritage properties identified as being important to the community.

Registers include:

- all properties that are designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act* (Part IV or V)
- properties that have not been formally designated, but have been identified as having cultural heritage value or interest to the community

For more information, contact:

- municipal clerk
- municipal heritage planning staff
- municipal heritage committee

iv. subject to a notice of:

- intention to designate (under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*)
- a Heritage Conservation District study area bylaw (under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*)

A property that is subject to a **notice of intention to designate** as a property of cultural heritage value or interest and the notice is in accordance with:

- section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*
- section 34.6 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. **Note:** To date, the only applicable property is Meldrum Bay Inn, Manitoulin Island. [s.34.6]

An area designated by a municipal by-law made under section 40.1 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* as a **heritage conservation district study area**.

For more information, contact:

- municipal clerk – for a property that is the subject of notice of intention [s. 29 and s. 40.1]
- *Ontario Heritage Trust*
v. included in the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s list of provincial heritage properties

Provincial heritage properties are properties the Government of Ontario owns or controls that have cultural heritage value or interest.

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) maintains a list of all provincial heritage properties based on information provided by ministries and prescribed public bodies. As they are identified, MTCS adds properties to the list of provincial heritage properties.

For more information, contact the MTCS Registrar at registrar@ontario.ca.

3b. Is the property (or project area) a National Historic Site (or part of)?

National Historic Sites are properties or districts of national historic significance that are designated by the Federal Minister of the Environment, under the Canada National Parks Act, based on the advice of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada.

For more information, see the National Historic Sites website.

3c. Is the property (or project area) designated under the Heritage Railway Stations Protection Act?

The Heritage Railway Stations Protection Act protects heritage railway stations that are owned by a railway company under federal jurisdiction. Designated railway stations that pass from federal ownership may continue to have cultural heritage value.

For more information, see the Directory of Designated Heritage Railway Stations.

3d. Is the property (or project area) designated under the Heritage Lighthouse Protection Act?

The Heritage Lighthouse Protection Act helps preserve historically significant Canadian lighthouses. The Act sets up a public nomination process and includes heritage building conservation standards for lighthouses which are officially designated.

For more information, see the Heritage Lighthouses of Canada website.

3e. Is the property (or project area) identified as a Federal Heritage Building by the Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office?

The role of the Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office (FHBRO) is to help the federal government protect the heritage buildings it owns. The policy applies to all federal government departments that administer real property, but not to federal Crown Corporations.

For more information, contact the Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office.

See a directory of all federal heritage designations.

3f. Is the property (or project area) located within a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage Site?

A UNESCO World Heritage Site is a place listed by UNESCO as having outstanding universal value to humanity under the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. In order to retain the status of a World Heritage Site, each site must maintain its character defining features.

Currently, the Rideau Canal is the only World Heritage Site in Ontario.

For more information, see Parks Canada – World Heritage Site website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part B: Screening for potential Cultural Heritage Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a. Does the property (or project area) contain a parcel of land that has a municipal, provincial or federal commemorative or interpretive plaque?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heritage resources are often recognized with formal plaques or markers.

Plaques are prepared by:

- municipalities
- provincial ministries or agencies
- federal ministries or agencies
- local non-government or non-profit organizations
For more information, contact:

- municipal heritage committees or local heritage organizations – for information on the location of plaques in their community
- Ontario Historical Society’s Heritage directory – for a list of historical societies and heritage organizations
- Ontario Heritage Trust – for a list of plaques commemorating Ontario’s history
- Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada – for a list of plaques commemorating Canada’s history

4b. Does the property (or project area) contain a parcel of land that has or is adjacent to a known burial site and/or cemetery?

For more information on known cemeteries and/or burial sites, see:

- Cemeteries Regulations, Ontario Ministry of Consumer Services – for a database of registered cemeteries
- Ontario Genealogical Society (OGS) – to locate records of Ontario cemeteries, both currently and no longer in existence; cairns, family plots and burial registers
- Canadian County Atlas Digital Project – to locate early cemeteries

In this context, adjacent means contiguous or as otherwise defined in a municipal official plan.

4c. Does the property (or project area) contain a parcel of land that is in a Canadian Heritage River watershed?

The Canadian Heritage River System is a national river conservation program that promotes, protects and enhances the best examples of Canada’s river heritage.

Canadian Heritage Rivers must have, and maintain, outstanding natural, cultural and/or recreational values, and a high level of public support.

For more information, contact the Canadian Heritage River System.

If you have questions regarding the boundaries of a watershed, please contact:

- your conservation authority
- municipal staff

4d. Does the property (or project area) contain a parcel of land that contains buildings or structures that are 40 or more years old?

A 40 year ‘rule of thumb’ is typically used to indicate the potential of a site to be of cultural heritage value. The approximate age of buildings and/or structures may be estimated based on:

- history of the development of the area
- fire insurance maps
- architectural style
- building methods

Property owners may have information on the age of any buildings or structures on their property. The municipality, local land registry office or library may also have background information on the property.

Note: 40+ year old buildings or structure do not necessarily hold cultural heritage value or interest; their age simply indicates a higher potential.

A building or structure can include:

- residential structure
- farm building or outbuilding
- industrial, commercial, or institutional building
- remnant or ruin
- engineering work such as a bridge, canal, dams, etc.

For more information on researching the age of buildings or properties, see the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit Guide Heritage Property Evaluation.
Part C: Other Considerations

5a. Is there local or Aboriginal knowledge or accessible documentation suggesting that the property (or project area) is considered a landmark in the local community or contains any structures or sites that are important to defining the character of the area?

Local or Aboriginal knowledge may reveal that the project location is situated on a parcel of land that has potential landmarks or defining structures and sites, for instance:

- buildings or landscape features accessible to the public or readily noticeable and widely known
- complexes of buildings
- monuments
- ruins

5b. Is there local or Aboriginal knowledge or accessible documentation suggesting that the property (or project area) has a special association with a community, person or historical event?

Local or Aboriginal knowledge may reveal that the project location is situated on a parcel of land that has a special association with a community, person or event of historic interest, for instance:

- Aboriginal sacred site
- traditional-use area
- battlefield
- birthplace of an individual of importance to the community

5c. Is there local or Aboriginal knowledge or accessible documentation suggesting that the property (or project area) contains or is part of a cultural heritage landscape?

Landscapes (which may include a combination of archaeological resources, built heritage resources and landscape elements) may be of cultural heritage value or interest to a community.

For example, an Aboriginal trail, historic road or rail corridor may have been established as a key transportation or trade route and may have been important to the early settlement of an area. Parks, designed gardens or unique landforms such as waterfalls, rock faces, caverns, or mounds are areas that may have connections to a particular event, group or belief.

For more information on Questions 5.a., 5.b. and 5.c., contact:

- Elders in Aboriginal Communities or community researchers who may have information on potential cultural heritage resources. Please note that Aboriginal traditional knowledge may be considered sensitive.
- municipal heritage committees or local heritage organizations
- Ontario Historical Society’s “Heritage Directory” - for a list of historical societies and heritage organizations in the province

An internet search may find helpful resources, including:

- historical maps
- historical walking tours
- municipal heritage management plans
- cultural heritage landscape studies
- municipal cultural plans

Information specific to trails may be obtained through Ontario Trails.