

Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport

Archaeology Programs Unit
Programs and Services Branch
Culture Division
401 Bay Street, Suite 1700
Toronto ON M7A 0A7
Tel.: (519) 675-6898
Email: Shari.Prowse@ontario.ca

Ministère du Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport

Unité des programmes d'archéologie
Direction des programmes et des services
Division de culture
401, rue Bay, bureau 1700
Toronto ON M7A 0A7
Tél. : (519) 675-6898
Email: Shari.Prowse@ontario.ca



Jan 12, 2017

Lafe Meicenheimer (P457)
Golder Associates Ltd.
1 - 309 Exeter London ON N6L 1C1

RE: Review and Entry into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports: Archaeological Assessment Report Entitled, "STAGE 1-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT George Street Land Parcel Port Stanley, Ontario, Parts 1-8 11R-1261, Former Township of Southwold, Now Municipality of Central Elgin, Elgin County, Ontario ", Dated Jan 4, 2017, Filed with MTCS Toronto Office on Jan 10, 2017, MTCS Project Information Form Number P457-0028-2016, MTCS File Number 0005401

Dear Mr. Meicenheimer:

This office has reviewed the above-mentioned report, which has been submitted to this ministry as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c 0.18.¹ This review has been carried out in order to determine whether the licensed professional consultant archaeologist has met the terms and conditions of their licence, that the licensee assessed the property and documented archaeological resources using a process that accords with the 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists set by the ministry, and that the archaeological fieldwork and report recommendations are consistent with the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario.

The report documents the Stage 1-2 assessment of the study area as depicted in Map 10 of the above titled report and recommends the following:

Based on the results of the Stage 1 background study and the Stage 2 property assessment, it was concluded that the pre-contact Aboriginal material identified at Locations 1 and 3 has no further cultural heritage value or interest, while Location 2 (AeHh-150) does have further cultural heritage value or interest and further archaeological assessment is required.

Given these findings the following recommendations are provided:

1) The cultural heritage value or interest of Locations 1 and 3 has been sufficiently assessed and documented, the sites may be considered free of further archaeological concern, and no further archaeological assessment of these sites is required.

2) Location 2 (AeHh-150) possesses cultural heritage value or interest and should be subject to a Stage 3 site-specific archaeological assessment prior to any development impacts.

3) As outlined in Section 2.0 of the report herein, Golder conducted two CSP) collections at Location 2 (AeHh-150) during the Stage 2 assessment that met all requirements outlined in Section 3.2.1 of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011). This was done to take advantage of good site conditions at the time. As such, when the Stage 3 site-specific assessment of Location 2 (AeHh-150) is ready to proceed it is recommended that it begin with the hand excavation of test units as outlined in Section 3.2, as well as Table 3.1, of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011).

4) Since Location 2 (AeHh-150) has been identified as a large, diffuse pre-contact Aboriginal site where it is not clearly evident that Stage 4 mitigation of impacts will be required, it is recommended that the test unit excavation strategy should follow Table 3.1, Standards 5, 6, and 7. Specifically, multiple grids of test units should be excavated at 5 metre intervals over areas of artifact concentration. However, as no distinct artifact concentration were identified, despite conducting two CSP collections, it is recommended that the test units should focus on the four diagnostic projectile points. Additional test units amounting to 20% of the initial grid unit total around each point should be excavated between the points to further document the artifact distribution. Finally, test units amounting to 10% of the initial grid unit totals should be excavated on the periphery of the initial test units centres on the projectile points to sample the site periphery. Archaeologists will also engage with First Nation groups expressing interest in the archaeological resources of the area, as per Engaging Aboriginal Communities in Archaeology (Government of Ontario 2010).

All units should be excavated into the first five centimetres of subsoil unless a cultural feature is uncovered. Any features identified during the Stage 3 assessment should have their plan view drawn; each feature should be covered with geotextile fabric prior to backfilling. All soil excavated from the test units will be screened through six millimetre hardware cloth to facilitate the recovery of artifacts that may be present. The recovered artifacts will be tagged in the field by their provenience unit and returned to the laboratory for washing, cataloguing and analysis.

Based on the information contained in the report, the ministry is satisfied that the fieldwork and reporting for the archaeological assessment are consistent with the ministry's 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists and the terms and conditions for archaeological licences. This report has been entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports. Please note that the ministry makes no representation or warranty as to the completeness, accuracy or quality of reports in the register.

Should you require any further information regarding this matter, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Shari Prowse
Archaeology Review Officer

cc. Archaeology Licensing Officer
Julian Novick, Wastell Homes
Susan Galloway, Elgin County, Land Division

¹In no way will the ministry be liable for any harm, damages, costs, expenses, losses, claims or actions that may result: (a) if the Report(s) or its recommendations are discovered to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent; or (b) from the issuance of this letter. Further measures may need to be taken in the event that additional artifacts or archaeological sites are identified or the Report(s) is otherwise found to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent.