

Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport

Culture Programs Unit  
Programs and Services Branch  
Culture Division  
401 Bay Street, Suite 1700  
Toronto ON M7A 0A7  
Tel.: (416)-314-7691  
Email: Ian.Hember@ontario.ca

Ministère du Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport

Unité des programmes culturels  
Direction des programmes et des services  
Division de culture  
401, rue Bay, bureau 1700  
Toronto ON M7A 0A7  
Tél. : (416)-314-7691  
Email: Ian.Hember@ontario.ca



January 22, 2013

Scott Martin  
Golder Associates Ltd  
309 Exeter Road, Unit 1  
London, Ontario  
N6L 1C1

**RE: Review and Entry into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports: Archaeological Assessment Report Entitled, “Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, NextEra East Durham Wind Energy Project, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Glenelg, now West Grey Township, Grey County, Ontario,” Revised Report Dated 20 December 2012, Received by MTC Toronto Office on 4 January 2013, MTC Project Information Form Number P218-274-2012, MTCS RIMS Number HD00533**

Dear Scott:

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 assessment of the study area as depicted in Figures 3-0 through 3-11 of the above titled report and recommends the following:

*The Stage 2 archaeological assessment of the East Durham Wind Energy Project resulted in the identification of three Euro-Canadian historic archaeological sites. Recommendations for each location are found below.*

#### **5.1 Location 1 (BbHd-3)**

<sup>1</sup>*In 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.*

The Stage 2 assessment of Location 1 (BbHd-3) revealed a spatially discrete cluster of mid to late 19th century historic Euro-Canadian cultural material. The entire Stage 2 surface scatter was identified within the surveyed area and did not extend beyond the surveyed area. The most common type of artifact recovered from Location 1 (BbHd-3) was mid-to-late 19th century ironstone ceramics (n=54). The presence of more than 20 artifacts dating the period of use prior to 1900 lends cultural heritage value or interest to the site. Based on this consideration, the artifacts identified fulfill the criteria for a Stage 3 archaeological investigation as per Section 2.2 Standard 1c of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011b), to further evaluate its cultural heritage value or interest. Given this, it is recommended that Location 1 (BbHd-3) be subject to a Stage 3 assessment prior to any ground disturbance activities to further test the nature and density of the site. The Stage 3 assessment should employ both the controlled surface pick-up and hand excavated test unit methodology as outlined in Sections 3.2 and 3.3, as well as Table 3.1, of the MTCS' Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011b). Prior to conducting the field work, the area will need to be re-ploughed and allowed to weather for the controlled surface pick-up. The test unit excavation should consist of one metre by one metre square test units laid out in a systematic grid and should be excavated by hand to a depth of five centimetres within the subsoil. Site specific land registry research to supplement the previous background study concerning the land use and occupation history specific to Location 1 (BbHd-3) should also be conducted as part of the Stage 3 assessment.

#### 5.2 Location 2 (BbHd-4)

The Stage 2 assessment of Location 2 (BbHd-4) revealed a spatially discrete cluster of mid-to-late 19th century historic Euro-Canadian cultural material. The most common type of artifact recovered from Location 2 (BbHd-4) was mid to late 19th century ironstone ceramics (n=54). The presence of more than 20 artifacts dating the period of use prior to 1900 lends cultural heritage value or interest to the site. Based on this consideration, the artifacts identified fulfill the criteria for a Stage 3 archaeological investigation as per Section 2.2 Standard 1c of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011b), to further evaluate its cultural heritage value or interest. Given this, it is recommended that Location 2 (BbHd-4) be subject to a Stage 3 assessment prior to any ground disturbance activities to further test the nature and density of the site. The Stage 3 assessment should employ both the controlled surface pick-up and hand excavated test unit methodology as outlined in Sections 3.2 and 3.3, as well as Table 3.1, of the MTCS' Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011b). Prior to conducting the field work, the area will need to be re-ploughed and allowed to weather for the controlled surface pick-up. The test unit excavation should consist of one metre by one metre square test units laid out in a systematic grid and should be excavated by hand to a depth of five centimetres within the subsoil. Site specific land registry research to supplement the previous background study concerning the land use and occupation history specific to Location 2 (BbHd-4) should also be conducted as part of the Stage 3 assessment.

The boundaries of the Stage 2 surface scatter to the south and north were identified within the surveyed area; along the eastern edge of the surveyed area the surface topography slopes down to a poorly drained area, making it unlikely the scatter extends to the east beyond the surveyed area. To the west of the surface scatter is a pasture that was not a part of the construction disturbance area and was therefore not subject to Stage 2 survey; it is unknown if the surface scatter extends into this area to the west. The Stage 3 assessment should include the hand excavation of units in the area subject to Stage 2 survey and extending to the west to ensure the nature and extent of the entire site is documented.

### 5.3 Location 3 (BbHe-2)

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 3 (BbHe-2) revealed a spatially discrete cluster of mid-to-late 19th century historic Euro-Canadian cultural material. The most common type of artifact recovered from Location 3 (BbHe-2) was mid to late 19th century ironstone ceramics (n=90). The presence of more than 20 artifacts dating the period of use prior to 1900 lends cultural heritage value or interest to the site. Based on this consideration, the artifacts identified fulfill the criteria for a Stage 3 archaeological investigation as per Section 2.2 Standard 1c of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011b), to further evaluate its cultural heritage value or interest. Given this, it is recommended that Location 3 (BbHe-2) be subject to a Stage 3 assessment prior to any ground disturbance activities to further test the nature and density of the site. The Stage 3 assessment should employ both the controlled surface pick-up and hand excavated test unit methodology as outlined in Sections 3.2 and 3.3, as well as Table 3.1, of the MTCS' Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011b). Prior to conducting the field work, the area will need to be re-ploughed and allowed to weather for the controlled surface pick-up. The test unit excavation should consist of one metre by one metre square test units laid out in a systematic grid and should be excavated by hand to a depth of five centimetres within the subsoil. Site specific land registry research to supplement the previous background study concerning the land use and occupation history specific to Location 3 (BbHe-2) should also be conducted as part of the Stage 3 assessment.*

*The boundaries of the surface scatter to the north and east were identified within the surveyed area; along the western and southern margins of the surface scatter is a pasture that was not a part of the construction disturbance area and was therefore not subject to Stage 2 survey; it is expected the surface scatter extends into this area. The Stage 3 assessment should include the hand excavation of units in the area subject to Stage 2 survey and extending to the west to ensure the nature and extent of the entire site is documented.*

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,

Ian Hember  
Archaeology Review Officer

- c. Thomas Bird Environmental, Services Project Manager, NextEra Energy Canada,  
Mansoor Mahmood, Director, Environmental Approvals Branch, Ministry of the  
Environment