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Executive Summary

A Stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessment was previously conducted by Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants Inc. (TMHC) for a roughly 42.31 hectare rural agricultural parcel, falling within Lot 29, Broken Front Concession in the Geographic Township of West Oxford, now in the Township of Southwest Oxford, Oxford County, Ontario. Johnston Brothers (Bothwell) Ltd. is proposing to license the area for aggregate extraction and hired TMHC to carry out an archaeological assessment as a standard condition of the aggregate licensing approval process, under the Aggregate Resources Act, R.S.O. 1990. William Bradshaw, P.Eng., is coordinating the licensing application on behalf of the proponent. The purpose of this work was to determine whether there are any archaeological resources present on the property that may be adversely affected by the proposed change in land use. The Stage 2 field survey resulted in the discovery of 8 archaeological find spots, two of which (Location A – AgHf-57 and Location E – AgHf-58) meet provincial standards for Stage 3 testing. It was decided to revise the subject property to remove Location E (AgHf-58) from the proposed licensing area. As such, Location E (AgHf-58) is no longer of concern for this project. The Stage 3 testing for Location A – AgHf-57 was undertaken by TMHC in the summer of 2015. This report describes the results of the Stage 3 archaeological assessment.

A Stage 3 archaeological assessment was carried out in keeping with the 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists. The Stage 3 work consisted of a CSP at a one-metre interval, followed by the excavation of seven one-metre test units across the site area. One flake fragment of Onondaga chert was recovered from the unit excavation. No potential cultural features were identified.

Based on the absence of cultural features and presence of a single flake, we conclude that Location A (AgHf-57) is a pre-contact period findspot that is has an Early Archaic period affiliation based on the recovery of a bifurcate base projectile point during the Stage 2 archaeological assessment.

As Location A (AgHf-57) does not meet the provincial criteria for cultural heritage value or interest, no further work is recommended and the site area should be considered free of archaeological concern.

These recommendations are subject to report review and acceptance by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport and to the provisions established in Section 4.0 of this report.
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1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT

1.1 Development Context

1.1.1 Introduction

A Stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessment was previously conducted by Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants Inc. (TMHC) for a roughly 42.31 hectare rural agricultural parcel, falling within Lot 29, Broken Front Concession in the Geographic Township of West Oxford, now in the Township of Southwest Oxford, Oxford County, Ontario. Johnston Brothers (Bothwell) Ltd. is proposing to license the area for aggregate extraction and hired TMHC to carry out an archaeological assessment as a standard condition of the aggregate licensing approval process, under the Aggregate Resources Act, R.S.O. 1990. William Bradshaw, P.Eng., is coordinating the licensing application on behalf of the proponent. The purpose of this work was to determine whether there are any archaeological resources present on the property that may be adversely affected by the proposed change in land use. The Stage 2 field resulted in the discovery of 8 archaeological find spots, two of which (Location A – AgHf-57 and Location E – AgHf-58) meet provincial standards for Stage 3 testing. It was decided to revise the subject property to remove Location E (AgHf-58) from the proposed licencing area. As such, Location E (AgHf-58) is no longer of concern for this project. The Stage 3 testing for Location A – AgHf-57 was undertaken by TMHC in the summer of 2015. This report describes the results of the Stage 3 archaeological assessment.

All archaeological consulting activities were performed under the Professional Archaeological License of Tomasz Porawski, M.A. (P1075) and in accordance with the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011). Permission to enter the property and carry out all required archaeological work, including collecting artifacts when present, was given by William Bradshaw, agent for the proponent.

1.1.2 Purpose and Legislative Context

The Ontario Heritage Act makes provisions for the protection and conservation of heritage resources in the Province of Ontario. Heritage concerns are recognized as a matter of provincial interest in Section 2.6.2 of the Provincial Policy Statement which stipulates that municipalities shall have regard for the conservation of features of
significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological or scientific interest. The purpose of a Stage 1 background study is to determine if there is potential for cultural resources to be found on a property for which a change in land use is pending. It is used to determine the need for a Stage 2 field assessment involving the search for archaeological sites. In accordance with Provincial Policy Statement 2.6, if significant sites are found, a strategy (usually avoidance, preservation or excavation) must be put forth for their mitigation.

The Aggregate Resources Act, R.S.O. 1990, also calls for the conservation of heritage resources and all class-specific license applications filed with the Ministry of Natural Resources must provide technical reports that outline measures for the identification and mitigation of archaeological resources within proposed extraction areas. Thus, cultural heritage resources must be considered within the licensing approval process. Aggregate extraction may only take place on properties that have been cleared of archaeological concern. A Stage 1 background review is carried out to determine if there is potential for the discovery of archaeological sites within a proposed licensed area. If a property demonstrates archaeological potential, a Stage 2 field survey must be carried out. If potentially significant sites are found during the field review, subsequent Stage 3 and Stage 4 assessments may be required.

1.2 Archaeological Context

1.2.1 Overview and Physical Setting

The subject property is a roughly 42.31 hectare rural agricultural parcel fronting the south side of Hamilton Road east of the community of Putnam and encompasses part of Lot 29, Broken Front Concession in the Geographic Township of West Oxford, now in the Township of Southwest Oxford, Oxford County. The subject property is bounded to the north by Hamilton Road, to the west by Five Points Line, to the south by Thomas Road and to the east by a fence/field line that separates the agricultural field from a food processing plant and associated lands (Maps 1 to 3). The property consists primarily of a cultivated agricultural field, where the general topography of the property is generally flat with small knolls throughout. The parcel also contains an existing farmstead near Hamilton Road. The farmstead is accessed via a laneway leading from the road to a yellow brick farm house. Behind and south of the house rests a number of outbuildings. Additional barns were recently demolished and are now represented by piles of debris and areas of extensive ground alterations. A hollowed out burning pit is also present alongside the demolition debris. A small watercourse (Michael Sheenan Drain) runs near to the southern property boundary and the parcel’s southeast corner. Small associated slivers of related scrubland are present along the subject property boundaries. In addition, there is a small overgrown area near the southwest corner of the property that was described by residents as a “borrow pit”. This feature is partially fenced and contains a formerly cut face; it is likely a small historic wayside type pit used for gravel extraction. It is surrounded by slivers of overgrown grass, trees and bushes. A railway bed lies to the
south of Thomas Road, about 60 metres south of the southern boundary of the property. The lands south of Thomas Road are generally overgrown and wet, except for a few residential lots along the roadway. This general area is still primarily rural, but contains a number of active and rehabilitated aggregate pits, farmsteads and commercial businesses and industrial complexes.

The project lands fall within the Oxford Till Plain physiographic region, as defined by Chapman and Putnam (1984:143) and within a spillway that separates drumlinized till plains to the north from the Mount Elgin Ridges to the south (Map 4). The earliest of the glacial spillways laid down beds of silt and fine sand whereas later, when water levels lowered, gravelly alluvium was deposited over the lower parts of the basin and along the Thames River. For some time now the basin’s sand and gravel deposits have been used for aggregate extraction (Chapman and Putnam 1984:146). The soils within the subject property are Burford sandy loam (Map 5), a well-draining soil consisting of loam and sandy loam material overlying coarse gravel and developed on outwash and deltaic deposits (Wicklund and Richards 1961). The underlying bedrock is Norfolk formation grey and brown limestone (Wicklund and Richards 1961:9). The subject property falls within the South Thames River watershed. The main branch of the river is roughly 750 metres to the north. A Thames tributary, Reynolds Creek, runs through the main intersection in Putnam and several small tributaries (some channelized) flow from the east and run in proximity to the subject property. The Michael Sheanan Drain runs along the southern boundary and the Coleman Creek Drain flows to the south. These drain west to empty into the Alex Wallis Drain, which eventually empties into Reynolds Creek in Putnam (Map 6).

1.2.2 Summary of Registered or Known Archaeological Sites

According to the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database (OASD) (request results received May 29, 2015), there are two registered archaeological site within one kilometre the subject property. Both of these were discovered during a Stage 2 archaeological assessment conducted by Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants Inc. (TMHC) for a proposed aggregate pit on the opposite side of Hamilton Road. The first site, AgHf-48, was a small native site of undetermined age, function and cultural affiliation. Stage 3 testing on two positive test pits revealed no further artifacts. The second site, AgHf-49, was an isolated find of a single native artifact, a Late Archaic/Early Woodland transition Perkiomen Broad Point (Justice 1987:169-170). No further work was recommended for this site (TMHC 2010a, b). Additional 19th century domestic sites and native sites exist in the vicinity of Putnam and just beyond the 1 km radius.

1.2.3 Summary of Past Archaeological Investigations Within 50 Metres

During the course of this assessment it was established that there has been one previous archaeological assessment within 50 metres of the subject property. As the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport currently does not maintain an inventory of
archaeological assessment areas per se, it cannot be confirmed if his is a complete inventory of work undertaken within 50 metres of the subject property. However, it is known that many of the existing aggregate properties in the immediate vicinity were licensed prior to the requirement for archaeological assessment and therefore, this inventory would appear to be reasonable accurate.

The archaeological assessment referred to resulted in the discovery of AgHf-48 and AgHf-49. In 2010, Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants Inc. undertook a Stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessment of an adjacent North Dorchester Township property in support of a pending aggregate license application. A combined test pit and pedestrian survey resulted in the documentation of four archaeological find spots, designated Locations 1 through 4. Location 1 (AgHf-48) consisted of two positive test pits yielding three pieces of chipping detritus. Location 2 consisted of two positive test pits with a small number of 19th century artifacts, while Location 3 (AgHf-49) was a fragmentary Perkiomen Broad Point (Justice 1987:169-170). The last location consisted of an isolated flake. Location 1 was recommended for further assessment. The results of this assessment were presented in a report entitled Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment, Proposed Aggregate Pit, Erwin Property, Part of Lot 1, Concession A SRT, Geographic Township of North Dorchester, Municipality of Thames Centre, Middlesex County, Ontario (PIF: P083-071-2010; Arthur Figura, licensee, P083; October 2010) (TMHC 2010a).

As a follow up to the Stage 2 fieldwork, Stage 3 testing was undertaken on AgHf-48 later in the fall of 2010. This consisted of the excavation of eight one-metre test units surrounding the positive test pits. The Stage 3 fieldwork did not result in the discovery of additional artifacts and Stage 4 mitigation was not recommended. A summary of the latter investigation was presented in a report entitled Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment, Proposed Aggregate Pit, Erwin Property, Part of Lot 1, Concession A SRT, Geographic Township of North Dorchester, Municipality of Thames Centre, Middlesex County, Ontario (PIF: P083-078-2010; Arthur Figura, licensee, P083; November 2010) (TMHC 2010b).

Archaeological Work Pertaining to the Current Project

TMHC conducted a Stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessment for a roughly 42.31 hectare rural agricultural parcel falling within Lot 29, Broken Front Concession in the Geographic Township of West Oxford, now in the Township of Southwest Oxford, Oxford County, Ontario, in the summer of 2015. This work was conducted as a standard condition of the aggregate licensing approval process to determine whether there are any archaeological resources present on the property that may be adversely affected by extracting the aggregate from the area. The Stage 1 background study determined that the subject property had potential for the discovery of archaeological resources, as indicated by the proximity of a water source (a tributary of Reynolds Creek), a registered archaeological site (AgHf-48), and of historic transportation routes (Five Points Road, Hamilton Road, Thomas Road). As such, a Stage 2 field assessment consisting of a
combined pedestrian and test pit survey at a five metre transect interval was recommended. The Stage 2 work resulted in the identification of eight archaeological locations (Locations A-H). Of the eight sites, Location A (AgHf-57) and Location E (AgHf-58) were recommended for a Stage 3 archaeological assessment; however, Location E (AgHf-58) was removed from the proposed licencing area and is no longer of concern for the project.

At the time of discovery, Location A (AgHg-57) consisted of a single Early Archaic bifurcate base projectile point that was located in the agricultural field during the pedestrian survey. The intensification did not identify any additional artifacts. Therefore, Location A (AgHf-57) was considered an Early Archaic period findspot and met the provincial requirement for a Stage 3 archaeological assessment.

The Stage 1 and 2 report recommended that the Stage 3 work should consist of (TMHC 2015):

*the controlled surface collection of artifacts (under conditions of 80% surface visibility) followed by the hand excavation of one-metre units in the vicinity of the find. Given the small size of the find spot, units should be excavated at every five metres across the site, with an additional 20% of units placed in areas of interest. Given this is a single component Early Archaic site, as per Section 3.2.2, a sample of 20% of the total number of units should be excavated with 3 mm hardware cloth, with the remain units excavated using 6 mm screen.*

The results of this assessment were presented in a report entitled *Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment, Proposed Aggregate Pit, Part of Lot 29, Broken Front Concession, Geographic Township of West Oxford, Now the Township of Southwest Oxford, Oxford County, Ontario* (PIF P1075-0001-2015; Tomasz Porawski, licensee, P1075; TMHC 2015).

### 1.2.4 Dates of Archaeological Fieldwork

The Stage 3 CSP was conducted on June 15th, 2015, and the Stage 3 unit excavation was conducted on June 25th, 2015. The weather conditions were warm and sunny on both days.

### 1.3 Historical Context

#### 1.3.1 First Peoples Settlement in Oxford County

The previous Stage 1 and 2 assessment report (TMHC 2015) provided a detailed summary of pre- and early-post contact First Peoples’ settlement in the Oxford County. As such, the same information is only provided in tabular format here (Table 1).
Table 1: Cultural Chronology for First Peoples Settlement in Oxford County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Time Range (circa)</th>
<th>Diagnostic Features</th>
<th>Complexes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paleoindian</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>9000 - 8400 B.C.</td>
<td>fluted projectile points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>8400 - 8000 B.C.</td>
<td>non-fluted and lanceolate points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>8000 - 6000 B.C.</td>
<td>serrated, notched, bifurcate base points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>6000 - 2500 B.C.</td>
<td>stemmed, side &amp; corner notched points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>2000 - 1800 B.C.</td>
<td>narrow points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1800 - 1500 B.C.</td>
<td>broad points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1500 - 1100 B.C.</td>
<td>small points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal</td>
<td></td>
<td>1100 - 950 B.C.</td>
<td>first true cemeteries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>950 - 400 B.C.</td>
<td>expanding-stemmed points, Vinette pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>400 B.C. - A.D. 500</td>
<td>dentate, pseudo-scallop pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>Early Iroquoian</td>
<td>A.D. 900 - 1300</td>
<td>first corn, cord-wrapped stack pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Iroquoian</td>
<td>A.D. 1300 - 1400</td>
<td>first villages, corn horticulture, longhouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late Iroquoian</td>
<td>A.D. 1400 - 1650</td>
<td>large villages and houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>A.D. 1700 - 1875</td>
<td>tribal emergence, territoriality, first European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>treatments, mixture of Native &amp; European items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td></td>
<td>A.D. 1796 - present</td>
<td>English goods, homesteads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.2 Historic Euro-Canadian and Municipal Settlement

The previous Stage 1 and 2 assessment report (TMHC 2015) provided a detailed summary of historic Euro-Canadian and municipal settlement. As such, it is not repeated here, although the specific details about known historic settlement and land use within the subject property are provided.

Based on the 1857 Tremaine’s map (Map 7), the subject property falls within historic lots 29 and 30 of the Broken Front Concession. The relevant portion of Lot 29 is shown as owned by W. Parnell in 1857, with Lot 30 owned by R. Ingram. Lot 30 is curious. Modern maps of assessment parts and lots and concessions no longer recognize a Lot 30 in the Broken Front Concession. An inventory of land registry records for Oxford County compiled by the local chapter of the Ontario Genealogical Society also does not list an entry for a Lot 30 BF. Nonetheless, the Topographical and Historical Atlas of the County of Oxford (Map 8) also shows a Lot 30, Broken Front. On that 1876 map, the owner of the east portion of the subject property, comprising Lot 29, is listed as James Adams. Lot 30 is shown as divided into two long, narrow parcels, with the most westerly owned by R. Frary (Trary) and the easterly by R. Ingram. No structures are shown within these properties on either the 1857 or 1876 maps, although the maps for West Oxford Township do not generally show this level of detail. Both maps also show the location of Hamilton Road much further north than it is currently. Strangely, the 1876 map also depicts the Credit Valley Railway passing to the south of Hamilton Road. This railway was never built and the feature is not shown on the Middlesex County mapping for the adjacent section of North Dorchester Township. Therefore, the accuracy of the Oxford county maps is questioned.
The Crown patent for Lot 29, Broken Front was awarded to Samuel Canfield (Canfield) Jr. on December 31, 1798. Canfield was the son of an American born yeoman and former Captain in the American Revolutionary War. In the late 1700s Canfield Sr. moved to Canada from Connecticut and obtained land. He died in Woodstock in 1813. Canfield Jr. lived in Ingersoll in the 1850s, as indicated by census records. The 1852 Gazetteer lists him living on Lot 18, Concession 18 (Shenston 1852). It is not known if he ever lived on Lot 29. There is no record of a crown patent for Lot 30, Broken Front Concession.

The subject property has remained in agricultural use since the time of its originally clearing in the 19th century.

2.0 STAGE 3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT

Stage 3 assessment was undertaken for four sites, Location A (AgHf-57). Consultation was undertaken with Malcolm Horne of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport regarding the previous Stage 2 results and appropriate strategies for Stage 3 assessment.

2.1 Field Methods

The site location was re-identified in the field using the Stage 2 field notes and recorded landscape markers, and the GPS coordinates collected at the time of survey. The site area was subject to a pedestrian survey at a one metre transect interval or less, under conditions of good weathering and 80% surface visibility or better. The Stage 3 assessment was undertaken immediately following the Stage 2 pedestrian survey and therefore good surface conditions still remained and the field did not require re-ploughing. When artifacts were identified on the surface, these were flagged and their location mapped using a Topcon GRS-1 RTK GPS/Glonass Network Rover, a high precision survey unit that advertises subcentimetre accuracy. Survey continued for a minimum of 20 metres beyond all artifacts identified on the surface. Each artifact or immediate cluster of artifacts that was mapped was given a unique station or point identifier for use in cataloguing and in preparing a detailed surface distribution map. All work was done in good weather and lighting conditions; there were no factors that inhibited the recognition and recovery of archaeological material.

Following the mapping of surface artifacts, datum points were established (D1 at 500N 300E:1 and D2 at 495N 300E:1) and a five metre grid was laid out over the maximum extent of the Stage 2 and Stage 3 surface scatter using a total station, measuring tapes and the triangulation method. The grid was oriented towards magnetic north. Grid stakes were used to mark five metre intervals along the north and east transect lines. Each five by five metre grid unit was assigned a unique alphanumeric identifier based on north and east grid references of the southwest corner. Each major grid unit was then subdivided into 25 individual one-metre squares that were given sub-unit
designations of 1 to 25 by working sequentially from west to east along each row, then moving northward (Appendix A).

The ploughzone from each one-metre unit was excavated by hand and passed through 6 mm hardware cloth; the same process was carried out for the first 5 cm of subsoil, unless subsurface features were identified. In the case of the latter, these were mapped and photographed, covered with geotextile and not excavated, although the unit containing the feature was backfilled. Artifacts were bagged by one-metre provenience units and observed soil layer (when appropriate) and taken to the laboratory for processing. For each one-metre unit, artifacts belonging to the same class were grouped and given a single catalogue number. When unit excavation was completed, the squares were backfilled. Photographs of representative Stage 3 units were also taken.

As AgHf-57 has a confirm Early Archaic component, the soils from a sample of the units were required to be passed through a 3mm hardware cloth. To ensure a representative and consistent sample is taken, we screened the unit above the Stage 2 findspot and a quadrant (25%) of the four cardinal units with the 3mm mesh to ensure a consistent sample. This was opposed to “20% of units.”

2.2 Record of Finds

The Stage 3 CSP did not identify any additional artifacts on the ground surface. As such, the Stage 3 unit excavation was focused on the location of the original Stage 2 findspot. A total of seven one-metre units were excavated during the Stage 3 archaeological assessment: five on the grid at a five metre interval surrounding the original findspot and two infill units placed surrounding the original findspot. The units contained between 25cm and 33cm (average 28cm) of stone filled brown sandy loam over orange/brown clay sand subsoil. Six of the excavated Stage 3 units contained no artifacts. One piece of flake fragment of Onondaga chert was recovered from 505N 300E:1. No other artifacts or potential cultural features were identified during the Stage 3 archaeological assessment.

Table 2: Location A (AgHf-57) Stage 3 Artifact Catalogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Layer/Depth</th>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>505N 300E:1</td>
<td>pz, 0-25cm</td>
<td>chipping detritus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Onondaga; flake fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Documentary Records

- Field notes, field maps and photo logs June 25, 2015
- Photo catalogue – June 25 (P1090182-99)
- Artifacts are bagged individually with paper labels, and sorted into larger bags according to location and organized by catalogue number.
  - Bag 1: Johnston Bros. – Erwin Pit, 2015-039, Stage 3, AgHf-57, Location A, All Artifacts
- Bags are located within a “Various Small Projects completed 2015” banker’s box, along with other small projects. This box is currently being stored at our location in London, Ontario, N6G 3M6.

2.3 Analysis and Conclusions

A Stage 3 archaeological assessment was carried out in keeping with the 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists. The Stage 3 work consisted of a CSP at a one-metre interval, followed by the excavation of seven one-metre test units across the site area. One flake fragment of Onondaga chert was recovered from the unit excavation. No potential cultural features were identified.

Based on the absence of cultural features and presence of a single flake, we conclude that Location A (AgHf-57) is a pre-contact period findspot that is has an Early Archaic period affiliation based on the recovery of a bifurcate base projectile point during the Stage 2 archaeological assessment. As no cultural features and only a single flake was recovered during the Stage 3 archaeological assessment, we conclude that Location A (AgHf-57) does not meet the provincial criteria for further cultural heritage value or interest and has been adequately documented through the assessment work conducted to date.

2.4 Recommendations

As Location A (AgHf-57) does not meet the provincial criteria for cultural heritage value or interest, no further work is recommended and the site area should be considered free of archaeological concern.

These recommendations are subject to report review and acceptance by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport and to the provisions established in Section 4.0 of this report.

3.0 SUMMARY

A Stage 3 archaeological assessment was conducted Location A (AgHf-57) located within the municipal lot currently designated Lot 29, Broken Front Concession in the Geographic Township of West Oxford, now in the Township of Southwest Oxford, in Oxford County, Ontario. The Stage 3 work consisted of a CSP and the excavation of seven one-metre test units across the site area, and a single flake fragment of Onondaga chert was recovered during the Stage 3 archaeological assessment. Location A (AgHf-57)
is a pre-contact period findspot that is has an Early Archaic period affiliation based on the recovery of a bifurcate base projectile point during the Stage 2 archaeological assessment. As Location A (AgHf-57) does not meet the provincial criteria for cultural heritage value or interest, no further work is recommended and the site area should be considered free of archaeological concern.

4.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION

This report is submitted to the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport 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 Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, a letter will be issued by the ministry stating that there are no further concerns with regard to alterations to archaeological sites by the proposed development.

It is an offence under Sections 48 and 69 of the Ontario Heritage Act for any party other than a licensed archaeologist to make any alteration to a known archaeological site or to remove any artifact or other physical evidence of past human use or activity from the site, until such time as a licensed archaeologist has completed archaeological 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.

Should previously undocumented (i.e., unknown or deeply buried) 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. Further, archaeological sites recommended for further archaeological fieldwork or protection remain subject to Section 48 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act and may not be altered, or have artifacts removed from them, except by a person holding an archaeological licence.

The Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33 requires that any person discovering human remains must notify the police or coroner and the Registrar of Cemeteries at the Ministry of Small Business and Consumer Services. The Registrar of Cemeteries, Cemeteries Regulation Unit can be reached at (416)326-8404 or (416)326-8393.
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APPENDIX A: Illustration of Grid Coordinate System

example: subsquare 25 in five by five metre grid unit would be labelled 500N 300E:25