1.0 PROJECT REPORT COVER PAGE

LICENSEE INFORMATION:

Contact Information:	Michael B. Henry CD BA FRAI FRSA Southwestern District Office 237 Sanders Street East Exeter, N0M 1S1 Phone: (419) 432-4435 Email: mhenry@amick.ca www.amick.ca
Licensee:	Michael B. Henry CD BA FRAI FRSA
Ontario Archaeology Licence:	P058

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Corporate Project Number:	2020-168
MHSTCI Project Number:	P058-1931-2020
Investigation Type:	Stage 1-2 Archaeological Property Assessment
Project Name:	South Fergus MESP & Secondary Plan
Project Location:	7856 2nd Line, Fergus, Part of Lots 11, 12 & 14, & All of Lot 13, Concession 2, (Geographic Township of Nichol), Township of Centre Wellington, County of Wellington
Project Designation Number:	Not Currently Available

MHSTCI FILING INFORMATION:

Site Record/Update Form(s):	N/A
Date of Report Filing:	15 August 2021
Type of Report:	**ORIGINAL**

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report describes the results of the 2020 & 2021 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 7856 2nd Line, Fergus, Part of Lots 11, 12 & 14, & All of Lot 13, Concession 2, (Geographic Township of Nichol), Township of Centre Wellington, County of Wellington, conducted by AMICK Consultants Limited. This study was conducted under Professional Archaeologist License #P058 issued to Michael Henry by the Minister of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries for the Province of Ontario. This assessment was undertaken as a requirement under the Planning Act (RSO 1990) and the Provincial Policy Statement (2020) in order to support a Draft Plan of Subdivision and companion Zoning By-law Amendment application as part of the pre-submission process. Within the land use planning and development context, Ontario Regulation 544/06 under the Planning Act (1990b) requires an evaluation of archaeological potential and, where applicable, an archaeological assessment report completed by an archaeologist licensed by the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI). Policy 2.6 of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS 2020) addresses archaeological resources. All work was conducted in conformity with Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture (MTC) Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011), the Ontario Heritage Act (RSO 1990a).

AMICK Consultants Limited was engaged by the proponent to undertake a Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of lands potentially affected by the proposed undertaking and was granted permission to carry out archaeological fieldwork. The entirety of the study area was subject to property inspection and photographic documentation concurrently with the Stage 2 Property Assessment by high intensity test pit methodology at a five-metre interval between individual test pits, test pit methodology at ten metre intervals to confirm disturbance and by high intensity pedestrian survey at an interval of five metres between individual transects on 15,16, 18, 19 & 20 November 2020 and 5 April 2021. All records, documentation, field notes, photographs and artifacts (as applicable) related to the conduct and findings of these investigations are held at the Southwestern District corporate offices of AMICK Consultants Limited until such time that they can be transferred to an agency or institution approved by the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) on behalf of the government and citizens of Ontario.

STAGE 2 RECOMMENDATIONS:

As a result of the Stage 2 Property Assessment of the study area, no archaeological resources were encountered. Consequently, the following recommendations are made:

1. *No further archaeological assessment of the study area is warranted;*
2. *The Provincial interest in archaeological resources with respect to the proposed undertaking has been addressed;*
3. *The proposed undertaking is clear of any archaeological concern.*

3.0 TABLE OF CONTENTS

4.0 PROJECT PERSONNEL

AMICK CONSULTANTS LIMITED PARTNERS
Michael Henry (MHSTCI Professional Archaeologist Licence #P058)
Marilyn Cornies (MHSTCI Professional Archaeologist Licence #P038)

PROJECT COORDINATOR
Michael Henry (MHSTCI Professional Archaeologist Licence #P058)

PROJECT LICENSEE ARCHAEOLOGIST
Michael Henry (MHSTCI Professional Archaeologist Licence #P058)

PROJECT FIELD DIRECTORS
Katrina Mason (MHSTCI Applied Research Archaeologist Licence #R1226)
Michael Henry (MHSTCI Professional Archaeologist Licence #P058)
Marilyn Cornies (MHSTCI Professional Archaeologist Licence #P038)

PROJECT FIELD ASSISTANTS
Jessica Watson Ryan Crowe Garrett Gribbin

PROJECT REPORT PREPARATION
Katrina Mason (MHSTCI Applied Research Archaeologist Licence #R1226)

PROJECT GRAPHICS
Katrina Mason (MHSTCI Applied Research Archaeologist Licence #R1226)

PROJECT PHOTOGRAPHY
Katrina Mason (MHSTCI Applied Research Archaeologist Licence #R1226)

5.0 PROJECT CONTEXT

5.1 DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

This report describes the results of the 2020 & 2021 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 7856 2nd Line, Fergus, Part of Lots 11, 12 & 14, & All of Lot 13, Concession 2, (Geographic Township of Nichol), Township of Centre Wellington, County of Wellington, conducted by AMICK Consultants Limited. This study was conducted under Professional Archaeologist License #P058 issued to Michael Henry by the Minister of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries for the Province of Ontario. This assessment was undertaken as a requirement under the Planning Act (RSO 1990) and the Provincial Policy Statement (2020) in order to support a Draft Plan of Subdivision and companion Zoning By-law Amendment application as part of the pre-submission process. Within the land use planning and development context, Ontario Regulation 544/06 under the Planning Act (1990b) requires an evaluation of archaeological potential and, where applicable, an archaeological assessment report completed by an archaeologist licensed by the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI). Policy 2.6 of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS 2020) addresses archaeological resources. All work was conducted in conformity with Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture (MTC) Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011), the Ontario Heritage Act (RSO 1990a).

AMICK Consultants Limited was engaged by the proponent to undertake a Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of lands potentially affected by the proposed undertaking and was granted permission to carry out archaeological fieldwork. The entirety of the study area was subject to property inspection and photographic documentation concurrently with the Stage 2 Property Assessment by high intensity test pit methodology at a five-metre interval between individual test pits, test pit methodology at ten metre intervals to confirm disturbance and by high intensity pedestrian survey at an interval of five metres between individual transects on 15,16, 18, 19 & 20 November 2020 and 5 April 2021. All records, documentation, field notes, photographs and artifacts (as applicable) related to the conduct and findings of these investigations are held at the Southwestern District corporate offices of AMICK Consultants Limited until such time that they can be transferred to an agency or institution approved by the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) on behalf of the government and citizens of Ontario.

A detailed plan of the development was not available at the time of filing. A map was provided by the South Fergus Landowner Group that indicates the area will be divided into Parcels 1, 2, 3a-b, and 4a-4c. This map has been submitted together with this report to MHSTCI for review and reproduced within this report as Map 4.

5.2 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

5.2.1 PRE-CONTACT LAND-USE OUTLINE

What follows is an outline of Aboriginal occupation in the area during the Pre-Contact Era from the earliest known period, about 9000 B.C. up to approximately 1650 AD.

5.2.1.1 PALAEO-INDIAN PERIOD (APPROXIMATELY 9000-7500 B.C.)

North of Lake Ontario, evidence suggests that early occupation began around 9000 B.C. People probably began to move into this area as the glaciers retreated and glacial lake levels began to recede. The early occupation of the area probably occurred in conjunction with environmental conditions that would be comparable to modern Sub-Arctic conditions. Due to the great antiquity of these sites, and the relatively small populations likely involved, evidence of these early inhabitants is sparse and generally limited to tools produced from stone or to by-products of the manufacture of these implements.

5.2.1.2 ARCHAIC PERIOD (APPROXIMATELY 8000-1000 B.C.)

By about 8000 B.C. the gradual transition from a postglacial tundra-like environment to an essentially modern environment was largely complete. Prior to European clearance of the landscape for timber and cultivation, the area was characterized by forest. The Archaic Period is the longest and the most apparently stable of the cultural periods identified through archaeology. The Archaic Period is divided into the Early, Middle and Late Sub-Periods, each represented by specific styles in projectile point manufacture. Many more sites of this period are found throughout Ontario, than of the Palaeo-Indian Period. This is probably a reflection of two factors: the longer period of time reflected in these sites, and a greater population density. The greater population was likely the result of a more diversified subsistence strategy carried out in an environment offering a greater variety of abundant resources. (Smith 2002:58-59)

Current interpretations suggest that the Archaic Period populations followed a seasonal cycle of resource exploitation. Although similar in concept to the practices speculated for the big game hunters of the Palaeo-Indian Period, the Archaic populations utilized a much broader range of resources, particularly with respect to plants. It is suggested that in the spring and early summer, bands would gather at the mouths of rivers and at rapids to take advantage of fish spawning runs. Later in the summer and into the fall season, smaller groups would move to areas of wetlands to harvest nuts and wild rice. During the winter, they would break into yet smaller groups probably based on the nuclear family and perhaps some additional relatives to move into the interior for hunting. The result of such practices would be to create a distribution of sites across much of the landscape. (Smith 2002: 59-60).

The material culture of this period is much more extensive than that of the Palaeo-Indians. Stylistic changes between Sub-Periods and cultural groups are apparent, although the overall quality in production of chipped lithic tools seems to decline. This period sees the introduction of ground stone technology in the form of celts (axes and adzes), manos and metates for grinding nuts and fibres, and decorative items like gorgets, pendants, birdstones, and bannerstones. Bone tools are also evident from this time period. Their presence may be a result of better preservation from these more recent sites rather than a lack of such items in

earlier occupations. In addition, copper and exotic chert types appear during the period and are indicative of extensive trading (Smith 2002: 58-59).

5.2.1.3 WOODLAND PERIOD (APPROXIMATELY 1000 B.C.-1650 A.D.)

The primary difference in archaeological assemblages that differentiates the beginning of the Woodland Period from the Archaic Period is the introduction of ceramics to Ontario populations. This division is probably not a reflection of any substantive cultural changes, as the earliest sites of this period seem to be in all other respects a continuation of the Archaic mode of life with ceramics added as a novel technology. The seasonally based system of resource exploitation and associated population mobility persists for at least 1500 years into the Woodland Period. (Smith 2002: 61-62)

The Early Woodland Sub-Period dates from about 1000-400 B.C. Many of the artifacts from this time are similar to the late Archaic and suggest a direct cultural continuity between these two temporal divisions. The introduction of pottery represents and entirely new technology that was probably acquired through contact with more southerly populations from which it likely originates. (Smith 2002:62)

The Middle Woodland Sub-Period dates from about 400 B.C.-800 A.D. Within the region including the study area, a complex emerged at this time termed "Point Peninsula". Point Peninsula pottery reflects a greater sophistication in pottery manufacture compared with the earlier industry. The paste and temper of the new pottery is finer and new decorative techniques such as dentate and pseudo-scallop stamping appear. There is a noted Hopewellian influence in southern Ontario populations at this time. Hopewell influences from south of the Great Lakes include a widespread trade in exotic materials and the presence of distinct Hopewell style artifacts such as platform pipes, copper or silver panpipe covers and shark's teeth. The populations of the Middle Woodland participated in a trade network that extended well beyond the Great Lakes Region.

The Late Woodland Sub-Period dates from about 500-1650 A.D. The Late Woodland includes four separate phases: Princess Point, Early Ontario Iroquoian, Middle Ontario Iroquoian and Late Ontario Iroquoian.

The Princess Point phase dates to approximately 500-1000 A.D. Pottery of this phase is distinguished from earlier technology in that it is produced by the paddle method instead of coil and the decoration is characterized by the cord wrapped stick technique. Ceramic smoking pipes appear at this time in noticeable quantities. Princess Point sites cluster along major stream valleys and wetland areas. Maize cultivation is introduced by these people to Ontario. These people were not fully committed to horticulture and seemed to be experimenting with maize production. They generally adhere to the seasonal pattern of occupation practiced by earlier occupations, perhaps staying at certain locales repeatedly and for a larger portion of each year (Smith 2002: 65-66)

The Early Ontario Iroquoian stage dates to approximately 950-1050 A.D. This stage marks the beginning of a cultural development that led to the historically documented Ontario Iroquoian groups that were first contacted by Europeans during the early 1600s (Petun, Neutral, and Huron). At this stage formal semi-sedentary villages emerge. The Early stage of this cultural development is divided into two cultural groups in southern Ontario. The areas occupied by each being roughly divided by the Niagara Escarpment. To the west were located the Glen Meyer populations, and to the east were situated the Pickering people (Smith 2002: 67).

The Middle Ontario Iroquoian stage dates to approximately 1300-1400 A.D. This stage is divided into two sub-stages. The first is the Uren sub-stage lasting from approximately 1300-1350 A.D. The second of the two sub-stages is known as the Middleport sub-stage lasting from roughly 1350-1400 A.D. Villages tend to be larger throughout this stage than formerly (Smith 2002: 67).

The Late Ontario Iroquoian stage dates to approximately 1400-1650 A.D. During this time the cultural divisions identified by early European explorers are under development and the geographic distribution of these groups within Ontario begins to be defined.

5.2.2 General Historical Outline

In 1837 by Act of Parliament the new District of Wellington was formed and a court house and jail in the town of Guelph were authorized. The District was named after England's Duke of Wellington and initially included the counties of Wellington, Waterloo, Grey and parts of Dufferin (Wikipedia 2017).

By January 1854, Wellington County became an individual entity. At the time, it included the Townships and Towns of Amaranth, Arthur, Eramosa, Erin, Guelph, Guelph (Town), Garafraxa, Maryborough, Nichol, Peel, Pilkington, and Puslinch. Other municipalities were added between 1857 and 1881. Guelph separated in 1879 and was incorporated as a City; it lost representation on the County Council. Orangeville and Garafraxa East were annexed by Dufferin County (Wikipedia 2017).

The community of Fergus was settled in 1833 when settlers moved into the area. The town was first called “Little Falls” due to the scenic waterfalls in the area. The primary developers of the area were Adam Fergusson and James Webster. Both of these men were lawyers and in 1834 Fergusson built the first bridge in the area over the Grand River. The first house was built in 1833, a hotel in 1844 and in 1825 a sawmill, gristmill, church and school were opened. Fergusson was also the founder of the first curling club in Ontario, which was also opened in 1834. Until approximately 1850, an unwritten policy of restricted growth was implemented. Fergusson, Webster and other Scottish emigrants owned the land; therefore only people of Scottish descent could purchase village lots. However, in order to accommodate Irish settlers, Webster founded the nearby town of Arthur in 1840. Another settlement was established along what is currently known as Scotland Street. The settlers in the area were freed slaves who were part of the Pierpoint Settlement, named after Richard

Pierpoint who was a United Empire Loyalist. In 1855, a settler named James Wilson arrived and opened an oatmeal mill, flour mill, sawmill, woolen mill and a factory that supplied oatmeal for export. By this time, there was a booming economy, powered by the waterfalls on the Grand River. In 1858, the town was incorporated and renamed "Fergus" in honour of Adam Fergusson. By the year the town was incorporated, the population was 1000 but by 1869 the population had risen to 1500 (Elora & Fergus 2020).

Map 2 is a facsimile segment from the Illustrated Historical Atlas of Waterloo and Wellington Counties (Walker & Miles 1877). Map 2 illustrated the location of the study area and environs as of 1877. Lot 11 is shown to belong to J. Skock, Lot 12 is shown to belong to J. Gordon and a settlement road is shown to split the lot in half. This road is the current Highway 6. Lot 13 is shown to belong to Jason McQueen in the north half and J. Lindsay in the south half, Lot 14 is shown to belong to A.Wilkie. No structures are shown to be within any of the lots the study area is within. The surrounding lots are all owned and the town of Fergus is shown to the north of the study area. This demonstrates that the original property of which the study area is a part was settled by the time that the atlas data was compiled. Accordingly, it has been determined that there is potential for archaeological deposits related to early Post-Contact settlement within the study area. In addition, this map illustrates settlement roads adjacent to the study area to the east, west, and south as well as through the middle of Lot 12. These roads correspond to the current Guelph Street (West), Scotland Street (East), Highway 6 (through Lot 12) and 2 Line (South).

Map 3 is a facsimile segment of the Historical County Map of Wellington County (Leslie Guy 1861). Map 3 illustrates the location of the study area and environs as of 1861. Lot 11 is shown to belong to J. Skock, Lot 12 is shown to belong to Jason Gordon and a settlement road is shown to split the lot in half. This road is the current Highway 6. Lot 13 is shown to belong to Jason McQueen in the north half and Hugh McQueen in the south half, Lot 14 is shown to belong to David Wilkie. No structures are shown to be within any of the lots the study area is within. The surrounding lots are all owned and the town of Fergus is shown to the north of the study area. This demonstrates that the original property of which the study area is a part was settled by the time that the atlas data was compiled. Accordingly, it has been determined that there is potential for archaeological deposits related to early Post-Contact settlement within the study area. In addition, this map illustrates settlement roads adjacent to the study area to the east and west as well as through the middle of Lot 12. These roads correspond to the current Guelph Street (West), Scotland Street (East), Highway 6 (through Lot 12) and 2 Line (South).

It must be borne in mind that inclusion of names of property owners and depictions of structures and other features within properties on these maps were sold by subscription. Property owners paid to include information or details about their properties. While information included within these maps may provide information about the occupation of a property at a specific moment in time when the information was collected, the absence of such information does not necessarily indicate that the property was not occupied.

5.2.3 CURRENT CONDITIONS

The present use of the study area is as actively farmed agricultural land and residences. The study area is roughly 153 hectares in area. The study area includes within it mostly ploughable lands. There is a wooded area within the northern portion of the study area as well as along the southwest border. There are three residences within the study area. One is located in the western portion of the property, one is within an agricultural complex located along the southeastern border, and one along the eastern border. The residence in the western portion contains a shed and driveway that enters off of Guelph Street and continues to the residence as well as a small lawn area. Most of the lawn area at this residence is disturbed with gravel fill. The residence in the southeastern portion within the agricultural complex contains a gravel driveway off of 2 Line, a lawn, an attached garage, in-ground pool, concrete patio, and concrete pad in front of one of the two sheds, a bank barn, two silos and gravel parking area for farming equipment. The other residence along the eastern border is surrounded by lawn and a gravel driveway leads into the lot from Scotland Street. Highway 6 cuts through the centre of Lot 12. There is also an unnamed creek that flows between agricultural fields within Lot 11 and 12. The study area also contains two small streams in the meadow area within the western portion of the study area. There is a man-made pond located centrally within the study area. Sand fill soil mounds are located adjacent to the subdivision and plaza, which is likely the source of the fill. There are also permanent low-lying wet areas within the wooded area in the northern portion of the study area. The study area is bounded on the north by the town of Fergus, on the east by agricultural land and Scotland Street, on the west by Guelph Street and on the south by 2 Line. The study area is adjacent to the intersection of Highway 6 and 2 Line to the north. A plan of the study area is included within this report as Map 4. Current conditions encountered during the Stage 1-2 Property Assessment are illustrated in Map 5.

5.2.4 SUMMARY OF HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The brief overview of readily available documentary evidence indicates that the study area is situated within an area that was close to historic transportation routes and in an area well populated during the nineteenth century and therefore has potential for sites relating to early Post-Contact settlement in the region. Background research indicates the property has potential for significant archaeological resources of Native origins based on proximity to a natural source of potable water in the past.

5.3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

The Archaeological Sites Database administered by the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) indicates that there is one (1) previously documented site within 1 kilometre of the study area. However, it must be noted that this is based on the assumption of the accuracy of information compiled from numerous researchers using different methodologies over many years. AMICK Consultants Limited assumes no responsibility for the accuracy of site descriptions, interpretations such as cultural affiliation,

or location information derived from the Archaeological Sites Database administered by MHSTCI. In addition, it must also be noted that a lack of formerly documented sites does not indicate that there are no sites present as the documentation of any archaeological site is contingent upon prior research having been conducted within the study area.

On the basis of information supplied by MHSTCI, no archaeological assessments have been conducted within 50 metres of the study area. AMICK Consultants Limited assumes no responsibility for the accuracy of previous assessments, interpretations such as cultural affiliation, or location information derived from the Archaeological Sites Database administered by MHSTCI. In addition, it must also be noted that the lack of formerly documented previous assessments does not indicate that no assessments have been conducted.

Data contained in previous archaeological reports in close proximity to the study area that is relevant to Stage 1 Background Study is defined within the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists in Section 7.5.8 Standard 4 as follows:

> *"Provide descriptions of previous archaeological fieldwork carried out within the limits of, or immediately adjacent to the project area,* ***as documented by all available reports that include archaeological fieldwork carried out on the lands to be impacted by this project, or where reports document archaeological sites immediately adjacent (i.e., within 50 m) to those lands****."*
>
> (MTCS 2011: 126 Emphasis Added)

In accordance with data supplied by MHSTCI for the purposes of completing this study, there are no previous reports detailing, *"archaeological fieldwork carried out on the lands to be impacted by this project"*, nor do any previous reports document known archaeological sites within 50 metres of the study area.

The Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists stipulates that the necessity to summarize the results of previous archaeological assessment reports, or to cite MHSTCI File Numbers in references to other archaeological reports, is reserved for reports that are directly relevant to the fieldwork and recommendations for the study area (S & Gs 7.5.7, Standard 2, MTC 2011: 125). This is further refined and elaborated upon in Section 7.5.8, Standards 4 & 5, MTC 2011:

> *"4. Provide descriptions of previous archaeological fieldwork carried out within the limits of, or immediately adjacent to the project area, as documented by all available* ***reports that include archaeological fieldwork carried out on the lands to be impacted by this project, or where reports document archaeological sites immediately adjacent (i.e., within 50m) to those lands."***
>
> *"5.* ***If previous findings and recommendations are relevant*** *to the current stage of work, provide the following:*

a. *a brief summary of previous findings and recommendations*
b. *documentation of any differences in the current work from the previously recommended work*
c. *rationale for the differences from the previously recommended work"*

(Emphasis Added)

The study area is situated in area for which there is no archaeological master plan.

It must be further noted that there are no relevant plaques associated with the study area, which would suggest an activity or occupation within, or in close proximity to, the study area that may indicate potential for associated archaeological resources of significant CHVI.

In addition, archaeological sites data is also used to determine if any archaeological resources had been formerly documented within or in close proximity to the study area and if these same resources might be subject to impacts from the proposed undertaking. This data was also collected in order to establish the relative significance of any resources that might be encountered during the conduct of the present study. For example, the relative rarity of a site can be used to assign an elevated level of significance to a site that is atypical for the immediate vicinity. The requisite archaeological sites data of previously registered archaeological sites was collected from the MHSTCI and the corporate research library of AMICK Consultants Limited. The Stage 1 Background Research methodology also includes a review of the most detailed available topographic maps, historical settlement maps, archaeological management plans (where applicable) and commemorative plaques or monuments. When previous archaeological research documents lands to be impacted by the proposed undertaking or archaeological sites within 50 metres of the study area, the reports documenting this earlier work are reviewed for pertinent information. AMICK Consultants Limited will often modify this basic methodology based on professional judgment to include additional research (such as, local historical works or documents and knowledgeable informants).

5.3.1 PRE-CONTACT REGISTERED SITES

A summary of registered and/or known archaeological sites within a 1-kilometre radius of the study area was gathered from the Archaeological Sites Database, administered by MHSTCI. As a result it was determined that no (0) archaeological sites relating directly to Pre-Contact habitation/activity had been formally registered within the immediate vicinity of the study area. However, the lack of formally documented archaeological sites does not mean that Pre-Contact people did not use the area; it more likely reflects a lack of systematic archaeological research in the immediate vicinity. Even in cases where one or more assessments may have been conducted in close proximity to a proposed landscape alteration, an extensive area of physical archaeological assessment coverage is required throughout the region to produce a representative sample of all potentially available archaeological data in order to provide any meaningful evidence to construct a pattern of land use and settlement in the past.

An unnamed creek flows between agricultural fields in Lots 11 and 12. This creek is not shown to be on either of the historical maps reproduced in this report. This is likely due to the small size of the creek, however it cannot be discerned that this creek was not present in the past. There are also two small streams that branch off of the creek. The distance to water criteria used to establish potential for archaeological sites suggests potential for Pre-Contact occupation and land use in the area in the past.

Table 1 illustrates the chronological development of cultures within southern Ontario prior to the arrival of European cultures to the area at the beginning of the 17th century. This general cultural outline is based on archaeological data and represents a synthesis and summary of research over a long period of time. It is necessarily generalizing and is not necessarily representative of the point of view of all researchers or stakeholders. It is offered here as a rough guideline and as a very broad outline to illustrate the relationships of broad cultural groups and time periods.

TABLE 1 PRE-CONTACT CULTURAL CHRONOLOGY FOR SOUTHERN ONTARIO

Years ago	Period	Southern Ontario
250	Terminal Woodland	Ontario and St. Lawrence Iroquois Cultures
1000 2000	Initial Woodland	Princess Point, Saugeen, Point Peninsula, and Meadowood Cultures
3000 4000 5000 6000	Archaic	Laurentian Culture
7000 8000 9000 10000 11000	Palaeo-Indian	Plano and Clovis Cultures
		(Wright 1972)

5.3.2 POST-CONTACT REGISTERED SITES

A summary of registered and/or known archaeological sites within a 1-kilometre radius of the study area was gathered from the Archaeological Sites Database, administered by MHSTCI. As a result it was determined that one (1) archaeological sites relating directly to Post-Contact habitation/activity had been formally registered within the immediate vicinity of the study area. The previously registered Post-Contact sites are briefly described below in Table 2:

TABLE 2 POST-CONTACT SITES WITHIN 1KM

Site Name	Borden #	Site Type	Cultural Affiliation
	AkHb-8	Farmstead	Euro-Canadian

The above noted archaeological site is not situated within 300 metres of the study area. Therefore, it has no impact on determinations of archaeological potential for further archaeological resources related to Post-Contact activity and occupation with respect to the archaeological assessment of the proposed undertaking.

5.3.4 Location and Current Conditions

The study area is described as 7856 2nd Line, Fergus, Part of Lots 11, 12 & 14, & All of Lot 13, Concession 2, (Geographic Township of Nichol), Township of Centre Wellington, County of Wellington. The study area was subject to this assessment as a requirement under the Planning Act (RSO 1990) and the Provincial Policy Statement (2020) in order to support a Draft Plan of Subdivision and companion Zoning By-law Amendment application as part of the pre-submission process.

The present use of the study area is as actively farmed agricultural land and residences. The study area is roughly 153 hectares in area. The study area includes within it mostly ploughable lands. There is a wooded area within the northern portion of the study area as well as along the southwest border. There are three residences within the study area. One is located in the western portion of the property, one is within an agricultural complex located along the southeastern border, and one along the eastern border. The residence in the western portion contains a shed and driveway that enters off of Guelph Street and continues to the residence as well as a small lawn area. Most of the lawn area at this residence is disturbed with gravel fill. The residence in the southeastern portion within the agricultural complex contains a gravel driveway off of 2 Line, a lawn, an attached garage, in-ground pool, concrete patio, and concrete pad in front of one of the two sheds, a bank barn, two silos and gravel parking area for farming equipment. The other residence along the eastern border is surrounded by lawn and a gravel driveway leads into the lot from Scotland Street. Highway 6 cuts through the centre of Lot 12. There is also an unnamed creek that flows between agricultural fields within Lot 11 and 12. The study area also contains two small streams in the meadow area within the western portion of the study area. There is a man-made pond located centrally within the study area. Sand fill soil mounds are located adjacent to the subdivision and plaza, which is likely the source of the fill. There are also permanent low-lying wet areas within the wooded area in the northern portion of the study area. The study area is bounded on the north by the town of Fergus, on the east by agricultural land and Scotland Street, on the west by Guelph Street and on the south by 2 Line. The study area is adjacent to the intersection of Highway 6 and 2 Line to the north. A plan of the study area is included within this report as Map 4. Current conditions encountered during the Stage 1-2 Property Assessment are illustrated in Map 5.

5.3.5 Physiographic Region

The study area is situated within the Guelph Drumlin Field physiographic region. For the most part, these hills are of the broad oval type with slopes less steep than the Peterborough drumlins. The till in these drumlins is loamy and calcerous and was derived mostly from dolostone of the Amabel Foundation. In addition, it contains fragments of the underlying red

shale which is exposed below the escarpment. It is a pale brown in colour. The till is rather stony with large surface boulders being more numerous in some localities than others (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 137-138).

5.3.6 SURFACE WATER

Sources of potable water, access to waterborne transportation routes, and resources associated with watersheds are each considered, both individually and collectively to be the highest criteria for determination of the potential of any location to support extended human activity, land use, or occupation. Accordingly, proximity to water is regarded as the primary indicator of archaeological resource potential. The Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists stipulates that undisturbed lands within 300 metres of a water source are considered to have archaeological potential (MTC 2011: 21).

An unnamed creek flows between agricultural fields in Lots 11 and 12. This creek is not shown on the historical atlas maps but that is likely due to its small size. There are two small streams that branch off of the creek within the meadow in the western portion of the study area. There is also a man-made pond in the centre of the study area. There are permanent low-lying and wet areas throughout the wooded areas of the property as well.

5.3.7 CURRENT PROPERTY CONDITIONS CONTEXT

Current characteristics encountered within an archaeological research study area determine if property Assessment of specific portions of the study area will be necessary and in what manner a Stage 2 Property Assessment should be conducted, if necessary. Conventional assessment methodologies include pedestrian survey on ploughable lands and test pit methodology within areas that cannot be ploughed. For the purpose of determining where property Assessment is necessary and feasible, general categories of current landscape conditions have been established as archaeological conventions. These include:

5.3.7.1 BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURAL FOOTPRINTS

A building, for the purposes of this particular study, is a structure that exists currently or has existed in the past in a given location. The footprint of a building is the area of the building formed by the perimeter of the foundation. Although the interior area of building foundations would often be subject to property Assessment when the foundation may represent a potentially significant historic archaeological site, the footprints of existing structures are not typically assessed. Existing structures commonly encountered during archaeological assessments are often residential-associated buildings (houses, garages, sheds), and/or component buildings of farm complexes (barns, silos, greenhouses). In many cases, even though the disturbance to the land may be relatively shallow and archaeological resources may be situated below the disturbed layer (e.g. a concrete garage pad), there is no practical means of assessing the area beneath the disturbed layer. However, if there were evidence to suggest that there are likely archaeological resources situated beneath the disturbance, alternative methodologies may be recommended to study such areas.

The study area contains three residences. The first residential lot contains a house and shed. The second residential lot is within an agricultural complex and contains a house, attached garage, bank barn, two silos, and two sheds. The third residence is along the eastern border and contains a house and lawn. Map 5 of this report illustrates the locations of these features.

5.3.7.2 DISTURBANCE

Areas that have been subjected to extensive and deep land alteration that has severely damaged the integrity of archaeological resources are known as land disturbances. Examples of land disturbances are areas of past quarrying, major landscaping, and sewage and infrastructure development (MTC 2011: 18), as well as driveways made of gravel or asphalt or concrete, in-ground pools, and wells or cisterns. Surfaces paved with interlocking brick, concrete, asphalt, gravel and other surfaces meant to support heavy loads or to be long wearing hard surfaces in high traffic areas, must be prepared by the excavation and removal of topsoil, grading, and the addition of aggregate material to ensure appropriate engineering values for the supporting matrix and also to ensure that the installations shed water to avoid flooding or moisture damage. All hard surfaced areas are prepared in this fashion and therefore have no or low archaeological potential. Major utility lines are conduits that provide services such as water, natural gas, hydro, communications, sewage, and others. These major installations should not be confused with minor below ground service installations not considered to represent significant disturbances removing archaeological potential, such as services leading to individual structures which tend to be comparatively very shallow and vary narrow corridors. Areas containing substantial and deeply buried services or clusters of below ground utilities are considered areas of disturbance, and may be excluded from Stage 2 Property Assessment. Disturbed areas are excluded from Stage 2 Property Assessment due to no or low archaeological potential and often because they are also not viable to assess using conventional methodology.

> *"Earthwork is one of the major works involved in road construction. This process includes excavation, material removal, filling, compaction, and construction. Moisture content is controlled, and compaction is done according to standard design procedures. Normally, rock explosion at the road bed is not encouraged. While filling a depression to reach the road level,* ***the original bed is flattened after the removal of the topsoil.*** *The fill layer is distributed and compacted to the designed specifications. This procedure is repeated until the compaction desired is reached. The* ***fill material should not contain organic elements,*** *and possess a low index of plasticity. Fill material can include gravel and decomposed rocks of a particular size, but should not consist of huge clay lumps. Sand clay can be used. The area is considered to be adequately compacted when the roller movement does not create a noticeable deformation.* ***The road surface finish is reliant on the economic aspects, and the estimated usage."*** *[Emphasis Added]*
>
> (Goel 2013)

The supporting matrix of a hard paved surface cannot contain organic material which is

subject to significant compression, decay and moisture retention. Topsoil has no engineering value and must be removed in any construction application where the surface finish at grade requires underlying support.

Installation of sewer lines and other below ground services associated with infrastructure development often involves deep excavation that can remove archaeological potential. This consideration does not apply to relatively minor below ground services that connect structures and facilities to services that support their operation and use. Major servicing corridors will be situated within adjacent road allowances with only minor, narrow and relatively shallow underground services entering into the study area to connect existing structures to servicing mainlines. The relatively minor, narrow and shallow services buried within a residential property do not require such extensive ground disturbance to remove or minimize archaeological potential within affected areas.

The study area contains three driveways that lead to the residences located within the study area. One of the residential lots on the western border is disturbed with gravel fill. The large agricultural complex has disturbance behind the bank barn, where it appears gravel was laid for parking farming equipment. There is also a concrete paved area in front of one of the sheds at the agricultural complex. A concrete patio is located where the inground pool is located. In the northern portion of the study area there are soil mounds of sand fill that appear to be dumped from the construction of the plaza and subdivision adjacent to the study area. Map 5 of this report illustrates the locations of these features.

5.3.7.3 Low-Lying and Wet Areas

Landscape features that are covered by permanently wet areas, such as marshes, swamps, or bodies of water like streams or lakes, are known as low-lying and wet areas. Low-lying and wet areas are excluded from Stage 2 Property Assessment due to inaccessibility.

The study area contains an unnamed creek that flows between agricultural fields in Lots 11 and 12. Two small streams branch off of the creek. There are sections of low-lying and wet areas throughout the wood lots. These areas are permanently wet, which is evident through the large cattail and dogwood growth. There is also an inground pool at the larger residence. There is a man-made pond located centrally in the study area. Map 5 of this report illustrates the locations of these features.

5.3.7.4 Steep Slope

Landscape which slopes at a greater than (>) 20 degree change in elevation, is known as steep slope. Areas of steep slope are considered uninhabitable, and are excluded from Stage 2 Property Assessment.

Generally, steep slopes are not assessed because steep slopes are interpreted to have low potential, not due to viability to assess, except in cases where the slope is severe enough to become a safety concern for archaeological field crews. In such cases, the Occupational

Health and Safety Act takes precedence as indicated in the introduction to the Standards and Guidelines. AMICK Consultant Limited policy is to assess all slope areas whenever it is safe to do so. Assessment of slopes, except where safety concerns arise, eliminates the invariably subjective interpretation of what might constitute a steep slope in the field. This is done to minimize delays due to conflicts in such interpretations and to increase the efficiency of review.

The study area does not contain areas of steep slope.

5.3.7.5 Wooded Areas

Areas of the property that cannot be ploughed, such as natural forest or woodlot, are known as wooded areas. These wooded areas qualify for Stage 2 Property Assessment, and are required to be assessed using test pit survey methodology.

The study area contains wooded areas within the northern portion of the study area as well as along the southwest border. There is also wooded area located centrally within the northeast portion of the study area. These wooded areas are mostly low-lying and wet and surrounded by agricultural fields. Map 5 of this report illustrates the locations of these features.

5.3.7.6 Ploughable Agricultural Lands

Areas of current or former agricultural lands that have been ploughed in the past are considered ploughable agricultural lands. Ploughing these lands regularly turns the soil, which in turn brings previously buried artifacts to the surface, which are then easily identified during visual inspection. Furthermore, by allowing the ploughed area to weather sufficiently through rainfall, soil is washed off of exposed artifacts at the surface and the visibility of artifacts at the surface of recently worked field areas is enhanced markedly. Pedestrian survey of ploughed agricultural lands is the preferred method of physical assessment because of the greater potential for finding evidence of archaeological resources if present.

The study area consists mainly of ploughable agricultural lands. Map 5 of this report illustrates the locations of these features.

5.3.7.7 Lawn, Pasture, Meadow

Landscape features consisting of former agricultural land covered in low growth, such as lawns, pastures, meadows, shrubbery, and immature trees. These are areas that may be considered too small to warrant ploughing, (i.e. less than one hectare in area), such as yard areas surrounding existing structures, and land-locked open areas that are technically workable by a plough but inaccessible to agricultural machinery. These areas may also include open area within urban contexts that do not allow agricultural tillage within municipal or city limits or the use of urban roadways by agricultural machinery. These areas are required to be assessed using test pit survey methodology.

The study area contains a small portion of lawn, which surrounds the three residences. Map 5 of this report illustrates the locations of these features.

5.3.8 SUMMARY

Background research indicates the vicinity of the study area has potential for archaeological resources of Native origins based on proximity to a source of potable water. Background research also suggests potential for archaeological resources of Post-Contact origins based on proximity to previously registered archaeological sites of Post-Contact origins, proximity to a historic roadway, and proximity to areas of documented historic settlement.

Current conditions within the study area indicate that some areas of the property may have no or low archaeological potential and do not require Stage 2 Property Assessment or should be excluded from Stage 2 Property Assessment. These areas would include the footprint of existing structures and areas paved for driveways. A significant proportion of the study area does exhibit archaeological potential and therefore a Stage 2 Property Assessment is required.

Archaeological potential does not indicate that there are necessarily sites present, but that environmental and historical factors suggest that there may be as yet undocumented archaeological sites within lands that have not been subject to systematic archaeological research in the past.

6.0 FIELD WORK METHODS AND WEATHER CONDITIONS

This report confirms that the study area was subject to Stage 2 Property Assessment by high intensity test pit methodology at a five-metre interval between individual test pits, test pit methodology at ten-metre intervals to confirm disturbance and by high intensity pedestrian survey at an interval of five metres between individual transects on 15,16, 18, 19 & 20 November 2020 and 5 April 2021.

The fieldwork undertaken as a component of this study was conducted according to the archaeological fieldwork standards and guidelines (including weather and lighting conditions). Weather conditions were appropriate for the necessary fieldwork required to complete the Stage 2 Property Assessment and to create the documentation appropriate to this study. The locations from which photographs were taken and the directions toward which the camera was aimed for each photograph are illustrated in Map 5 of this report. Upon completion of the property inspection of the study area, it was determined that select areas would require Stage 2 Property Assessment.

It must be noted that AMICK Consultants Limited has been retained to assess lands as specified by the proponent. As such, AMICK Consultants Limited is constrained by the terms of the contract in place at the time of the Archaeological Assessment and can only enter into lands for which AMICK Consultants Limited has received consent from the owner

or their agent(s). The proponent has been advised that the entire area within the planning application must be subject to archaeological assessment and that portions of the planning application may only be excluded if they are of low potential, are not viable to assess, or are subject to planning provisions that would restrict any such areas from any form of ground altering activities.

6.1 PROPERTY INSPECTION

A detailed examination and photo documentation was carried out on the study area in order to document the existing conditions of the study area to facilitate the Stage 2 Property Assessment. All areas of the study area were visually inspected and select features were photographed as a representative sample of each area defined within Map 5. Observations made of conditions within the study area at the time of the inspection were used to inform the requirement for Stage 2 Property Assessment for portions of the study area as well as to aid in the determination of appropriate Stage 2 Property Assessment strategies. The locations from which photographs were taken and the directions toward which the camera was aimed for each photograph are illustrated in Map 5 of this report.

6.2 PEDESTRIAN SURVEY

In accordance with the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists, pedestrian survey is required for all portions of the study area that are ploughable or can be subject to cultivation. This is the preferred method to utilize while conducting an assessment. This report confirms that the conduct of pedestrian survey within the study area conformed to the following standards:

1. *Actively or recently cultivated agricultural land must be subject to pedestrian survey.*
   [All actively or recently cultivated agricultural land was subject to pedestrian survey.]

2. *Land to be surveyed must be recently ploughed. Use of chisel ploughs is not acceptable. In heavy clay soils ensure furrows are disked after ploughing to break them up further.*
   [All land was recently ploughed.]

3. *Land to be surveyed must be weathered by one heavy rainfall or several light rains to improve visibility of archaeological resources.*
   [All land was weathered by rainfall.]

4. *Provide direction to the contractor undertaking the ploughing to plough deep enough to provide total topsoil exposure, but not deeper than previous ploughing.*
   [Direction was given to the contractor undertaking the ploughing to plough deep enough to provide total topsoil exposure, but not deeper than previous ploughing]

5. *At least 80 % of the ploughed ground surface must be visible. If surface visibility is below 80% (e.g. due to crop stubble, weeds, young crop growth), ensure the land is re-ploughed before surveying.*
   [Roughly 98% of the ploughed field surface was exposed and visible.]

6. *Space survey transects at maximum intervals of 5m (20 survey transects per hectare)*
   [All transects were conducted at an interval of 5m between individual transects.]

7. *When archaeological resources are found, decrease survey transects to 1m intervals over a minimum of a 20m radius around the find to determine whether it is an isolated find or part of a larger scatter. Continue working outward at this interval until full extent of the surface scatter has been defined.*
   [Not Applicable – No archaeological resources were encountered.]

8. *Collect all formal artifact types and diagnostic categories. For 19th century archaeological sites, collect all refined ceramic sherds (or, for larger sites collect a sufficient sample to form the basis for dating).*
   [Not Applicable – No archaeological resources were encountered.]

9. *Based on professional judgment, strike a balance between gathering enough artifacts to document the archaeological site and leaving enough in place to relocate the site if it is necessary to conduct further assessment.*
   [Not Applicable – No archaeological resources were encountered.]

(MTC 2011: 30-31)

6.3 TEST PIT SURVEY

In accordance with the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists, test pit survey is required to be undertaken for those portions of the study area where deep prior disturbance had not occurred prior to assessment or which were accessible to survey. Test pit survey is only used in areas that cannot be subject to ploughing or cultivation. This report confirms that the conduct of test pit survey within the study area conformed to the following standards:

1. Test pit survey only on terrain where ploughing is not possible or viable, as in the following examples:

a. wooded areas
[All wooded areas were test pit surveyed at an interval of 5 m between individual test pits. In the low-lying and wet areas within the wooded areas, test pit survey was not viable.]

b. pasture with high rock content
[Not Applicable - The study area does not contain any pastures with high rock content]

c. abandoned farmland with heavy brush and weed growth
[Not Applicable - The study area does not contain any abandoned farmland with heavy brush and weed growth]

d. orchards and vineyards that cannot be strip ploughed (planted in rows 5 m apart or less), gardens, parkland or lawns, any of which will remain in use for several years after the survey
[Not Applicable - The study area does not contain any of the above-mentioned circumstances]

e. properties where existing landscaping or infrastructure would be damaged. The presence of such obstacles must be documented in sufficient detail to demonstrate that ploughing or cultivation is not viable.
[The study area contains residential and agricultural structures as well as existing landscaping that would be damaged by ploughing. The residences are to be maintained, therefore test pit survey was employed rather than ploughing. The degree of disturbance in both of these areas also prohibited ploughing.]

f. narrow (10 m or less) linear survey corridors (e.g., water or gas pipelines, road widening). This includes situations where there are planned impacts 10 m or less beyond the previously impacted limits on both sides of an existing linear corridor (e.g., two linear survey corridors on either side of an existing roadway). Where at the time of fieldwork the lands within the linear corridor meet the standards as stated under the above section on pedestrian survey land preparation, pedestrian survey must be carried out. Space test pits at maximum intervals of 5 m (400 test pits per hectare) in areas less than 300 m from any feature of archaeological potential.
[Not Applicable – The study area does not contain any linear corridors]

2. *Space test pits at maximum intervals of 5 m (400 test pits per hectare) in areas less than 300 m from any feature of archaeological potential.*
[All test pits were spaced at an interval of 5m between individual test pits, except in instances where disturbed gravel or sand fill was encountered, in which case test pit survey was conducted at 10 metre intervals]

3. *Space test pits at maximum intervals of 10 m (100 test pits per hectare) in areas more than 300 m from any feature of archaeological potential.*
[The entirety of the test pitted areas of the study area were assessed using high intensity test pit methodology at an interval of 5 metres between individual test pits, except in instances where disturbed gravel or sand fill was encountered, in which case test pit survey was conducted at 10 metre intervals]

4. *Test pit to within 1 m of built structures (both intact and ruins), or until test pits show evidence of recent ground disturbance.*
   [Test pits were placed within 1m of all built structures]

5. *Ensure that test pits are at least 30 cm in diameter.*
   [All test pits were at least 30 cm in diameter]

6. *Excavate each test pit, by hand, into the first 5 cm of subsoil and examine the pit for stratigraphy, cultural features, or evidence of fill.*
   [Regardless of the interval between individual test pits, all test pits were excavated by hand into the first 5 cm of subsoil where possible and examined for stratigraphy, cultural features, or evidence of fill. In areas that consisted of fill soils, test pits were also excavated a minimum of 30 cm below grade in order to ensure disturbance extended below even deep topsoil layers such as those encountered in agricultural fields to ensure that the depth of disturbance was sufficient to remove archaeological potential in most contexts. Where other evidence indicates locations of potentially significant archaeological sites that may include cultural deposits below fill soils, alternative strategies to explore beneath the fill layers found in some areas may be necessary to complete the Stage 2 Property Assessment. In such cases, further Stage 2 Property Assessment may be recommended following completion of the property survey under conventional methodologies.]

7. *Screen soil through mesh no greater than 6 mm.*
   [All soil was screened through mesh no greater than 6 mm]

8. *Collect all artifacts according to their associated test pit.*
   [Not Applicable - No archaeological resources were encountered]

9. *Backfill all test pits unless instructed not to by the landowner.*
   [All test pits were backfilled]

(MTC 2011: 31-32)

"*A combination of property inspection and test pitting may be used when initial Stage 2 results determine that all or part of the project area may in fact be disturbed. The Stage 2 survey may then consists of a detailed inspection (equivalent to Stage 1), combined with test pitting."*

1. *If it was not done as part of Stage 1, inspect and document the disturbed areas according to the standards described for Stage 1 property inspections.*
   [The disturbed areas of the study area were inspected and documented as per the standards described for Stage 1 property inspections. Areas of suspected disturbance where test pit survey was viable were shovel tested as described below. These areas include the gravel driveways, the footprint of existing structures, the concrete pad, the gravel parking area for farm equipment, the

concrete patio, the presence of gravel fill in the lawn, and the sand fill soil mounds in the northern portion of the study area.

Standard archaeological survey methodologies employed in Ontario for Stage 2 Archaeological Property Assessment (i.e. pedestrian survey and test pit survey) cannot determine if deeply buried cultural remains are or are not present. The purpose of Stage 2 Property Assessment is not to test for deeply buried deposits. The Standards and Guidelines for Consultants Archaeologists recognize this fact and have a whole separate section covering this specific issue. The only way to determine if deeply buried remains are present is to follow those standards not via a standard Stage 1-2 Archaeological Property Assessment.

In most cases, unless there is documentation or evidence to the contrary, areas where grading has exceeded topsoil depth are areas considered to have no or low archaeological potential because in most cases removal of the topsoil will remove archaeological sites. While archaeological sites are popularly thought of as being deeply buried, archaeological sites begin on the surface of the ground and for most of humanity's history involved no substantial excavations or significant landscape alterations. Only with the rise of urbanization and sedentary settlement do sites begin to accumulate depth. This is a result of continuous building and rebuilding over top of earlier settlements. Deep archaeological sites are created by adding to the surface of an area and building the landform up. Deeply buried archaeological deposits are relatively rare outside of urban environments in Ontario and even within urban contexts, this seldom occurs outside of the historic core of the community where redevelopment has occurred since initial settlement.

If an area was not occupied during a period of potential archaeological significance, there is no potential to locate deeply buried significant archaeological resources. There are only a few very rare exceptions related to historical significance that is not tied to the time period of activity or occupation of a site but to certain historical events and/or personalities.

Areas of suspected disturbance where test pit survey was viable were shovel tested as described below.

2. *Place Stage 2 test pits throughout the disturbed areas according to professional judgment (and where physically viable) as to confirm that these areas have been completely disturbed.*
   *[*An area of suspected disturbance was identified during the Property Inspection conducted as part of the Stage 2 Property Assessment. This area consists of an area identified probable disturbance from the gravel driveways, the footprint of existing structures, the concrete pad in front of one of the sheds, the gravel parking area for farm equipment, the concrete patio, the presence of gravel fill in the lawn, and the sand fill soil mounds in the northern portion of the study area. Test pits were excavated every 10 metres across the entirety of this portion of the study area

where physically viable. The intensity of test pit survey conducted is far in excess of the minimum standard required. AMICK Consultants Limited tested the suspected disturbed area at a 10-metre interval to confirm disturbance in a manner consistent with the objectives to ensure that the area is accurately delimited and properly identified. There is no requirement to systematically examine such areas. The Standards and Guidelines require only judgmental testing based on the professional judgment of the investigating archaeologist. In most typical archaeological assessments the entire area of presumed disturbance will be written off as an area of no archaeological potential without thorough testing to demonstrate that the entire area is disturbed or it will be tested at subjective, irregular and inconsistent intervals, and consequently such testing cannot verify that the entire area contained within the presumed limits of disturbance are, in fact, disturbed. The methodology employed here by AMICK Consultants Limited exceeds any requirements of the Standards and Guidelines and that which is generally applied within the industry.

The excavated soil and the profiles of these test pits were examined to determine if each represented an area of disturbance. Test pits were excavated a minimum of 30 cm below grade in order to ensure that test pits were excavated to depths below the surrounding natural grade. This procedure demonstrated that the entire study area consists of fill deposited within a deeply disturbed context. There is no archaeological potential within this area.]

(MTC 2011: 38)

7.0 RECORD OF FINDS

Section 7.8.2 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011: 137-138) outlines the requirements of the Record of Finds component of a Stage 2 report:

1. *For all archaeological resources and sites that are identified in Stage 2, provide the following:*
    a. *a general description of the types of artifacts and features that were identified*
    b. *a general description of the area within which artifacts and features were identified, including the spatial extent of the area and any relative variations in density*
    c. *a catalogue and description of all artifacts retained*
    d. *a description of the artifacts and features left in the field (nature of material, frequency, other notable traits).*
2. *Provide an inventory of the documentary record generated in the field (e.g. photographs, maps, field notes).*
3. *Submit information detailing exact site locations on the property separately from the project report, as specified in section 7.6. Information on exact site locations includes the following:*
    a. *table of GPS readings for locations of all archaeological sites*

b. maps showing detailed site location information.

7.1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

No archaeological resources of any description were encountered anywhere within the study area.

7.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELDWORK DOCUMENTATION

The documentation produced during the field investigation conducted in support of this report includes: one sketch map, one page of photo log, one page of field notes, and 52 digital photographs.

8.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

AMICK Consultants Limited was engaged by the proponent to undertake a Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of lands potentially affected by the proposed undertaking and was granted permission to carry out archaeological fieldwork. The entirety of the study area was subject to property inspection and photographic documentation concurrently with the Stage 2 Property Assessment on 15,16, 18, 19 & 20 November 2020 and 5 April 2021, consisting of high-intensity test pit survey at an interval of five metres between individual test pits, test pit survey at ten-metre intervals to confirm disturbance and high intensity pedestrian survey at an interval of five metres between individual transects. All records, documentation, field notes, photographs and artifacts (as applicable) related to the conduct and findings of these investigations are held at the Southwestern District corporate offices of AMICK Consultants Limited until such time that they can be transferred to an agency or institution approved by the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) on behalf of the government and citizens of Ontario.

8.1 STAGE 1 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

As part of the present study, background research was conducted in order to determine the archaeological potential of the proposed project area.

"A Stage 1 background study provides the consulting archaeologist and Ministry report reviewer with information about the known and potential cultural heritage resources within a particular study area, prior to the start of the field assessment." (OMCzCR 1993)

The evaluation of potential is further elaborated Section 1.3 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologist (2011) prepared by the Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture:

" The Stage 1 background study (and, where undertaken, property inspection) leads to an evaluation of the property's archaeological potential. If the evaluation indicates that there is archaeological potential anywhere on the property, the next step is a Stage 2 assessment."
(MTC 2011: 17)

Features or characteristics that indicate archaeological potential when documented within the study area, or within close proximity to the study area (as applicable), include:

" - previously identified archaeological sites
- *water sources (It is important to distinguish types of water and shoreline, and to distinguish natural from artificial water sources, as these features affect site locations and types to varying degrees.):*
    - *primary water sources (lakes, rivers, streams, creeks)*
    - *secondary water sources (intermittent streams and creeks, springs, marshes, swamps)*
    - *features indicating past water sources (e.g., glacial lake shorelines indicated by the presence of raised sand or gravel beach ridges, relic river or stream channels indicated by clear dip or swale in the topography, shorelines of drained lakes or marshes, cobble beaches)*
    - *accessible or inaccessible shoreline (e.g., high bluffs, swamp or marsh fields by the edge of a lake, sandbars stretching into marsh)*
- *elevated topography (e.g., eskers, drumlins, large knolls, plateaux)*
- *pockets of well-drained sandy soil, especially near areas of heavy soil or rocky ground*
- *distinctive land formations that might have been special or spiritual places, such as waterfalls, rock outcrops, caverns, mounds, and promontories and their bases. There may be physical indicators of their use, such as burials, structures, offerings, rock paintings or carvings.*
- *resource areas, including:*
    - *food or medicinal plants (e.g., migratory routes, spawning areas, prairie)*
    - *scarce raw materials (e.g., quartz, copper, ochre or outcrops of chert)*
    - *early Post-contact industry (e.g., fur trade, logging, prospecting, mining)*
- *areas of early Post-contact settlement. These include places of early military or pioneer settlement (e.g., pioneer homesteads, isolated cabins, farmstead complexes), early wharf or dock complexes, pioneer churches and early cemeteries. There may be commemorative markers of their history, such as local, provincial, or federal monuments or heritage parks.*
- *Early historical transportation routes (e.g., trails, passes, roads, railways, portage routes)*
- *property listed on a municipal register or designated under the Ontario Heritage Actor that is a federal, provincial or municipal historic landmark or site*
- *property that local histories or informants have identified with possible archaeological sties, historical events, activities, or occupations"*

(MTC 2011: 17-18)

The evaluation of potential does not indicate that sites are present within areas affected by proposed development. Evaluation of potential considers the possibility for as yet undocumented sites to be found in areas that have not been subject to systematic archaeological investigation in the past. Potential for archaeological resources is used to determine if property assessment of a study area or portions of a study area is required.

> *"Archaeological resources not previously documented may also be present in the affected area. If the alternative areas being considered, or the preferred alternative selected, exhibit either high or medium potential for the discovery of archaeological remains an archaeological assessment will be required."*
>
> (MCC & MOE 1992: 6-7)

> *"The Stage 1 background study (and, where undertaken, property inspection) leads to an evaluation of the property's archaeological potential. If the evaluation indicates that there is archaeological potential anywhere on the property, the next step is a Stage 2 assessment."*
>
> (MTC 2011: 17)

In addition, archaeological sites data is also used to determine if any archaeological resources had been formerly documented within or in close proximity to the study area and if these same resources might be subject to impacts from the proposed undertaking. This data was also collected in order to establish the relative cultural heritage value or interest of any resources that might be encountered during the conduct of the present study. For example, the relative rarity of a site can be used to assign an elevated level of cultural heritage value or interest to a site that is atypical for the immediate vicinity. The requisite archaeological sites data of previously registered archaeological sites was collected from the MHSTCI and the corporate research library of AMICK Consultants Limited. The Stage 1 Background Research methodology also includes a review of the most detailed available topographic maps, historical settlement maps, archaeological management plans (where applicable) and commemorative plaques or monuments. When previous archaeological research documents lands to be impacted by the proposed undertaking or archaeological sites within 50 metres of the study area, the reports documenting this earlier work are reviewed for pertinent information. AMICK Consultants Limited will often modify this basic methodology based on professional judgment to include additional research (such as, local historical works or documents and knowledgeable informants).

Section 7.7.3 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011: 132) outlines the requirements of the Analysis and Conclusions component of a Stage 1 Background Study.

1) *"Identify and describe areas of archaeological potential within the project area.*
2) *Identify and describe areas that have been subject to extensive and deep land alterations. Describe the nature of alterations (e.g., development or other activity) that have severely damaged the integrity of archaeological resources and have removed archaeological potential."*

CHARACTERISTICS INDICATING ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

Section 1.3.1 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists specifies the property characteristics that indicate archaeological potential (MTC 2011: 17-18). Factors that indicate archaeological potential are features of the local landscape and environment that may have attracted people to either occupy the land or to conduct activities within the study area. One or more of these characteristics found to apply to a study area would necessitate a Stage 2 Property Assessment to determine if archaeological resources are present. These characteristics are listed below together with considerations derived from the conduct of this study.

1) *Previously Identified Archaeological Sites*
   Previously registered archaeological sites have not been documented within 300 metres of the study area.

2) *Water Sources*
   Primary water sources are described as including lakes, rivers streams and creeks. Close proximity to primary water sources (300 metres) indicates that people had access to readily available sources of potable water and routes of waterborne trade and communication should the study area have been used or occupied in the past.

   There are no identified primary water sources within 300 metres of the study area.

   Secondary water sources are described as including intermittent streams and creeks, springs, marshes, and swamps. Close proximity (300 metres) to secondary water sources indicates that people had access to readily available sources of potable water, at least on a seasonal basis, and in some cases seasonal access to routes of waterborne trade and communication should the study area have been used or occupied in the past.

   There is an unnamed creek that flows between agricultural fields within Lots 11 and 12. There are also two small streams within the meadow area that connect to the creek and a man-made pond in the centre of the study area.

3) *Features Indicating Past Water Sources*
   Features indicating past water resources are described as including glacial lake shorelines indicated by the presence of raised sand or gravel beach ridges, relic river or stream channels indicated by clear dip or swale in the topography, shorelines of drained lakes or marshes, and cobble beaches. Close proximity (300 metres) to features indicating past water sources indicates that people had access to readily available sources of potable water, at least on a seasonal basis, and in some cases seasonal access to routes of waterborne trade and communication should the study area have been used or occupied in the past.

There are no identified features indicating past water sources within 300 metres of the study area.

4) *Accessible or Inaccessible Shoreline*

This form of landscape feature would include high bluffs, swamp or marsh fields by the edge of a lake, sandbars stretching into marsh, etc.

There are no shorelines within 300 metres of the study area.

5) *Elevated Topography*

Features of elevated topography that indicate archaeological potential include eskers, drumlins, large knolls, and plateaux.

There are no identified features of elevated topography within the study area.

6) *Pockets of Well-drained Sandy Soil*

Pockets of sandy soil are considered to be especially important near areas of heavy soil or rocky ground.

The soil throughout the study area is medium brown loamy clay, which is consistent with the wider area surrounding the property. Therefore, the presence of this soil has no impact on potential within the study area, as the wider area is not known for clay soils or exposed bedrock.

The image below (Kuhlmann, Stacy 2017) shows the consistencies of soil types and how they compare to one another. The soil found within the study area was loamy clay, which contains a higher percentage of loam with a lower percentage of clay. The lower percentage of clay allows the soil to break up from the action of ploughing alone when not compacted or bound by extensive root masses.



(Kuhlmann, Stacy 2017)

7) *Distinctive Land Formations*

These are landscape features that might have been special or spiritual places, such as waterfalls, rock outcrops, caverns, mounds, and promontories and their bases. There may be physical indicators of their use, such as burials, structures, offerings, rock paintings or carvings.

There are no identified distinctive land formations within the study area.

8) *Resource Areas*

Resource areas that indicate archaeological potential include food or medicinal plants (e.g., migratory routes, spawning areas, and prairie), scarce raw materials (e.g., quartz, copper, ochre or outcrops of chert) and resources of importance to early Post-contact industry (e.g., logging, prospecting, and mining).

There are no identified resource areas within the study area.

9) *Areas of Early Post-Contact Settlement*

These include places of early military or pioneer settlement (e.g., pioneer homesteads, isolated cabins, and farmstead complexes), early wharf or dock complexes, pioneer churches and early cemeteries. There may be commemorative markers of their history, such as local, provincial, or federal monuments or heritage parks.

The study area is not situated within close proximity to an area of early Post-Contact Settlement. The town of Fergus is shown to be almost a kilometer away from the study area in the 1861 and 1877 historical maps.

10) *Early Historical Transportation Routes*

This includes evidence of trails, passes, roads, railways, portage routes.

The study area is situated within 100 metres of early settlement roads that appear on the Historic Atlas Map of 1861 and 1877. These historic roads correspond to the roads presently known as 2 Line, Guelph Street, Scotland Street and Highway 6.

11) *Heritage Property*

Property listed on a municipal register or designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act* or is a federal, provincial or municipal historic landmark or site.

There are no listed or designated heritage buildings or properties that form a part of the study area. There are no listed or designated heritage buildings or properties that are adjacent to the study area.

12) *Documented Historical or Archaeological Sites*

This includes property that local histories or informants have identified with possible archaeological sites, historical events, activities, or occupations. These are properties which have not necessarily been formally recognized or for which there is additional

evidence identifying possible archaeological resources associated with historic properties in addition to the rationale for formal recognition.

There are no known heritage features, or known historic sites, or known archaeological sites within the study area in addition to those formally documented with the appropriate agencies or previously noted under a different criterion.

CHARACTERISTICS INDICATING REMOVAL OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

Section 1.3.2 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists specifies the property characteristics which indicate no archaeological potential or for which archaeological potential has been removed (MTC 2011: 18-19). These characteristics are listed below together with considerations derived from the conduct of this study.
The introduction of Section 1.3.2 (MTC 2011: 18) notes that *"Archaeological potential can be determined not to be present for either the entire property or a part(s) of it when the area under consideration has been subject to extensive and deep land alterations that have severely damaged the integrity of any archaeological resources. This is commonly referred to as 'disturbed' or 'disturbance', and may include:"*

1) *Quarrying*
   There is no evidence to suggest that quarrying operations were ever carried out within the study area.

2) *Major Landscaping Involving Grading Below Topsoil*
   Unless there is evidence to suggest the presence of buried archaeological deposits, such deeply disturbed areas are considered to have lost their archaeological potential. Properties that do not have a long history of Post-Contact occupation can have archaeological potential removed through extensive landscape alterations that penetrate below the topsoil layer. This is because most archaeological sites originate at grade with relatively shallow associated excavations into the soil. Pre-Contact sites and early historic sites are vulnerable to extensive damage and complete removal due to landscape modification activities. In urban contexts where a lengthy history of occupation has occurred, properties may have deeply buried archaeological deposits covered over and sealed through redevelopment activities that do not include the deep excavation of the entire property for subsequent uses. Buildings are often erected directly over older foundations preserving archaeological deposits associated with the earlier occupation.

   There is evidence to suggest that major landscaping operations involving grading below topsoil were carried out within the study area. In this instance, the gravel driveways, concrete pad, concrete patio, and gravel parking area are examples of major landscaping operations. Surfaces paved with interlocking brick, concrete, asphalt, gravel and other surfaces meant to support heavy loads or to be long wearing hard surfaces in high traffic areas, must be prepared by the excavation and removal of topsoil, grading, and the addition of aggregate material to ensure appropriate

engineering values for the supporting matrix and also to ensure that the installations shed water to avoid flooding or moisture damage. All hard surfaced areas are prepared in this fashion and therefore have no or low archaeological potential. Disturbed areas are excluded from Stage 2 Property Assessment due to no or low archaeological potential and often because they are also not viable to assess using conventional methodology.

3) *Building Footprints*
Typically, the construction of buildings involves the deep excavation of foundations, footings and cellars that often obliterate archaeological deposits situated close to the surface.

There are several buildings within the study area. These consist of three residences, a bank barn, two silos and three sheds.

4) *Sewage and Infrastructure Development*
Installation of sewer lines and other below ground services associated with infrastructure development often involves deep excavation that can remove archaeological potential.

There is no evidence to suggest that substantial below ground services of any kind have resulted in significant impacts to any significant portion of the study area. Major utility lines are conduits that provide services such as water, natural gas, hydro, communications, sewage, and others. These major installations should not be confused with minor below ground service installations not considered to represent significant disturbances removing archaeological potential, such as services leading to individual structures which tend to be comparatively very shallow and vary narrow corridors. Areas containing substantial and deeply buried services or clusters of below ground utilities are considered areas of disturbance, and may be excluded from Stage 2 Property Assessment.

"Activities such as agricultural cultivation, gardening, minor grading and landscaping do not necessarily affect archaeological potential."

(MTC 2011: 18)

"Archaeological potential is not removed where there is documented potential for deeply buried intact archaeological resources beneath land alterations, or where it cannot be clearly demonstrated through background research and property inspection that there has been complete and intensive disturbance of an area. Where complete disturbance cannot be demonstrated in Stage 1, it will be necessary to undertake Stage 2 assessment."

(MTC 2011: 18)

SUMMARY

Table 3 below summarizes the evaluation criteria of the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) together with the results of the Stage 1 Background Study for the proposed undertaking. Based on the criteria, the property is deemed to have archaeological potential on the basis of proximity to water and the location of early historic settlement roads adjacent to the study area.

TABLE 3 EVALUATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

FEATURE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL		YES	NO	N/A	COMMENT
1	Known archaeological sites within 300m		**N**		If Yes, potential determined
PHYSICAL FEATURES					
2	Is there water on or near the property?	**Y**			If Yes, what kind of water?
2a	Primary water source within 300 m. (lakeshore, river, large creek, etc.)		**N**		If Yes, potential determined
2b	Secondary water source within 300 m. (stream, spring, marsh, swamp, etc.)	**Y**			If Yes, potential determined
2c	Past water source within 300 m. (beach ridge, river bed, relic creek, etc.)		**N**		If Yes, potential determined
2d	Accessible or Inaccessible shoreline within 300 m. (high bluffs, marsh, swamp, sand bar, etc.)		**N**		If Yes, potential determined
3	Elevated topography (knolls, drumlins, eskers, plateaus, etc.)		**N**		If Yes, and Yes for any of 4-9, potential determined
4	Pockets of sandy soil in a clay or rocky area		**N**		If Yes and Yes for any of 3, 5-9, potential determined
5	Distinctive land formations (mounds, caverns, waterfalls, peninsulas, etc.)		**N**		If Yes and Yes for any of 3-4, 6-9, potential determined
HISTORIC/PREHISTORIC USE FEATURES					
6	Associated with food or scarce resource harvest areas (traditional fishing locations, agricultural/berry extraction areas, etc.)		**N**		If Yes, and Yes for any of 3-5, 7-9, potential determined.
7	Early Post-Contact settlement area within 300 m.		**N**		If Yes, and Yes for any of 3-6, 8-9, potential determined
8	Historic Transportation route within 100 m. (historic road, trail, portage, rail corridors, etc.)	**Y**			If Yes, and Yes for any 3-7 or 9, potential determined
9	Contains property designated and/or listed under the Ontario Heritage Act (municipal heritage committee, municipal register, etc.)		**N**		If Yes and, Yes to any of 3-8, potential determined
APPLICATION-SPECIFIC INFORMATION					
10	Local knowledge (local heritage organizations, Pre-Contact, etc.)		**N**		If Yes, potential determined
11	Recent disturbance not including agricultural cultivation (post-1960-confirmed extensive and intensive including industrial sites, aggregate areas, etc.)	**Y**			If Yes, no potential or low potential in affected part (s) of the study area.

If **YES** to any of 1, 2a-c, or 10 Archaeological Potential is **confirmed**
If **YES** to 2 or more of 3-9, Archaeological Potential is **confirmed**
If **YES** to 11 or No to 1-10 Low Archaeological Potential is **confirmed** for at least a portion of the study area.

8.2 STAGE 2 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

Section 7.8.3 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011: 138-139) outlines the requirements of the Analysis and Conclusions component of a Stage 2 Property Assessment.

1. *Summarize all finding from the Stage 2 survey, or state that no archaeological sites were identified.*
2. *For each archaeological site, provide the following analysis and conclusions:*
   a. *A preliminary determination, to the degree possible, of the age and cultural affiliation of any archaeological sites identified.*
   b. *A comparison against the criteria in 2 Stage 2: Property Assessment to determine whether further assessment is required*
   c. *A preliminary determination regarding whether any archaeological sites identified in Stage 2 show evidence of a high level cultural heritage value or interest and will thus require Stage 4 mitigation.*

No archaeological sites or resources were found during the Stage 2 survey of the study area.

9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 STAGE 2 RECOMMENDATIONS

Under Section 7.8.4 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011: 139) the recommendations to be made as a result of a Stage 2 Property Assessment are described.

1) For each archaeological site, provide a statement of the following:
   a. Borden number or other identifying number
   b. Whether or not it is of further cultural heritage value or interest
   c. Where it is of further cultural heritage value or interest, appropriate Stage 3 assessment strategies

2) Make recommendations only regarding archaeological matters. Recommendations regarding built heritage or cultural heritage landscapes should not be included.

3) If the Stage 2 survey did not identify any archaeological sites requiring further assessment or mitigation of impacts, recommend that no further archaeological assessment of the property be required.

As a result of the Stage 2 Property Assessment of the study area, no archaeological resources were encountered. Consequently, the following recommendations are made:

1. *No further archaeological assessment of the study area is warranted;*

2. *The Provincial interest in archaeological resources with respect to the proposed undertaking has been addressed;*
3. *The proposed undertaking is clear of any archaeological concern.*

10.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION

While not part of the archaeological record, this report must include the following standard advisory statements for the benefit of the proponent and the approval authority in the land use planning and development process:

a. *This report is submitted to the Minister of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries 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 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 and Culture, 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.*

b. *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 Archaeological Reports referred to in Section 65.1 of the Ontario Heritage Act.*

c. *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 archaeologist to carry out archaeological fieldwork, in compliance with sec. 48 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act.*

d. *The Cemeteries Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.4 and the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33 (when proclaimed in force) require that any person discovering human remains must notify the police or coroner and the Registrar of Cemeteries at the Ministry of Consumer Services.*

e. *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.*

11.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES

Chapman, L.J. & D.F. Putnam. (1984). *The Physiography of Southern Ontario (Third Edition).* Ontario Geological Survey, Special Report #2. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Toronto.

Elora & Fergus. *Sharing the Secrets of Centre Wellington.* Retrieved from URL: https://www.fergusfilming.ca/fergusontario#:~:text=With%20a%20population%20of%2020%2C767,it's%20Scottish%20founders%2C%20Adam%20Fergusson.

Esri. "Topographic" [basemap]. Scale Not Given. "World Topographic Map". April 5 2021. http://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=30e5fe3149c34df1ba922e6f5bbf808f.

Goel, Tarun (2013). Road Construction: History and Procedure. Bright Hub Engineering. Retrieved 24 May 2015 from URL: http://www.brighthubengineering.com/structural-engineering/59665-road-construction-history-and-procedure/

Google Earth (Version 6.0.3.2197) [Software]. (2021). Available from http://www.google.com/earth/index.html.

Kuhlmann, Stacy. (2017). *Types of Soil.* Diagram of Soil Types available from http://www.tes.com/lessons/AKChU3fbfZKo9g/types-of-soil.

Leslie, Guy. (1861). *Historical County Map of Wellington County.* Charles Wheelock and W.C. Chewett, W.C. Chewett & Co., Orangeville.

Ontario Heritage Act, RSO 1990a, Government of Ontario. (Queen's Printer, Toronto).

Ontario Heritage Amendment Act, SO 2005, Government of Ontario. (Queen's Printer, Toronto).

Ontario Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation (OMCzCR). (1993). *Archaeological Assessment Technical Guidelines, Stages 1-3 and Reporting Format.* (Queen's Printer for Ontario 1993)

Ontario Ministry of Culture (MCL). (2005). *Conserving a Future for Our Past: Archaeology, Land Use Planning & Development in Ontario (An Educational Primer and Comprehensive Guide for Non-Specialists).* (Heritage & Libraries Branch, Heritage Operations Unit: Toronto).

Ontario Ministry of Culture and Communications (MCC) & Ministry of Environment (MOE). (1992). *Guideline for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments.* (Cultural Programs Branch, Archaeology and Heritage Planning: Toronto).

Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture (MTC). (2011). *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologist.* (Programs and Services Branch: Culture Programs Unit, Toronto).

Ontario Planning Act, RSO 1990b, Government of Ontario. (Queen's Printer, Toronto).

Provincial Policy Statement (2020). Government of Ontario. (Queen's Printer, Toronto).

Smith, David G. (2002). "Ten Thousand Years: Aboriginal Heritage in Mississauga." In *Mississauga: The First 10,000 Years*. Frank Dieterman, Ed. Mississauga Heritage Foundation, Eastendbooks, Toronto.

South Fergus Landowner Group. (2020). *South Fergus MESP & Secondary Plan.* South Fergus Landowner Group, Fergus.

Walker & Miles. (1877). *Illustrated Historical Atlas of Waterloo and Wellington Counties.* Walker & Miles, Toronto.

Wikipedia. (2017). *Wellington County, Ontario.* Retrieved 29 August, 2017 from URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wellington_County,_Ontario#History

Wright, J.V. (1972). *Ontario Prehistory: an Eleven-thousand-year Archaeological Outline*. Archaeological Survey of Canada. National Museum of Man, Ottawa.

12.0 MAPS



MAP 1 LOCATION OF THE STUDY AREA (ESRI 2021)



MAP 2 FACSIMILE SEGMENT OF THE ILLUSTRATED HISTORICAL ATLAS OF WATERLOO AND WELLINGTON COUNTIES (WALKER & MILES 1877)



MAP 3 FACSIMILE SEGMENT OF THE HISTORICAL COUNTY MAP OF WELLINGTON COUNTY (LESLIE GUY 1861)



MAP 4 SECONDARY PLAN (SOUTH FERGUS LANDOWNER GROUP 2020)



MAP 5 AERIAL PHOTO OF THE STUDY AREA (GOOGLE EARTH 2021)

13.0 IMAGES

IMAGE 1 SURVEY CONDITIONS IN WOODED AREA

IMAGE 2 SURVEY CONDITIONS IN WOODED AREA

IMAGE 3 DOGWOOD IN LOW-LYING WET AREA

IMAGE 4 MEADOW AREA SURVEY CONDITIONS

IMAGE 5 TEST PIT IN PROGRESS

IMAGE 6 CREW AT WORK

IMAGE 7 PEDESTRIAN SURVEY CONDITIONS

IMAGE 8 CREW AT WORK

IMAGE 9 LOW-LYING WET AREA

IMAGE 10 SAND FILL SOIL MOUNDS

IMAGE 11 SMALL STREAM IN MEADOW

IMAGE 12 SMALL STREAM IN MEADOW

IMAGE 13 CREEK THROUGH MEADOW

IMAGE 14 BANK BARN AND SHED WITH CONCRETE PAD

IMAGE 15 GRAVEL DRIVEWAY AND RESIDENCE

IMAGE 16 BANK BARN AND SILOS

IMAGE 17 SHED AND GRAVEL ON TOPSOIL

IMAGE 18 IN-GROUND POOL AND CONCRETE PATIO

IMAGE 19 TEST PIT IN PROGRESS

IMAGE 20 SHED

IMAGE 21 GRAVEL DRIVEWAY

IMAGE 22 RESIDENCE AND DISTURBED LAWN

IMAGE 23 DISTURBED TEST PIT

IMAGE 24 CREW CONDUCTING PEDESTRIAN SURVEY

IMAGE 25 SOIL CONDITIONS IN PLOUGHED FIELD

IMAGE 26 PEDESTRIAN SURVEY CONDITIONS

IMAGE 27 CREW CONDUCTING PEDESTRIAN SURVEY

IMAGE 28 GRAVEL PARKING AREA BEHIND BARN

IMAGE 29 RESIDENCE ON EASTERN BORDER