



4.3 Location 3 (BbHe-2)

The Stage 2 assessment of Location 3 (BbHe-2) resulted in the recovery of a scatter of mid-to-late 19th century historic Euro-Canadian artifacts. Ironstone ceramics comprised 64.7% of the entire ceramic assemblage (n=90). Ironstone or graniteware is a variety of refined white earthenware introduced in the 1840s that became extremely popular in Upper Canada by the 1860s (Kenyon 1985). In addition to the ironstone ceramics, mid 19th century whiteware ceramics accounted for 14.4% (n=20) of the recovered ceramic assemblage.

Spatially Location 3 (BbHe-2) is located on Lot 37, Concession 1 NDR, Geographic Township of Glenelg, Grey County, Ontario. No one is listed as owning this lot on the 1880 *Grey County Supplement to the Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada* (Belden and Company 1880) (Figure 2); however as discussed previously, only subscribers to the historical atlas had their names included on the maps. The presence of more than 20 artifacts dating the period of use prior to 1900 lends cultural heritage value or interest to the site; these artifacts include the previously discussed ironstone and whiteware ceramics. Based on this consideration, the artifacts identified fulfill the criteria for a Stage 3 archaeological investigation as per Section 2.2 Standard 1c of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011b), to further evaluate its cultural heritage value or interest. The site has been registered with the MTCS and has been assigned Borden number BbHe-2.

4.4 Preliminary Indication of Sites Possible Requiring Stage 4 Archaeological Assessment

This preliminary indication of whether any site could be eventually recommended for Stage 4 archaeological assessment is required under the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* Section 7.8.3 Standard 2c, but no firm recommendation for or against Stage 4 archaeological assessment will be made until the forthcoming Stage 3 archaeological assessment has been conducted. Based on the recovered Stage 2 artifacts, it is unlikely that any of the three locations discussed in this report (Location 1 (BbHd-3), Location 2 (BbHd-4) and Location 3 (BbHe-2)) will be recommended for Stage 4 archaeological assessment.



5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

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

5.1 Location 1 (BbHd-3)

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

5.2 Location 2 (BbHd-4)

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



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

5.3 Location 3 (BbHe-2)

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

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

The MTCS is asked to accept this report into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports. Additional archaeological assessment is still required; hence the archaeological sites recommended for further archaeological fieldwork 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.



6.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION

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

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

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

The *Cemeteries Act*, R.S.O. 1990 c. C.4 and the *Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act*, 2002, R.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.

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.



7.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES

Adams, Nick

1994 *Field Manual for Avocational Archaeologists in Ontario*. Ontario Archaeological Society Incorporated Archaeological Stewardship Project. Ontario Archaeological Society, North York.

Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI)

2010 *Stage 1 Archaeological Resource Assessment (Revised), NextEra Wind Project: East Durham Wind Farm, West Grey Township (former Township of Glenelg), County of Grey, Ontario*. Report on file with the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, Toronto.

Belden, H. and Company

1880 *Grey Supplement to the Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada*.

Birks, Steve

2012 *A-Z of Stoke-on-Trent Potters. Alphabetical Index. List of Over 1500 Stoke-on-Trent Potters*. Electronic document: http://www.thepotteries.org/allpotters/index_alpha.htm. Last accessed January 18, 2012.

Collard, Elizabeth

1967 *Nineteenth-Century Pottery and Porcelain in Canada*. McGill University Press, Montreal.

Fike, Richard E.

1987 *The Bottle Book: A Comprehensive Guide to Historic, Embossed Medicine Bottles*. Gibbs M. Smith Inc., Salt Lake City.

Gallo, John

1985 *Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Yellow Ware*. New York.

Giarde, Jeffery L.

1989 *Glass Milk Bottles: Their Makers and Marks*. L. G. Enterprises, California.

Golder Associates Ltd.

2012b *Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, Additional Reporting, East Durham Wind Energy Project (Revised November 9, 2012), Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Glenelg, now West Grey Township, Grey County, Ontario*. Report on file with the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, Toronto

Government of Canada

1993 *NTS Map Sheet 41A/7 (Markdale)*. Centre for Topographic Resources, Natural Resources Canada.