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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In January 2014, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. carried out a Stage 1 archaeological assessment of lands with the potential to be impacted by the proposed replacement of the Woodburn Bridge in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. This report documents the background research and archaeological potential modeling involved in the assessment, and presents conclusions and recommendations pertaining to archaeological concerns within the study area. The assessment was completed as a component of a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA), Schedule B, in compliance with the Environmental Assessment Act.

The trigger for the EA Schedule B process is based on the age of the structure (over 40 years) and the potential for it to retain cultural heritage value. A built heritage assessment is also being completed.

The Stage 1 assessment of the study area was conducted under Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport licence #P007, PIF #P007-0579-2013. The optional property inspection, discussed in Section 1.2 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011:15–17), was not undertaken for this assessment. The corpus of available satellite imagery and topographic mapping provided clear evidence that multiple areas of no archaeological potential are located within the study area. Accordingly, no greater level of detail was needed to recommend appropriate Stage 2 assessment strategies.

The results of the Stage 1 assessment indicate that the study area currently comprises a mixture of areas of archaeological potential and areas of no archaeological potential. Based on these findings, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. recommends that all areas of archaeological potential that could be impacted by the project be subject to a Stage 2 property assessment in advance of construction. Given that the areas of archaeological potential comprise non-agricultural lands and lands were ploughing is not viable (i.e., linear corridors on either side of an existing roadway), the assessment should be conducted using the test pit survey method in accordance with the requirements set out in Section 2.1.2 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011:31–32).

The identified areas of no archaeological potential are not recommended for further assessment. Should the Municipal Class EA result in the determination that the project lands and all associated areas of impact can be completely restricted to areas of no archaeological potential, a Stage 2 property assessment will not be required in advance of construction. A Letter of Review and Entry into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports is requested, as provided for in Section 65.1 of the Ontario Heritage Act.
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1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT

1.1 Development Context

In January 2014, ARA carried out a Stage 1 archaeological assessment of lands with the potential to be impacted by the proposed replacement of the Woodburn Bridge in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. This report documents the background research and archaeological potential modeling involved in the assessment, and presents conclusions and recommendations pertaining to archaeological concerns within the study area. The assessment was completed as a component of a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA), Schedule B, in compliance with the Environmental Assessment Act.

The trigger for the EA Schedule B process is based on the age of the structure (over 40 years) and the potential for it to retain cultural heritage value. A built heritage assessment is also being completed.

The study area for this Stage 1 assessment consists of a rectilinear 0.62 ha parcel of land located southwest of the community of Woodburn and northeast of Binbrook (see Map 1–Map 2; Appendix A). This parcel comprises part of the Woodburn Road ROW and its associated embankments and ditches, the Woodburn Bridge, and adjacent maintained lawns, unmaintained lands and agricultural lands. In legal terms, the study area falls on part of Block 1 (Lot 5) and Block 2 (Lot 1), Concession 2 in the Geographic Township of Binbrook (former Wentworth County).

The Stage 1 assessment of the study area was conducted under MTCS licence #P007, PIF #P007-0579-2013. In compliance with the objectives set out in Section 1.0 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011:13–23), this assessment was carried out in order to:

- Provide information concerning the study area’s geography, history and current land condition;
- Determine the presence of known archaeological sites in the study area;
- Present strategies to mitigate project impacts to such sites, if they are located;
- Evaluate in detail the study area’s archaeological potential; and
- Recommend appropriate strategies for Stage 2 archaeological assessment, if some or all of the study area has archaeological potential.

The assessment was conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18. All notes, photographs and records pertaining to the background study are currently housed in ARA’s processing facility located at 154 Otonabee Drive, Kitchener. Subsequent long-term storage will occur at ARA’s head office located at 97 Gatewood Road, Kitchener.

The MTCS is asked to review the results and recommendations presented in this report and provide their endorsement through a Letter of Review and Entry into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports.
1.2 Historical Context

After a century of archaeological work in southern Ontario, scholarly understanding of the historic usage of lands in the City of Hamilton has become very well-developed. What follows is a detailed summary of the archaeological cultures that have settled in the vicinity of the study area over the past 11,000 years; from the earliest Palaeo-Indian hunters to the most recent Euro-Canadian farmers.

1.2.1 Pre-Contact

1.2.1.1 Palaeo-Indian Period

The first documented evidence of occupation in southern Ontario dates to around 9000 BC, after the retreat of the Wisconsinan glaciers and the formation of Lake Algonquin, Early Lake Erie and Early Lake Ontario (Karrow and Warner 1990; Jackson et al. 2000:416–419). At that time small Palaeo-Indian bands moved into the region, leading mobile lives based on the communal hunting of large game and the collection of plant-based food resources (Ellis and Deller 1990:38; MCL 1997:34). Current understanding suggests that Palaeo-Indian peoples ranged over very wide territories in order to live sustainably in a post-glacial environment with low biotic productivity. This environment changed considerably during this period, developing from a sub-arctic spruce forest to a boreal forest dominated by pine (Ellis and Deller 1990:52–54, 60).

An Early Palaeo-Indian period (ca. 9000–8400 BC) and a Late Palaeo-Indian period (ca. 8400–7500 BC) are discernable amongst the lithic spear and dart points. Early points are characterized by grooves or ‘flutes’ near the base while the later examples lack such fluting. All types would have been used to hunt caribou and other ‘big game’. Archaeological sites from both time-periods typically served as small campsites or ‘way-stations’ (occasionally with hearths or fire-pits), where tool manufacture/maintenance and hide processing would have taken place. For the most part, these sites tend to be small (less than 200 sq. m) and ephemeral (Ellis and Deller 1990:51–52, 60–62). Many parts of the Palaeo-Indian lifeway remain unknown.

1.2.1.2 Archaic Period

Beginning in the early 8th millennium BC, the biotic productivity of the environment began to increase as the climate warmed and southern Ontario was colonized by deciduous forests. This caused the fauna of the area to change as well, and ancient peoples developed new forms of tools and alternate hunting practices to better exploit both animal and plant-based food sources. These new archaeological cultures are referred to as ‘Archaic’. Thousands of years of gradual change in stone tool styles allows for the recognition of Early (7500–6000 BC), Middle (6000–2500 BC) and Late Archaic periods (2500–900 BC) (MCL 1997:34).

The Early and Middle Archaic periods are characterized by substantial increases in the number of archaeological sites and a growing diversity amongst stone tool types and exploited raw materials. Notable changes in Archaic assemblages include a shift to
notched or stemmed projectile points, a growing prominence of net-sinkers (notched pebbles) and an increased reliance on artifacts like bone fish hooks and harpoons. In addition to these smaller items, archaeologists also begin to find evidence of more massive wood working tools such as ground stone axes and chisels (Ellis et al. 1990:65–67).

Towards the end of the Middle Archaic (ca. 3500 BC), the archaeological evidence suggests that populations were 1) increasing in size, 2) paying more attention to ritual activities, 3) engaging in long distance exchange (e.g. in items such as copper) and 4) becoming less mobile (Ellis et al. 1990:93; MCL 1997:34). Late Archaic peoples typically made use of shoreline/riverine sites located in rich environmental zones during the spring, summer and early fall, and moved further inland to deer hunting and fruit-gathering sites during late fall and winter (Ellis et al. 1990:114).

During the Late Archaic these developments continued, and new types of projectile points appeared along with the first true cemeteries. Excavations of burials from this time-frame indicate that human remains were often cremated and interred with numerous grave goods, including items such as projectile points, stone tools, red ochre, materials for fire-making kits, copper beads, bracelets, beaver incisors, and bear maxilla masks (Ellis et al. 1990:115–117). Interestingly, these true cemeteries may have been established in an attempt to solidify territorial claims, linking a given band or collection of bands to a specific geographic location.

From the tools unearthed at Archaic period sites it is clear that these people had an encyclopaedic understanding of the environment that they inhabited. The number and density of the sites that have been found suggest that the environment was exploited in a successful and sustainable way over a considerable period of time. The success of Archaic lifeways is attested to by clear evidence of steady population increases over time. Eventually, these increases set the stage for the final period of Pre-Contact occupation—the Woodland Period (Ellis et al. 1990:120).

1.2.1.3 Early and Middle Woodland Periods

The beginning of the Woodland period is primarily distinguished from the earlier Archaic by the widespread appearance of pottery. Although this difference stands out prominently amongst the archaeological remains, it is widely believed that hunting and gathering remained the primary subsistence strategy throughout the Early Woodland period (900–400 BC) and well into the Middle Woodland period (400 BC–AD 600). In addition to adopting ceramics, communities also grew in size during this period and participated in developed and widespread trade relations (Spence et al. 1990; MCL 1997:34).

The first peoples to adopt ceramics in the vicinity of the study area are associated with the Meadowood archaeological culture. This culture is characterized by distinctive Meadowood preforms, side-notched Meadowood points and Vinette 1 ceramics (thick and crude handmade pottery with cord-marked decoration). Meadowood peoples are believed to have been organized in bands of roughly 35 people, and some of the best documented
sites are fall camps geared towards the hunting of deer and the gathering of nuts (Spence et al. 1990:128–137).

Ceramic traditions continued to develop during the subsequent Middle Woodland period, and three distinct archaeological cultures emerged in southern Ontario: ‘Point Peninsula’ north and northeast of Lake Ontario, ‘Couture’ near Lake St. Clair and ‘Saugeen’ in the rest of southwestern Ontario (see Map 3). These cultures all shared a similar method of decorating pottery, using either dentate or pseudo-scallop shell stamp impressions, but they differed in terms of preferred vessel shape, zones of decoration and surface finish (Spence et al. 1990:142–43).

The local Saugeen complex, which appears to have extended from Lake Huron to as far east as the Humber River and the Niagara Peninsula, is characterized by stamped pottery, distinctive projectile points, cobble spall scrapers and a lifeway geared towards the exploitation of seasonally-available resources such as game, nuts and fish (Spence et al. 1990:147–156). Although relatively distant from the study area, the Donaldson site along the Saugeen River may be representative of a typical Saugeen settlement; it was occupied in the spring by multiple bands that came to exploit spawning fish and bury members who had died elsewhere during the year (Finlayson 1977:563–578). The archaeological remains from this site include post-holes, hearth pits, garbage-dumps (middens), cemeteries and even a few identifiable rectangular structures (Finlayson 1977:234–514).

During the Middle to Late Woodland transition (AD 600–900), major developments took place at the western end of Lake Ontario as maize (corn) horticulture was introduced and settled agriculturalists emerged (Fox 1990:171, Figure 6.1). This shift is linked to the development of the Princess Point complex, which is characterized by distinctively decorated ceramic vessels (combining cord roughening, impressed lines and punctuate designs), triangular projectile points, T-based drills, steatite and ceramic pipes and ground stone chisels and adzes (Fox 1990:174–188).

The Grand Banks site near Cayuga is one of the best known Princess Point sites, and a calibrated radiocarbon date of AD 406–586 indicates that it was home to the first maize horticulturalists in northeastern North America (Warrick 2000:427). Generally, Princess Point sites consist of what are called ‘incipient’ longhouses, circular or square houses and even rudimentary palisades. Excavated evidence suggests that a typical village would have contained upwards of five contemporary houses at any one time, serving a population of roughly 75 people for perhaps 40–50 years. The evidence also indicates that many of these villages were reoccupied repeatedly over the centuries (Warrick 2000:429–434).

Intriguingly, approximately half of the documented Princess Point sites in Ontario have been discovered along the Grand River, but examples have also been found in the vicinity of the Credit and Humber Rivers (see Map 4). The distinctive artifacts and horticultural practices of Princess Point peoples have led to the suggestion that they were the
ancestors of the later Iroquoian-speaking populations of southern Ontario (Warrick 2000:427).

1.2.1.4 Late Woodland Period

In the Late Woodland period (ca. AD 900–1600), the practice of maize horticulture spread beyond the western end of Lake Ontario, allowing for population increases which in turn led to larger settlement sizes, higher settlement density and increased social complexity among the peoples involved. These developments are believed to be linked to the spread of Iroquoian-speaking populations in the area; ancestors of the historically-documented Huron, Neutral and Haudenosaunee Nations. Other parts of southern Ontario, including the Georgian Bay littoral, the Bruce Peninsula and the vicinity of Lake St. Clair, were inhabited by Algonkian-speaking peoples, who were much less agriculturally-oriented.

Late Woodland archaeological remains from the greater vicinity of the study area show three major stages of cultural development prior to European contact: ‘Early Iroquoian’, ‘Middle Iroquoian’ and ‘Late Iroquoian’ (Dodd et al. 1990; Lennox and Fitzgerald 1990; Williamson 1990).

Early Iroquoians (AD 900–1300) lived in small villages (ca. 0.4 ha) of between 75 and 200 people, and each settlement consisted of four or five longhouses up to 15 m in length. The houses contained central hearths and pits for storing maize (which made up 20–30% of their diet), and the people produced distinctive pottery with decorative incised rims (Warrick 2000:434–438). The best documented Early Iroquoian culture in the local area is the Glen Meyer complex, which is characterized by well-made and thin-walled pottery, ceramic pipes, gaming discs, and a variety of stone, bone, shell and copper artifacts (Williamson 1990:295–304).

Over the next century (AD 1300–1400), Middle Iroquoian culture became dominant in southwestern Ontario, and distinct ‘Uren’ and ‘Middleport’ stages of development have been identified. Both houses and villages dramatically increased in size during this time: longhouses grew to as much as 33 m in length, settlements expanded to 1.2 ha in size and village populations swelled to as many as 600 people. Middle Iroquoian villages were also better planned, suggesting emerging clan organization, and most seem to have been occupied for perhaps 30 years prior to abandonment (Dodd et al. 1990:356–359; Warrick 2000:439–446).

During the Late Iroquoian period (AD 1400–1600), the phase just prior to widespread European contact, it becomes possible to differentiate between the archaeologically-represented groups that would become the Huron and the Neutral Nations. The study area itself lies on the outskirts of the territorial boundaries of the Pre-Contact Neutral Nation, documented in lands as far west as Chatham and as far east as New York State.

The Neutral Nation is well represented archaeologically: typical artifacts include ceramic vessels and pipes, lithic chipped stone tools, ground stone tools, worked bone, antler and teeth, and exotic goods obtained through trade with other Aboriginal (and later European) groups (Lennox and Fitzgerald 1990:411–437). The population growth so characteristic
of earlier Middleport times appears to have slowed considerably during the Late Iroquoian period, and the Pre-Contact Neutral population likely stabilized at around 20,000 by the early 16th century (Warrick 2000:446).

Pre-Contact Neutral villages were much larger than Middleport villages, with average sizes in the neighbourhood of 1.7 ha. Exceptional examples of these could reach 5 ha in size, containing longhouses over 100 m in length and housing 2,500 individuals. This seemingly rapid settlement growth is thought to have been linked to Middleport 'baby boomers' starting their own families and needing additional living space (Warrick 2000:446–449).

It has been suggested that the size of these villages, along with the necessary croplands to sustain them, may have had some enduring impacts on the landscapes that surrounded them. In particular, there has been a correlation postulated between Pre-Contact era corn fields and modern stands of white pine (Janusas 1987:69–70, Figure 7). Aside from these villages, the Pre-Contact Neutral also made use of hamlets, agricultural field cabins, specialized camps (e.g., fishing camps) and cemeteries (MCL 1997:35; Warrick 2000:449).

For the most part, Pre-Contact Neutral archaeological sites occur in isolated clusters defined by some sort of geographic region, usually within a watershed or another well-defined topographic feature (see Map 5). It has been suggested that these clusters represent distinct tribal units, which may have been organized as a larger confederacy akin to the historic Five Nations Iroquois (Lennox and Fitzgerald 1990:410). Nineteen main clusters of villages have been identified, the closest manifestation of which is known as the 'Upper Twenty Mile Creek Cluster'. This cluster, comprising the Weylie, Davidson, Guyatt, Mitchell, Hoskin, McMurray, Ronald, Martin and Wood sites, appears to have flourished primarily in the 16th and 17th centuries (Lennox and Fitzgerald 1990:Table 13.1).

The end of the Late Woodland period can be conveniently linked to the arrival and spread of European fur traders in southern Ontario, and a terminus of AD 1600 effectively serves to demarcate some substantial changes in Aboriginal material culture. Prior to the establishment of the fur trade, items of European manufacture are extremely rare on Pre-Contact Neutral sites, save for small quantities of reused metal scrap. With the onset of the fur trade ca. AD 1580, European trade goods appear in ever-increasing numbers, and glass beads, copper kettles, iron axes and iron knives have all been found during excavations (Lennox and Fitzgerald 1990:425–432).

### 1.2.2 Early Contact

#### 1.2.2.1 European Explorers

The first European to venture into what would become southern Ontario was Étienne Brûlé, who was sent by Samuel de Champlain in the summer of 1610 to accomplish three goals: 1) to consolidate an emerging friendship between the French and the First Nations, 2) to learn their languages, and 3) to better understand their unfamiliar customs. Other Europeans would subsequently be sent by the French to train as
interpreters. These men became *coureurs de bois*, "living Indian-style ... on the margins of French society" (Gervais 2004:182). Such ‘woodsmen’ played an essential role in all later communications with the First Nations.

Champlain himself made two trips to Ontario: in 1613, he journeyed up the Ottawa River searching for the North Sea, and in 1615/1616, he travelled up the Mattawa River and descended to Lake Nipissing and Lake Huron to explore Huronia (Gervais 2004:182–185). He learned about many First Nations groups during his travels, including prominent Iroquoian-speaking peoples such as the Wendat (Huron), Petun (Tobacco) and ‘la nation neutre’ (the Neutrals), and a variety of Algonkian-speaking Anishinabeg bands.

Champlain's map of *Nouvelle France* from 1632 encapsulates his accumulated knowledge of the area (see Map 6). Although the distribution of the Great Lakes is clearly an abstraction in this early map, important details concerning the terminal Late Woodland occupation of southern Ontario are discernable. Numerous Aboriginal groups are identified throughout the area, for example, and prolific Neutral village sites can be seen 'west' of *Lac St. Louis* (Lake Ontario).

### 1.2.2.2 Trading Contacts and Conflict

The first half of the 17th century saw a marked increase in trading contacts between the First Nations and European colonists, especially in southern Ontario. Archaeologically, these burgeoning relations are clearly manifested in the widespread appearance of items of European manufacture by AD 1630, including artifacts such as red and turquoise glass beads, scissors, drinking glasses, keys, coins, firearms, ladles and medallions. During this time, many artifacts such as projectile points and scrapers began to be manufactured from brass, copper and iron scrap, and some European-made implements completely replaced more traditional tools (Lennox and Fitzgerald 1990:432–437).

Nicholas Sanson's *Le Canada, ou Nouvelle France* (1656) provides an excellent representation of southern Ontario at this time of heightened contact. Here the lands of the Neutral Nation are clearly labelled with the French rendering of their Huron name, ‘*Attawandaron*’ (see Map 7). Unfortunately, this increased contact had the disastrous consequence of introducing European diseases into First Nations communities. These progressed from localized outbreaks to much more widespread epidemics (MCL 1997:35; Warrick 2000:457). Archaeological evidence of disease-related population reduction appears in the form of reduced longhouse sizes, the growth of multi-ossuary cemeteries and the loss of traditional craft knowledge and production skills (Lennox and Fitzgerald 1990:432–433).

### 1.2.2.3 Five Nations Invasion

The importance of European trading contacts eventually led to increasing factionalism and tension between the First Nations, and different groups began to vie for control of the lucrative fur trade (itself a subject of competition between the French and British). In what would become Ontario, the Huron, the Petun, and their Anishinabeg trading partners allied themselves with the French. In what would become New York, the League of the
Haudenosaunee (the Five Nations Iroquois at that time) allied themselves with the British. The latter alliance may have stemmed from Champlain’s involvement in Anishinabeg and Huron attacks against Iroquoian strongholds in 1609 and 1615, which engendered enmity against the French (Lajeunesse 1960:xxix). Interposed between the belligerents, the members of the Neutral Nation refused to become involved in the conflict.

Numerous military engagements occurred between the two opposing groups during the first half of the 17th century, as competition over territories rich in fur-bearing animals increased. These tensions boiled over in the middle of the 17th century, leading to full-scale regional warfare (MNCFN 2010:5). In a situation likely exacerbated by epidemics brought by the Europeans and the decimation of their population, a party of roughly 1,000 Mohawk and Seneca warriors set upon Huronia in March 1649. The Iroquois desired to remove the Huron Nation altogether, as they were a significant obstacle to controlling the northern fur trade (Hunt 1940:91–92).

The Huron met their defeat in towns such as Saint Ignace and Saint Louis (Sainte-Marie was abandoned and burned by the Jesuits in the spring of 1649). Those that were not killed were either adopted in the Five Nations as captives or dispersed to neighbouring regions and groups (Ramsden 1990:384). The Petun shared a similar fate, and the remnants of the affected groups formed new communities outside of the disputed area, settling in Quebec (modern-day Wendake), in the area of Michilimackinac and near Lake St. Clair (where they were known as the Wyandot).

Anishinabeg populations from southern Ontario, including the Ojibway, Odawa, and Pottawatomi, fled westward to escape the Iroquois (Schmalz 1977:2). The Neutral were targeted in 1650 and 1651, and the Iroquois took multiple frontier villages (one with over 1,600 men) and numerous captives (Coyne 1895:18). The advance of the Iroquois led to demise of the Neutral Nation as a distinct cultural entity (Lennox and Fitzgerald 1990:456).

For the next four decades, southern Ontario remained an underpopulated wilderness (Coyne 1895:20). This rich hunting ground was exploited by the Haudenosaunee to secure furs for trade with the Dutch and the English, and settlements were established along the north shore of Lake Ontario at places like Teiaiagon on the Humber River and Ganatswekwyagon on the Rouge River (Williamson 2008:51). The Haudenosaunee are also known to have traded with the northern Anishinabeg during the second half of the 17th century (Smith 1987:19).

Due to their mutually violent history, the Haudenosaunee did not permit French explorers and missionaries to travel directly into southern Ontario for much of the 17th century. Instead, they had to journey up the Ottawa River to Lake Nipissing and then paddle down the French River into Georgian Bay (Lajeunesse 1960:xxix). New France was consequently slow to develop in southern Ontario, at least until the fall of several Iroquoian strongholds in 1666 and the opening of the St. Lawrence and Lake Ontario route to the interior (Lajeunesse 1960:xxxi).
In 1669, the Haudenosaunee allowed an expedition of 21 men to pass through their territory. This expedition, which included François Dollier de Casson (a Sulpician priest) and René Bréhant de Galinée, managed to reach and explore the Grand River, which they named *le Rapide* after the swiftness of its current. These men descended the Grand to reach Lake Erie, and they wintered at the future site of Port Dover (Coyne 1895:21). Galinée's map is one of the earliest documented representations of the interior of southwestern Ontario (see Map 8). In it, he notes the locations of several former Neutral villages at the western end of Lake Ontario, likely consisting of abandoned ruins.

1.2.2.4 *Anishinabeg Influx*

The fortunes of the Five Nations began to change in the 1690s, as disease and casualties from battles with the French took a toll on the formerly-robust group (Smith 1987:19). On July 19, 1701, the Haudenosaunee ceded lands in southern Ontario to King William III with the provision that they could still hunt freely in their former territory (Coyne 1895:28). However, this agreement appears to have lacked any sort of binding formality.

According to the traditions of the Algonkian-speaking Anishinabeg, Ojibway, Odawa and Potawatomi bands began to mount an organized counter-offensive against the Iroquois in the late 17th century (MNCFN 2010:5). Around the turn of the 18th century, the Anishinabeg of the Great Lakes expanded into Haudenosaunee lands, and attempted to trade directly with the French and the English (Smith 1987:19). This led to a series of battles between the opposing groups, in which the Anishinabeg were more successful (Coyne 1895:28).

Haudenosaunee populations subsequently withdrew into New York State, and Anishinabeg bands established themselves in southern Ontario. Many of these bands were mistakenly grouped together by the immigrating Europeans under the generalized designations of 'Chippewa/Ojibway' and 'Mississauga'. 'Mississauga', for example, quickly became a term applied to many Algonkian-speaking groups around Lake Erie and Lake Ontario (Smith 1987:19), despite the fact that the Mississaugas were but one part of the larger Ojibway Nation (MNCFN 2010:3).

The Anishinabeg are known to have taken advantage of the competition between the English and French over the fur trade, and they were consequently well-supplied with European goods. The Mississaugas, for example, traded primarily with the French and received "everything from buttons, shirts, ribbons to combs, knives, looking glasses, and axes" (Smith 1987:22). The British, on the other hand, were well-rooted in New York State and enjoyed mutually beneficial relations with the Haudenosaunee.

As part of this influx, many members of the Algonkian-speaking Ojibway, Potawatomi and Odawa First Nations came back to Lake Huron littoral. Collectively, these people came to be known as the Chippewas of Saugeen Ojibway Territory (also Saugeen Ojibway Nation). These Algonkian-speakers established themselves in the Bruce Peninsula, all of Bruce and Grey Counties, and parts of Huron, Dufferin, Wellington, and Simcoe Counties (Schmalz 1977:233).
Throughout the 1700s and into the 1800s, Anishinabeg populations hunted, fished, gardened and camped along the rivers, floodplains and forests of southern Ontario (Warrick 2005:2). However, their ‘footprint’ was exceedingly light, and associated archaeological sites are both rare and difficult to detect. Historical records often play a pivotal role in reconstructing Anishinabeg lifeways during the timeframe, as the first European colonists often wrote about the locations of Aboriginal camps and hunting grounds.

Historical maps from the 18th century likewise shed valuable light on the contemporary cultural landscape. H. Popple’s *A Map of the British Empire in America* (1733), for example, does not show any prominent settlements in the vicinity of the study area, which is a result of the ephemeral environmental impact of the mobile Ojibway (see Map 9).

### 1.2.2.5 Relations and Ambitions

The late 17th and early 18th centuries bore witness to the continued growth and spread of the fur trade across all of what would become the Province of Ontario. The French, for example, established and maintained trading posts along the Upper Great Lakes, offering enticements to attract fur traders from the First Nations. Even further north, Britain’s Hudson Bay Company dominated the fur trade. Violence was common between the two parties, and peace was only achieved with the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713 (Ray 2014). Developments such as these resulted in an ever-increasing level of contact between European traders and local Aboriginal communities.

As the number of European men living in Ontario increased, so too did the frequency of their relations with Aboriginal women. Male employees and former employees of French and British companies began to establish families with these women, a process which resulted in the ethnogenesis of a distinct Aboriginal people: the Métis. Comprised of the descendants of those born from such relations (and subsequent intermarriage), the Métis emerged as a distinct Aboriginal people during the 1700s (MNO 2011).

Métis settlements developed along freighting waterways and watersheds, and were tightly linked to the spread and growth of the fur trade. These settlements were part of larger regional communities, connected by “the highly mobile lifestyle of the Métis, the fur trade network, seasonal rounds, extensive kinship connections and a shared collective history and identity” (MNO 2011).

In 1754, hostilities over trade and the territorial ambitions of the French and the British led to the Seven Years’ War (often called the French and Indian War in North America), in which many Anishinabeg bands fought on behalf of the French. After the French surrender in 1760, these bands adapted their trading relationships accordingly, and formed a new alliance with the British (Smith 1987:22). In addition to cementing British control over the Province of Quebec, the Crown’s victory over the French also proved pivotal in catalyzing the Euro-Canadian settlement process. The resulting population influx caused the demographics of many areas to change considerably.
R. Sayer and J. Bennett’s *General Map of the Middle British Colonies in America* (1776) provides an excellent view of the ethnic landscape of southern Ontario prior to the widespread arrival of European settlers. This map clearly depicts Grand and Humber Rivers, the territory of the Ojibway, and the virtually untouched lands of southern Ontario (see Map 10).

### 1.2.3 The Euro-Canadian Era

#### 1.2.3.1 British Colonialism

With the establishment of absolute British control came a new era of land acquisition and organized settlement. In the *Royal Proclamation* of 1763, which followed the Treaty of Paris, the British government recognized the title of the First Nations to the land they occupied. In essence, the ‘right of soil’ had to be purchased by the Crown prior to European settlement (Lajeunesse 1960:cix). Numerous treaties and land surrenders were accordingly arranged by the Crown, and great swaths of territory were acquired from the Ojibway and other First Nations. These first purchases established a pattern “for the subsequent extinction of Indian title” (Gentilcore and Head 1984:78).

The first land purchases in Ontario took place along the shores of Lake Ontario and Lake Erie, as well as in the immediate ‘back country’. Such acquisitions began in August 1764, when a strip of land along the Niagara River was surrendered by Six Nations, Chippewa and Mississauga chiefs (NRC 2010). Although many similar territories were purchased by the Crown in subsequent years, it was only with the conclusion of the American Revolutionary War (1775–1783) that the British began to feel a pressing need for additional land. In the aftermath of the conflict, waves of United Empire Loyalists came to settle in the Province of Quebec, driving the Crown to seek out property for those who had been displaced. This influx had the devastating side effect of sparking the slow death of the fur trade, which was a primary source of income for many First Nations groups.

By the mid-1780s, the British recognized the need to 1) secure a military communication route from Lake Ontario to Lake Huron other than the vulnerable passage through Niagara, Lake Erie and Lake St. Clair; 2) acquire additional land for the United Empire Loyalists; and 3) modify the administrative structure of the Province of Quebec to accommodate future growth. The first two concerns were addressed through the negotiation of numerous ‘land surrenders’ with Anishinabeg groups north and west of Lake Ontario, and the third concern was mitigated by the establishment of the first administrative districts in the Province of Quebec.

On July 24, 1788, Sir Guy Carleton, Baron of Dorchester and Governor-General of British North America, divided the Province of Quebec into the administrative districts of Hesse, Nassau, Mecklenburg and Lunenburg (Archives of Ontario 2009). The vicinity of the study area fell within the Nassau District at this time, which consisted of a massive tract of land extending due north from the head of Bay of Quinte in the east and the tip of Long Point on Lake Erie in the west. According to early historians, “this division was purely
conventional and nominal, as the country was sparsely inhabited ... the necessity for minute and accurate boundary lines had not become pressing" (Mulvany et al. 1885:13).

Further change came in December 1791, when the Parliament of Great Britain’s Constitutional Act created the Provinces of Upper Canada and Lower Canada from the former Province of Quebec. Colonel John Graves Simcoe was appointed as Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada, and he became responsible for governing the new province, directing its settlement and establishing a constitutional government modelled after that of Britain (Coyne 1895:33).

Simcoe initiated several schemes to populate and protect the newly-created province, employing a settlement strategy that relied on the creation of shoreline communities with effective transportation links between them. These communities, inevitably, would be composed of lands obtained from the First Nations, and many more purchases were subsequently arranged. The vicinity of the study area, for example, was acquired on December 7, 1792 as part of the second ‘Between the Lakes Purchase’, conducted to enhance Governor Haldimand’s original purchase from 1784. In this transaction, the Mississaugas received goods worth 1,180.74 Quebec pounds as compensation for approximately 1,215,000 ha (NRC 2010).

In July 1792, Simcoe divided the province into 19 counties consisting of previously-settled lands, new lands open for settlement and lands not yet acquired by the Crown. These new counties stretched from Essex in the west to Glengarry in the east. Three months later, in October 1792, an Act of Parliament was passed whereby the four districts established by Lord Dorchester were renamed as the Western, Home, Midland and Eastern Districts (Archives of Ontario 2009).

The vicinity of the study area fell within the Home District at this time, and comprised part of Lincoln County’s First Riding (Archives of Ontario 2009). D.W. Smyth’s A Map of the Province of Upper Canada (1800) clearly shows the layout of the first townships established at the western end of Lake Ontario (see Map 11).

1.2.3.2 Wentworth County

Shortly after the creation of Upper Canada, the original arrangement of the province’s districts and counties was deemed inadequate. As population levels increased, smaller administrative bodies became desirable, resulting in the division of the largest units into more ‘manageable’ component parts. The first major changes in the vicinity of the study area took place in 1798, when an Act of Parliament called for the realignment of the Home and Western Districts and the formation of the London and Niagara Districts. Many new counties and townships were subsequently created (Archives of Ontario 2009).

The vicinity of the study area remained part of Lincoln County’s First Riding in the newly created Niagara District at this time, the latter of which also included Haldimand County (Archives of Ontario 2009). J. Purdy’s A Map of Cabotia (1814) shows all of the townships that had been surveyed by that time, including the Township of Binbrook (see Map 12).
Eventually, as even smaller units of government became desirable, the Home and Niagara Districts were further divided. In 1816, large parts of York County and Haldimand County were reincorporated as the newly-formed Halton and Wentworth Counties in the Gore District. The vicinity of the study area became part of the newly-formed Wentworth County at this time, which comprised the Townships of Ancaster, Barton, Glanford, Binbrook and Saltfleet, as well as the remnants of the Haldimand Tract (see Map 13). By 1817, the Gore District had 6,684 inhabitants (the majority of which were United Empire Loyalists), 18 grist mills and 41 saw mills (Cumming 1971:54). The southern townships of the Gore District were the best settled (Smith 1846:213).

Although many townships were added to Halton County in 1821, Wentworth County remained unchanged for the majority of the early 19th century (see Map 14). In 1837 and 1838, however, the layout of what would become southern Ontario was significantly altered through the creation of the Huron, Brock, Wellington, Talbot and Simcoe Districts (Archives of Ontario 2009). The Townships of Wilmot, Puslinch, Guelph, Eramosa, Erin and Garafraxa were transferred from Halton County in the Gore District to the newly-formed Wellington District at this time, as were Blocks 1–4 of the Haldimand Tract (Waterloo, Woolwich, Pilkingston and Nichol). The Townships of Brantford, Onondaga and Tuscarora were added to Wentworth County during this period of change (see Map 15). Wentworth County became part of Canada West in the new United Province of Canada in February 1841. In 1845, the Townships of Seneca and Oneida were also added to Wentworth County (Archives of Ontario 2009).

Following the abolition of the district system in 1849, the counties of Canada West were reconfigured once again. The boundaries of Wentworth County were largely redefined, as the southernmost townships of Halton County were transferred over as compensation for losses associated with the formation of Brant County to the west. For the remainder of the Euro-Canadian era, the study area fell within the boundaries of Wentworth County, which consisted of the Townships of Beverley, Ancaster, West Flamborough, East Flamborough, Barton, Saltfleet, Glanford and Binbrook, as well as the City of Hamilton and Town of Dundas (see Map 16–Map 17).

1.2.3.3 The Township of Binbrook

In historic times, the Township of Binbrook was bordered by the Townships of Caistor and Grimsby to the east, the Township of Seneca to the south, the Township of Glanford to the west, and the Township of Saltfleet to the north. The township was well-watered by Twenty Mile Creek in the north and the Welland River, West Wolf Creek and Little Wolf Creek in the south. As in many other townships in southern Ontario, these waterways were exploited for their water power, which was used in a variety of early industrial enterprises (Smith 1846:15)

The Township of Binbrook, originally known as Township #11 in the Nassau District, was surveyed by Augustus Jones in 1791. The lots in the township were laid out in four concessions of five blocks each, and each block consisted of 1,000 acres (405 ha), save for Block 5 which was only 600 acres (243 ha). These early blocks were later subdivided
into five lots of 200 acres (81 ha) each. In 1800, the ‘L of Glanford’ was added to the southern part of Binbrook; this new land became Concessions VII–X (BHS 1979:4).

The first settlers in the Township of Binbrook arrived in the late 18th century, and numerous properties were patented in 1791 (many of these patents were not registered until years later). The first documented settler was Brian Condon, who took up 800 acres (324 ha) south of Block 1, Concession 1. The Sweezeys/Swayzes followed, settling 6.0 km north of Hall’s Corners, and John McCarley and Morris Derrick were the first settlers in the southern part of the township (DVSA 1971:xi). Other early settlers included the Sherriffs, Halls, Ptolemys, Sideys and Henrys, many of whom resided in the township for a considerable period of time. Quite often, the first patentees were absentee land owners, as much of the land was set aside or granted to military and government officials who did not live in the township (BHS 1979:9).

By 1831, the township had a population of 161. The first blacksmith shop was located at Hall’s Corners, and the first store was kept by Mr. McMicken at Woodburn (DVSA 1971:xi). By 1846, the Township of Binbrook had three saw mills in operation and a population of 712. At that time, a total of 17,477 acres (7,073 ha) had been taken up, 6,357 acres (2,573 ha) of which were under cultivation (Smith 1846:15). The most prominent historic communities in the township included Hall’s Corners/Binbrook and Woodburn, although smaller communities also developed at Blackheath and Sinclairville (see Map 18).

The community of Binbrook, situated in the west-central part of the township, was originally named Hall’s Corners after settler Henry Hall. Hall was a local merchant, and he also served as the postmaster for a time. During the Fenian Raids in the late 1860s, Hall’s Corners served as a garrison centre (BHS 1979:161). According to one historical source, there was “a large company of volunteers here, belonging to the 77th Battalion, organized and gazetted in 1866 ... John Brown as Captain and James Hoey, Ensign” (DVSA 1971:xi). In the late 19th century, Hall’s Corners housed the township offices, a temperance hall, five churches, a dry-goods store, a general store and post office, and over a dozen other local businesses (DVSA 1971:xi).

Woodburn, located in the northeastern part of the township, developed along Twenty Mile Creek and Woodburn Road (see Map 19). The creek was exploited for early industrial purposes, and the settlement was originally known as Steam Mill. The settlement’s first inhabitants included the Ptolemys, McEvoy’s, Twisses, Shaws, Counsells, Coopers, Swayzes, Quances, Daws, Jarvises, Robertses, Edmondses and Browns (BHS 1979:175–177). The first school, known as Steam Mill School, was built in 1830. The village boasted both a saw mill and a steam powered saw & grist mill at that time. Other early businesses included an axe factory, a boiler shop, a blacksmith shop, a boot and shoe maker, a brewery and distillery, and a hotel. The village had a general store on the west side of Woodburn Road and another on the east on the bank of Twenty Mile Creek (BHS 1979:175). While little remains of the bustling village today, it once had a population of 2,000 (BHS 1979:174).
In 1974, the Townships of Binbrook and Glanford were amalgamated to form the Township of Glanbrook in the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth. In 2001, Glanbrook was dissolved and the area became part of the new City of Hamilton.

1.2.3.4 Block 1 (Lot 5) and Block 2 (Lot 2), Concession 2

As discussed in Section 1.1, the study area falls within part of Block 1 (Lot 5) and Block 2 (Lot 1), Concession 2 in the Geographic Township of Binbrook. The lots in this area were laid out during the initial survey of the township in the late 18th century, and the vicinity of the study area was well-settled for the remainder of the Euro-Canadian period.

In an attempt to reconstruct the historic land use of the study area, ARA examined a historical map that documented past residents, structures (e.g., homes, businesses and public buildings) and features during the late 19th century. This map, published in Page & Smith’s *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth* (1875), was of the most detailed scale available (400 ft. to 1 inch). A georeferenced version of this historical map, showing the location of the study area, appears in Map 20 (McGill University 2001).

The *Illustrated Historical Atlas* (1875) indicates that every lot and concession in the vicinity of the study area was settled by the late 19th century, and that the core of the community of Woodburn was located to the northeast. The names of the historically-attested residents of the subject lots are summarized in Table 2, as are any additional relevant details associated with their specific biographical entries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Concession</th>
<th>Property Owner</th>
<th>Lot Size (acres)</th>
<th>Post Office</th>
<th>Biographic Details</th>
<th>Visible Features or Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Archibald Jarvis</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Woodburn</td>
<td>Irish farmer who settled ca. 1850</td>
<td>Woodburn village and Christ Anglican Church in northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lot 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>H. Henry</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Woodburn</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Structure and orchard in north-centre, Woodburn village in northeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lot 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.4 Summary of Past and Present Land Use

During Pre-Contact and Early Contact times, the vicinity of the study area would have comprised a mixture of deciduous trees and open areas. It seems clear that the First Nations managed the landscape to some degree, but the extent of such management is unknown. During the late 18th century, Euro-Canadian settlers arrived in the area and began to clear the forests for agricultural purposes. Over the course of the
Euro-Canadian era, this locality would have comprised primarily agricultural lands in the vicinity of Woodburn. Presently, the study area consists of part of the Woodburn Road ROW and its associated embankments and ditches, the Woodburn Bridge, and adjacent maintained lawns, unmaintained lands and agricultural lands.

1.2.5 Additional Background Information

Given that no other archaeological assessment reports have been prepared for the proposed project, and that no other assessments have been documented in the immediate area (see Section 1.3.1), additional relevant background information was not available to inform ARA’s potential modelling or recommendations (MTC 2011:125).

1.3 Archaeological Context

1.3.1 Previous Archaeological Work

In order to determine whether any archaeological assessments had been previously conducted within the limits of, or immediately adjacent to the study area, ARA submitted an inquiry to the Archaeology Data Coordinator (MTCS 2013) and conducted extensive independent background research. As a result of these investigations, ARA determined that there are no reports on record documenting past work within 50 m of the subject lands.

1.3.2 Summary of Registered or Known Archaeological Sites

An archival search was conducted using the MTCS’s Ontario Archaeological Sites Database in order to determine the presence of any registered archaeological resources which might be located within a 1 km radius of the study area (MTCS 2013). The results of this search indicate that there are seven previously-identified sites within these limits. The excavation results from these sites are summarized in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borden No.</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Year(s) Assessed</th>
<th>Cultural Affiliation</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AgGw-66</td>
<td>Scenic Woods IV</td>
<td>2002 (AAL)</td>
<td>Undetermined Pre-Contact</td>
<td>Lithic Scatter</td>
<td>A 10 x 10 scatter of 6 lithics; located on flat ground approximately 75 m SW of Twenty Mile Creek; no further work recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgGw-67</td>
<td>Scenic Woods V</td>
<td>2002 (AAL)</td>
<td>Undetermined Pre-Contact</td>
<td>Lithic Scatter</td>
<td>A 20 x 18 m scatter of 18 lithics; located on low-lying ground approximately 150 m SW of Twenty Mile Creek; further work recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgGw-68</td>
<td>Scenic Woods VI</td>
<td>2002 (AAL)</td>
<td>Undetermined Pre-Contact</td>
<td>Lithic Scatter</td>
<td>A 50 x 40 m scatter of 42 lithics; located on a slight rise approximately 75 m SE of Twenty Mile Creek; further work recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
None of these previously-identified sites are located within or immediately adjacent to the study area. Regardless, the presence of seven previously-identified sites within 1 km of the study area demonstrates the desirability of this locality for early settlement and resource exploitation.

1.3.3 **Natural Environment**

Environmental factors played a substantial role in shaping early land-use and site selection processes, particularly in small Pre-Contact societies with non-complex, subsistence-oriented economies. Euro-Canadian settlers also gravitated towards favourable environments, particularly those with agriculturally-suitable soils and a moderate climate. In order to fully comprehend the archaeological context of the study area, the following five features of the local natural environment must be considered: 1) forests; 2) drainage systems; 3) climatic conditions; 4) physiography; and 5) soil types.

The study area lies within the deciduous forest, an ecological zone described as having the most diverse forest life in Ontario. The region is characterized by a wide range of tree and shrub species, including eastern white pine, red pine, eastern hemlock, white cedar, yellow birch, sugar and red maple, basswood, red oak, black walnut, butternut, tulip, magnolia, black gum, and many types of oaks and hickories. A number of rare species of mammals, birds, plants and insects reside in the deciduous forest, including sassafras and tulip trees, southern flying squirrels, and red-bellied woodpeckers. Today, over 90% of Ontario’s population lives in this small region (MNR 2014).

Relatively little of the original forest cover remains standing today, however, as early Euro-Canadian agriculturalists conducted large-scale clearing operations to prepare the land for cultivation—only scattered woodlots remain in areas that are otherwise too poor for agriculture (MNR 2014). In Pre-Contact times, however, these dense forests would have been particularly bountiful. It is believed that the First Nations of the Great Lakes...
region exploited close to 500 plant species for food, beverages, food flavourings, medicines, smoking, building materials, fibres, dyes and basketry (Mason 1981:59–60). Furthermore, this diverse vegetation would have served as both home and food for a wide range of game animals, including white tailed deer, turkey, passenger pigeon, cottontail rabbit, elk, muskrat and beaver (Mason 1981:60).

In terms of local drainage systems, the subject lands lie entirely within the Lower Twenty Mile Creek subwatershed, which comprises part of the Lake Ontario South Shore watershed. The Lake Ontario South Shore watershed covers an area of 598 km² and contains Forty Mile Creek, Twenty Mile Creek and 15-16-18 Mile Creek (NPCA 2012). The study area itself is traversed by Twenty Mile Creek and the Lower Twenty Mile Creek Wetland Complex swamp, and is located 2.4 km south of Sinkhole Creek and 11.5 km south of Lake Ontario.

The local climatic region is that of the Lake Erie Counties, which lies south of the South Slopes. The immediate vicinity of the study area experiences a mean annual temperature of 7.2 °C, with mean daily maximum temperatures of 21.1 °C in July and mean daily maximum temperatures of -5.6 °C in January. The average annual precipitation level is 780 mm, 361 mm of which falls between May and September. The average frost-free period in this area lasts 142 days (Presant et al. 1965:20–21). On the whole, this agriculturally-favourable climate would have been well-suited for the common grain and forage crops grown during the Euro-Canadian period.

Physiographically, the study area lies within the region known as the Haldimand Clay Plain, which consists of a series of parallel clay belts deposited during the time of glacial Lake Warren. This region occupies most of the Niagara Peninsula above the escarpment, and covers an area of roughly 3,500 km² (Chapman and Putnam 1984:156–157). These physiographic elements have accumulated over dolostone bedrock belonging to the Middle and Lower Silurian Guelph formation (Davidson 1989:42).

The soils within the study area consist primarily of Alberton silty clay loam, which is a Mull Regosol made up of silty clay loam over clay that has variable drainage qualities. Alberton soils occur in most of the stream valleys of Ancaster, Glanford and Binbrook, and their lack of development indicates that they were deposited fairly recently. A small portion of the study area in the southwest comprises Smithville silt loam, which is a Grey-Brown Podzolic made up of silt loam over clay till that is moderately well-drained. Smithville soils are used to grow forage crops, spring grain, fall wheat, grain, silage crops and tree fruits (Presant et al. 1965:35–36, 44–45; Soil Map).

In summary, the study area possesses a number of environmental characteristics which would have made it attractive to both Pre-Contact and Euro-Canadian populations. The rich deciduous forest and the nearby water sources would have attracted a wide variety of game animals, and consequently, early hunters. The well-drained areas of Smithville silt loam would have been ideal for the maize horticulture of Middle to Late Woodland peoples and the mixed agriculture practiced by later Euro-Canadian populations. Finally, the proximity of the study area to Twenty Mile Creek would also have influenced its
settlement and land-use history. Such major waterways functioned as principal transportation routes in both Pre- and Post-Contact times.

1.3.4 Archaeological Fieldwork and Property Conditions

The Stage 1 assessment was carried out in January 2014 under MTCS licence #P007, PIF #P007-0579-2013. This assessment did not involve any archaeological fieldwork—a property inspection was not necessary as the historical and recent mapping of the area, as well as current sources and archaeological reports, were sufficient to inform the archaeological potential modelling. Accordingly, legal permission to enter and conduct all necessary fieldwork activities on project lands was not required.

Key personnel involved during the assessment were P.J. Racher, Project Director; C.E. Gohm, Operations Manager; C.J. Gohm, Deliverables Manager; and V. Cafik, Assistant Project Manager.

As discussed in Section 1.2.4, the study area consists of part of the Woodburn Road ROW and its associated embankments and ditches, the Woodburn Bridge, and adjacent maintained lawns, unmaintained lands and agricultural lands.
2.0 STAGE 1 BACKGROUND STUDY

2.1 Summary

The Stage 1 assessment of the study area, conducted under MTCS licence #P007, PIF #P007-0579-2013, was accomplished through an examination of the archaeology, history, geography and current land condition of the vicinity of the study area. This background study was carried out using archival sources (e.g., historical publications and records) and current academic and archaeological publications (e.g., archaeological studies and reports). It also included the analysis of modern topographic maps (at a 1:50,000 scale), recent satellite imagery, and historical maps/atlases of the most detailed scale available (400 ft. to 1 inch).

With occupation beginning in the Palaeo-Indian period approximately 11,000 years ago, the greater vicinity of the study area comprises a complex chronology of Pre-Contact and Euro-Canadian histories (see Section 1.2). Evidence of Archaic period, Woodland period and Early Contact period remains are well-attested in Wentworth County, and Euro-Canadian archaeological sites dating to pre-1900 and post-1900 contexts are likewise common. The presence of seven previously-identified sites in the vicinity of the study area demonstrates the desirability of this locality for early settlement and resource exploitation (see Section 1.3.2).

As mentioned in Section 1.3.3, the natural environment of the study area would have been attractive to both Pre-Contact and Euro-Canadian populations as a result of proximity to Twenty Mile Creek. The areas of well-drained soils and diverse vegetation of the vicinity of the study area would also have encouraged settlement throughout Ontario’s lengthy history. Euro-Canadian populations would have been particularly drawn to Woodburn Road, a historically-surveyed thoroughfare, and the early community of Woodburn itself (see Section 2.3).

In summary, the Stage 1 background study included an up-to-date listing of sites from the MTCS’s Ontario Archaeological Sites Database (in a 1 km radius around the study area), the consideration of previous archaeological field work in the area (within 50 m of the study area), the analysis of topographic maps and historic settlement maps (at the most detailed scale available), and the study of aerial photographs/satellite imagery. In this manner, the standards for background research set out in Section 1.1 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011:14–15) were met.

2.2 Field Methods (Property Inspection)

The optional property inspection, discussed in Section 1.2 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011:15–17), was not undertaken for this assessment. The corpus of available satellite imagery and topographic mapping provided clear evidence that multiple areas of no archaeological potential are located within the study area. Accordingly, no greater level of detail was needed to recommend appropriate Stage 2 assessment strategies. The results of ARA’s archaeological potential modelling are discussed below.
2.3 Analysis and Conclusions

In addition to the relevant historical sources and the results of past excavations and surveys (see Section 1.2–Section 1.3), the archaeological potential of a property can be assessed using its soils, hydrology and landforms as considerations. What follows is an in-depth analysis of the archaeological potential of the study area.

Throughout southern Ontario, scholars have noted a strong association between site locations and waterways. Young, Horne, Varley, Racher and Clish, for example, state that "either the number of streams and/or stream order is always a significant factor in the positive prediction of site presence" (1995:23). They further note that certain types of landforms, such as moraines, seem to have been favoured by different groups throughout prehistory (Young et al. 1995:33). According to Janusas (1988:1), "the location of early settlements tended to be dominated by the proximity to reliable and potable water resources." Site potential modeling studies (Peters 1986; Pihl 1986) have found that most prehistoric archaeological sites are located within 300 m of either extant water sources or former bodies of water, such as post-glacial lakes.

While many of these studies do not go into detail as to the basis for this pattern, Young, Horne, Varley, Racher and Clish (1995) suggest that the presence of streams would have been a significant attractor for a host of plant, game and fish species, encouraging localized human exploitation and settlement. Additionally, lands in close proximity to streams and other water courses were highly valued for the access they provided to transportation and communication routes. Primary water sources (e.g., lakes, rivers, streams and creeks) and secondary water sources (e.g., intermittent streams and creeks, springs, marshes and swamps) are therefore of pivotal importance for identifying archaeological potential (MTC 2011:17).

Section 1.3.1 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists emphasizes the following six features/characteristics as being additional indicators of positive potential for Pre-Contact archaeological materials: 1) features associated with extinct water sources (glacial lake shorelines, relic river channels, shorelines of drained lakes, etc.); 2) the presence of pockets of well-drained soils (for habitation and agriculture); 3) elevated topography (e.g. drumlins, eskers, moraines, knolls, etc.); 4) distinctive landforms that may have been utilized as spiritual sites (waterfalls, rocky outcrops, caverns, promontories, etc.); 5) proximity to valued raw materials (quartz, ochre, copper, chert outcrops, medicinal flora, etc.); and 6) accessibility of plant and animal food sources (spawning areas, migratory routes, prairie lands, etc.) (MTC 2011:17–18).

Conversely, it must be understood that non-habitation sites (e.g., burials, lithic quarries, kill sites, etc.) may be located anywhere. Potential modeling appears to break down when it comes to these idiosyncratic sites, many of which have more significance than their habitational counterparts due to their relative rarity. The Stage 1 archaeological assessment practices outlined in Section 1.4.1 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologist ensure that these important sites are not missed in Ontario, as no area can be exempted from further archaeological work unless it has been subjected to a Stage 1 property inspection or Stage 2 on-site documentation (MTC 2011:20–21).
With the development of integrated 'complex' economies in the Euro-Canadian era, settlement tended to become less dependent upon local resource procurement/production and more tied to wider economic networks. As such, proximity to transportation routes (roads, canals, etc.) became the most significant predictor of site location, especially for Euro-Canadian populations. In the early Euro-Canadian era (pre-1850), when transport by water was the norm, sites tended to be situated along major rivers and creeks—the 'highways' of their day. With the opening of the interior of the province to settlement after about 1850, sites tended to be more commonly located along historically-surveyed roads. Section 1.3.1 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists recognizes trails, passes, roads, railways and portage routes as examples of such early historical transportation routes (MTC 2011:18).

In addition to transportation routes, Section 1.3.1 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists emphasizes three other indicators of positive potential for Euro-Canadian archaeological materials: 1) areas of early settlement (military outposts, pioneer homesteads or cabins, early wharfs or dock complexes, pioneer churches, early cemeteries, etc.); 2) properties listed on a municipal register, designated under the Ontario Heritage Act or otherwise categorized as a federal, provincial or municipal historic landmark/site; and 3) properties identified with possible archaeological sites, historical events, activities or occupations, as identified by local histories or informants (MTC 2011:18).

Based on the location, drainage and topography of the subject lands and the application of land-use modelling, it seems clear that the study area, in its pristine state, would have potential for both Pre-Contact and Euro-Canadian archaeological sites. Local indicators of archaeological potential include one primary water source (Twenty Mile Creek), one historically-surveyed roadway (Woodburn Road) and one area of early settlement (the community of Woodburn).

In its current state, however, the study area retains only part of this archaeological potential. Section 2.1 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists states that only those areas that are permanently wet, consist of exposed bedrock, have steep slopes greater than 20°, or have been subjected to deep land alterations that have severely damaged the integrity of archaeological resources can be considered exempt from requiring Stage 2 archaeological assessment (MTC 2011:28). These guidelines serve as effective criteria for identifying areas of no archaeological potential.

Modern satellite imagery, topographic mapping and Google Street View photographs demonstrate that the archaeological potential of the study area has been negatively affected by past construction activities in certain locations. Specifically, deep land alterations have resulted in the removal of archaeological potential from the road platform and its associated embankments and ditches. Permanently wet areas were also noted in the central part of the study area (see Image 1–Image 4). The remainder of the study area retains its archaeological potential, or otherwise requires test-pitting to confirm disturbance in accordance with Section 2.1.8 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011:38).
Based on the results of this evaluation, the study area currently comprises a mixture of areas of archaeological potential and areas of no archaeological potential. In total, 49.38% (0.30 ha) was found to have archaeological potential, 45.33% (0.28 ha) was found to be disturbed and 5.29% (0.04 ha) was found to be permanently wet. ARA’s comprehensive evaluation of the archaeological potential of the study area appears in Map 21.

2.4 Recommendations

The Stage 1 assessment of the study area was completed in January 2014. The results of the assessment indicate that the study area currently comprises a mixture of areas of archaeological potential and areas of no archaeological potential. Based on these findings, ARA recommends that all areas of archaeological potential that could be impacted by the project be subject to a Stage 2 archaeological assessment in advance of construction.

Given that the areas of archaeological potential comprise non-agricultural lands and lands were ploughing is not viable (i.e., linear corridors on either side of an existing roadway), the Stage 2 assessment should be conducted using the test pit survey method in accordance with the requirements are set out in Section 2.1.2 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011:31–32). A maximum test pit survey interval of 5 m is required in all areas less than 300 m from any feature of archaeological potential, and a maximum test pit survey interval of 10 m is required in all areas more than 300 m from any feature of archaeological potential. Each test pit must be excavated into the first 5 cm of subsoil, and the resultant pits must be examined for stratigraphy, cultural features and/or evidence of fill. The soil from each test pit must be screened through 6 mm mesh and examined for archaeological materials.

If the agricultural lands within the linear corridors are recently ploughed, weathered by one heavy rainfall, and provide at least 80% visibility at the time of fieldwork, a pedestrian survey must be carried out in accordance with the requirements are set out in Section 2.1.1 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTC 2011:30–31). This survey method involves systematically walking the agricultural lands at a maximum interval of 5 m, mapping and collecting any artifacts found on the ground surface. If archaeological materials are encountered in the course of the pedestrian survey, the transect interval must be closed to 1 m and a close inspection of the ground must be conducted for 20 m in all directions.

The identified areas of no archaeological potential are not recommended for further assessment. Should the Municipal Class EA result in the determination that the project lands and all associated areas of impact can be completely restricted to areas of no archaeological potential, a Stage 2 property assessment will not be required in advance of construction. A Letter of Review and Entry into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports is requested, as provided for in Section 65.1 of the Ontario Heritage Act.
3.0 ADVISE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION

Section 7.5.9 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists requires that the following information be provided for the benefit of the proponent and approval authority in the land use planning and development process (MTC 2011:126–127):

- 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 archaeological fieldwork on the site, submitted a report to the Minister stating that the site has no further cultural heritage value or interest, and the report has been filed in the Ontario Public Register of Archaeology Reports referred to in Section 65.1 of the Ontario Heritage Act.

- Should previously undocumented 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.

4.0 IMAGES

Image 1: Area of No Archaeological Potential – Disturbed Lands
(Photo Taken on September 13, 2013; Facing Southwest; Courtesy of City of Hamilton)

Image 2: Area of No Archaeological Potential – Disturbed Lands
(Photo Taken on September 13, 2013; Facing North; Courtesy of City of Hamilton)
Image 3: Area of No Archaeological Potential – Permanently Wet Lands
(Photo Taken on September 13, 2013; Facing Northeast; Courtesy of City of Hamilton)

Image 4: Area of No Archaeological Potential – Permanently Wet Lands
(Photo Taken on September 13, 2013; Facing Southwest; Courtesy of City of Hamilton)
5.0 MAPS

Map 1: Location of the Study Area in the Province of Ontario (NRC 2004)
Map 2: Location of the Study Area in the City of Hamilton (NRC 2014)
Map 3: Middle Woodland Period Complexes
(Wright 1972:Map 4)

Map 4: Princess Point Site Clusters in Southern Ontario
(Warrick 2000:Fig. 3)
Map 5: Pre-Contact Iroquoian Site Clusters
(Warrick 2000:Figure 10)

Map 6: Detail from S. de Champlain’s Carte de la Nouvelle France (1632)
(Gentilcore and Head 1984:Map 1.2)
Map 7: Detail from N. Sanson's *Le Canada, ou Nouvelle France* (1656)
(Gentilcore and Head 1984:Map 1.10)

Map 8: Detail from the Map of Galinée's Voyage (1670)
(Lajeunesse 1960:Map 2)
Map 9: Detail from H. Popple's *A Map of the British Empire in America* (1733)
(Cartography Associates 2009)

Map 10: Detail from R. Sayer and J. Bennett’s *General Map of the Middle British Colonies in America* (1776)
(Cartography Associates 2009)
Map 11: Detail from D.W. Smyth’s *A Map of the Province of Upper Canada* (1800) (Cartography Associates 2009)

Map 12: Detail from J. Purdy’s *A Map of Cabotia* (1814) (Cartography Associates 2009)

Map 14: Detail from J. Arrowsmith’s *Upper Canada* (1837) (Cartography Associates 2009)
Map 15: Detail from J. Bouchette’s *Map of the Provinces of Canada* (1846)
(Cartography Associates 2009)

Map 16: Detail from G.W. Colton’s *Canada West* (1856)
(Cartography Associates 2009)
Map 17: Wentworth County from W.J. Gage and Co.’s Gage’s County Atlas (1886) (W.J. Gage and Co. 1886)
Map 18: The Township of Binbrook from Page & Smith’s *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth* (1875)
(McGill University 2001)
Map 19: The Proposed Village of Woodburn, ca. 1840s
(BHS 1979:176)
Map 20: The Township of Binbrook from Page & Smith’s *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth* (1875), Showing the Study Area
(McGill University 2001; The Creek Course is Generalized, as it Passed South of Woodburn)
Map 21: Assessment Results – Archaeological Potential Modeling
(Basemap from First Base Solutions®)
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APPENDICES
Appendix A: Project Mapping
Dear Mr. Racher:

The above-mentioned report, which has been submitted to this ministry as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c 0.18 has been entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports without technical review.¹

Please note that the ministry makes no representation or warranty as to the completeness, accuracy or quality of reports in the register.

Should you require further information, please do not hesitate to send your inquiry to ArchaeologyReports@ontario.ca.

cc. Archaeology Licensing Officer
    Margaret Fazio, City of Hamilton
    Margaret Fazio, City of Hamilton

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