



**ACC**

ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
CONSULTANTS CANADA

# Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment

White Church Urban Boundary Expansion

Lots 6 to 10, Concession 5, Former Geographic Township of Glanford, Wentworth County, now in the City of Hamilton, Ontario

Original Report

Prepared for:

**Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism**

Prepared by:

Archaeological Licensee: Matthew Muttart, M.A., P1208

**Archaeological Consultants Canada**

PO Box 81045 Ancaster, RPO Fiddlers Green

Hamilton, ON L9G 4X1

[www.onarch.ca](http://www.onarch.ca)

[info@onarch.ca](mailto:info@onarch.ca)

289.683.7844

PIF #: P1208-0301-2023

Project No. 195-01-23

November 14, 2024

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Archaeological Consultants Canada (ACC) was contracted by the Proponent to conduct a Stage 1 archaeological assessment as part of the pre-planning process for the White Church Urban Boundary Expansion. The assessment was required under the *Planning Act, R.S.O 1990*. The assessed area, or the “subject property”, is located on Part of Lot 6, and all of Lots 7, 8, 9, and 10, Concession 5, in the City of Hamilton, formerly in the Geographic Township of Glanford, Wentworth County, Ontario (Figure 1). The subject property measures 364.55 hectares (ha). The Proponent verified the subject property limits as defined within this report and provided a map showing the area of the White Church Urban Boundary Expansion (Figure 2).

The Stage 1 assessment was conducted under Professional Archaeological License P1208, held by Matthew Muttart. The Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) assigned Project Information Form (PIF) number P1208-0301-2023 to this project. No fieldwork was conducted for this assessment.

Stage 1 background research indicated that the subject property has general archaeological potential due to the following factors:

- The subject property is largely comprised of well-drained land that is suitable for human habitation and agriculture
- Fourteen farmsteads are illustrated within the subject property in 1875 historical mapping (Page & Smith, 1875).
- The subject property is adjacent to four concession roads, Airport Road East, Miles Road, White Church Road East, and Upper James Street.
- The subject property is located within 300 m of the historic limits of the community of Mount Hope.
- There are water sources within the subject property including 18 ponds and eleven seasonal tributaries of the Welland River and Twenty Mile Creek.
- There are 187 registered sites located within 1 km of the subject property, including 13 registered sites located within the subject property
- The City of Hamilton’s *Archaeological Management Plan* indicates that portions of the subject property have archaeological potential.

18.88 ha, 5%, of the subject property has been previously subject to Stage 2 archaeological assessments for proposed pipeline assessments (Stantec, 2015, 2016, 2022, TMHC, 2015, 2016; see Figures 10 and 13 of this report). Thirteen locations containing archaeological resources were identified within the subject property during these assessments. Some of the sites documented during the Stage 1 & 2 assessments have undergone subsequent Stage 3 and 4 excavations. Of the 13 sites, ten sites have been sufficiently documented and have no further CHVI. Three registered archaeological sites located within the subject property retain CHVI. AgGx-606 and AgGx-618 have been recommended for Stage 3 excavation (TMHC, 2017a).



AgGx-1030 has been subject to partial Stage 4 excavation, but a portion of the site is unexcavated (Stantec, 2024).

2.90 ha, 1%, of the subject property consists of waterbodies. If impacts to these waterbodies are proposed, marine archaeological potential may be evaluated through a separate process following the MCM's 2016 *Criteria for Evaluating Marine Archaeological Potential* checklist. 10.87 ha, 3%, of the subject property has low to no archaeological potential because it has been previously disturbed. The balance of the subject property, 231.90 ha, 91%, retains archaeological potential and requires Stage 2 assessment.

The following is a summary of recommendations provided for consideration by the Proponent and the MCM. For detailed recommendations please see the full report.

1. Aerial imagery and topographic mapping indicates that 10.87 ha of the property exhibits low potential for the recovery of archaeological resources due to previous disturbance. The Stage 2 assessment should confirm the presence and extent of these areas of low archaeological potential, and they should be mapped and documented by photography.
2. Stage 2 assessment has been conducted on 18.88 ha of the subject property. As the reports documenting this fieldwork have been approved by MCM, these lands do not require any further Stage 2 survey.
3. There are 13 registered sites documented within the subject property. Ten of these sites, AgGx-603, AgGx-619, AgGx-620, AgGx-621, AgGx-623, AgGx-624, AgGx-625, AgGx-626, AgGx-627, and AgGx-1029, have no further CHVI and require no additional fieldwork. Three sites, AgGx-606, AgGx-618, and AgGx-1030, retain further CHVI. Proposed fieldwork strategies for each site are presented in the full recommendations presented within this report.
4. Stage 2 archaeological assessment in the form of a pedestrian survey should be conducted on the agricultural fields which account for 247.88 ha of the subject property.
5. Stage 2 archaeological assessment in the form of a test pit survey should be conducted in all areas where ploughing is not possible or viable, including manicured lawn, treerows, scrubland, and forested areas, which account for 84.02 ha of the subject property.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	2
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	6
PROJECT PERSONNEL.....	7
1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT .....	8
1.1 Development Context .....	8
1.2 Historical Context .....	9
1.2.1 Background Research .....	9
1.2.2 A Cultural Chronology for Southern Ontario .....	9
1.3 Archaeological Context .....	14
1.3.1 Natural Environment.....	14
1.3.2 Current Land Use.....	15
1.3.3 Previous Archaeological Investigations.....	15
1.3.4 Archaeological Master Plans .....	34
2.0 FIELD METHODS .....	36
3.0 RECORD OF FINDS.....	37
3.1 Areas of Low Archaeological Potential .....	37
3.2 Previously Assessed Areas .....	37
3.3 Areas of Archaeological Potential .....	37
3.4 Documentary Record .....	38
4.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS .....	39
4.1 Potential for Archaeological Resources .....	39
4.2. Discussion .....	40
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS .....	43
6.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION .....	46
7.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES .....	47
8.0 FIGURES .....	53



## LIST OF TABLES

---

1. General Cultural Chronology for Southern Ontario	10
2. Landowners Listed on Hardy Gregory's 1859 Map of Wentworth County	13
3. Landowners Listed on Page & Smith's 1875 Map of Glanford Township	14
4. Registered Archaeological Sites within 1 km of the Subject Property	16
5. Inventory of Documentary and Material Records	38
6. Status of Registered Archaeological Sites within the Subject Property	41

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

1. Location of the Subject Property on a 1:50,000 Scale Topographic Map	
2. White Church Boundary Expansion Area Showing the Subject Property	
3. Location of the Subject Property on Baron De Rottenburg's 1850 Map of the Principal Communications in Canada West	
4. Location of the Subject Property on Hardy Gregory's 1859 Map of the County of Wentworth, Canada West	
5. Location of the Subject Property on Page & Smith's 1875 Illustrated Historical Atlas Map of Glanworth Township, County of Wentworth	
6. Location of the Subject Property on a Map of Wentworth County Soils	
7. Water Sources within the Subject Property	
8. Current Land Use of the Subject Property	
9. Location of the Subject Property on 1954 Aerial Imagery	
10. Previous Archaeological Assessments Conducted Within 50 m of the Subject Property	
11. Location of the Subject Property On the City of Hamilton's Rural Hamilton Archaeological Potential Map	
12. Location of the Subject Property on the City of Hamilton Archaeological Management Plan Map of Areas of Archaeological Potential	
13. Results and Recommendations of the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of the Subject Property	



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The following is a list of abbreviations and acronyms used throughout this report.

ACC	Archaeological Consultants Canada
AMICK	AMICK Consultants Limited
ASI	Archaeological Services Inc.
CHVI	Cultural Heritage Value or Interest
DCL	Detritus Consulting Ltd.
DPA	D. R. Poulton & Associates
ha	hectares
km	kilometre
m	metre
MCM	Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism
OASD	Ontario Archaeological Sites Database
PIF	Project Information Form
Stantec	Stantec Consulting Ltd.
TMHC	Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants Inc.
WSP	WSP Canada
%	percent



## PROJECT PERSONNEL

Project Manager:	Matthew Muttart, M.A., P1208
Professional License:	Matthew Muttart, M.A., P1208
Field Director:	Matthew Muttart, M.A., P1208
Report Preparation:	Kristy O’Neal, M.A., P066
Graphics:	Kristy O’Neal, M.A., P066



# Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment

## White Church Urban Boundary Expansion

Lots 6 to 10, Concession 5, Former Geographic Township of Glanford,  
Wentworth County, now in the City of Hamilton, Ontario

### 1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT

#### 1.1 Development Context

Archaeological Consultants Canada (ACC) was contracted by the Proponent to conduct a Stage 1 archaeological assessment as part of the pre-planning process for the White Church Urban Boundary Expansion. The assessment was required under the *Planning Act, R.S.O 1990*. The assessed area, or the “subject property”, is located on Part of Lot 6, and all of Lots 7, 8, 9, and 10, Concession 5, in the City of Hamilton, formerly in the Geographic Township of Glanford, Wentworth County, Ontario (Figure 1). The subject property measures 364.55 hectares (ha). The Proponent verified the subject property limits as defined within this report and provided a map showing the area of the White Church Urban Boundary Expansion (Figure 2).

The objective of a Stage 1 background study is to provide information about the subject property’s geography, history, previous archaeological fieldwork, and current land conditions. A Stage 1 study evaluates the subject property’s archaeological potential in order to recommend appropriate strategies for the Stage 2 survey.

The entirety of the current subject property has been subject to Stage 1 assessment by D. R. Poulton & Associates (DPA), who completed a Stage 1 assessment for the decommissioning and replacement of an Enbridge pipeline, Line 10. DPA’s assessment area included a 33 kilometre (km) long corridor for a preferred pipeline replacement route along with a 1-km radius surrounding the preferred route. However, while DPA’s assessment focused on large overall property, discussion of archaeological potential within the report was largely limited to the preferred pipeline route rather than their entire assessed area. DPA recommended a general Stage 2 survey of the preferred route and associated impact areas as far in advance of construction as possible but did not identify specific areas of archaeological potential (DPA, 2015:41). Furthermore, DPA’s assessment was completed nearly a decade ago and additional assessments have been conducted within and surrounding the current subject property, warranting an updated Stage 1 archaeological assessment.

The Stage 1 assessment was conducted under Professional Archaeological License P1208, held by Matthew Muttart. The Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) assigned Project Information Form (PIF) number P1208-0301-2023 to this project. No fieldwork was conducted for this assessment.

All fieldwork and reporting were completed using MCM’s 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. This report documents the research, results, and the conclusions and



recommendations based on the Stage 1 archaeological assessment. All documents and records related to this project will be curated at the offices of ACC, in accordance with subsection 66(1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (OHA).

## 1.2 Historical Context

### 1.2.1 Background Research

Stage 1 background research was conducted to determine the potential for finding and identifying archaeological resources including sites within the current subject property and to determine the necessity of conducting a Stage 2 survey. This is done by reviewing geographic, archaeological, and historical data for the property and the surrounding area. The background research was conducted to:

- amass all the readily available information on any previous archaeological surveys in the area.
- determine the locations of any registered and unregistered sites within and around the subject property.
- develop an historical framework for assigning levels of potential significance to any new sites discovered during fieldwork.

The following sections summarize the findings from DPA's Stage 1 archaeological assessment report (DPA, 2015). When applicable, ACC has updated DPA's previous findings with new information to conform to the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (MCM, 2011).

### 1.2.2 A Cultural Chronology for Southern Ontario

Over their thousands of years of occupation in the general region, Indigenous peoples have left behind, to a greater or lesser degree, physical evidence of their lifeway activities and settlements at many locations. Based upon a published synthesis of Indigenous cultural occupations (Wright, 1968). Table 1 is a general outline of the cultural history of southern Ontario that is applicable to the subject property. Ellis and Ferris (1990) provide greater detail of the distinctive characteristics of each time period and cultural group.

It is likely that Ontario was occupied soon after the retreat of the Ice Age glaciers. The earliest known human occupation in the area was during the Paleoindian period (between 12,000 and 9,500 years ago) wherein small groups of nomadic peoples hunted big game such as caribou in a cool sub-arctic climate. Sites are typically found near glacial features such as the shorelines of glacial lakes or kettle ponds which would have allowed access to the low-lying environments that were favoured by caribou and other wildlife. These people were few and their small, temporary campsites are relatively rare. Paleoindian sites are recognized by the presence of distinctive artifacts such as fluted projectile points, beaked scrapers, and graves and by the preference for light colored chert, such as Collingwood chert. The Paleoindian Period is divided into two sub-periods, Early Paleoindian, and Late Paleoindian.



Table 1: General Cultural Chronology for Southern Ontario

PERIOD	SUBDIVISION I	SUBDIVISION II	YEARS BEFORE PRESENT	COMMENTS
PALEOINDIAN	Early Paleoindian	Fluted Point Horizon	12,000-10,500	big game hunters
	Late Paleoindian	Holcombe & Hi-Lo Horizons	10,500-9,500	small nomadic groups
ARCHAIC	Early Archaic	Side Notched Horizon	10,000-9,700	nomadic hunters and gatherers
		Corner-Notched Horizon	9,700-8,900	
		Bifurcate Horizon	8,900-8,000	
	Middle Archaic	Middle Archaic I/Stemmed Horizon	8,000-5,500	territorial settlements
		Middle Archaic II	5,500-4,500	polished ground stone tools
	Late Archaic	Narrow Point Horizon	4,500-3,500	
		Broad Point Horizon	4,000-3,500	
		Small Point Horizon (including Haldimand and Glacial Kame Complexes)	3,500-2,800	burial ceremonialism
WOODLAND	Early Woodland	Meadowood Complex	2,900-2,400	introduction of pottery
		Middlesex Complex	2,500-2,000	
	Middle Woodland	SW Ontario: Saugeen	2,300-1,500	long distance trade networks
		Western Basin: Couture	2,300-1,500	
	Transitional Woodland	SW Ontario:		
		Princess Point	1,500/1,400-1,200	incipient agriculture
		Western Basin:		
	Late Woodland: Ontario Iroquois Tradition	Riviere au Vase	1500/1400-1200/1100	
		Early: Glen Meyer	1200/100-750/700	transition to village life
		Middle I: Uren	720/700-710/670	large villages with palisades
		Middle II: Middleport	710/670-670/600	wide distribution of ceramic styles
	Late Woodland: Western Basin Tradition	Late: Neutral	600-450	
		Younge Phase	1200/1100-800	
Springwells Phase		800-600		
HISTORIC	European Contact	Wolf Phase	600-450	
		Historic Neutral	450-350	tribal warfare
		Initial Contact	380-300	tribal displacement
		European Settlement	200 >	European settlement
		First Nations Resettlement	200 >	

(Compiled from Adams, 1994, Ellis *et al.*, 1990, Wright, 1968)

People during the Archaic period (*circa* 10,000 to 2,800 years ago) were still primarily nomadic hunters, but they adapted to a more temperate climate. Groups were dispersed during winter months and converged around watercourses from the spring to fall in large fishing campsites. The Archaic period is characterized by the appearance of ground stone tools, notched, or stemmed projectile points. The Archaic Period is divided into three sub-periods, Early, Middle, and Late Archaic. During the Archaic Period, groups began to establish territorial settlements



and introduce burial ceremonialism. There is a marked increase in the number and size of sites, especially during the Late Archaic period.

The Woodland period is distinguished by the introduction of pottery vessels for storage and cooking. Sites of the Woodland period (*circa* 3000 to 400 years ago) are usually the most numerous because the population levels in southern Ontario had significantly increased, especially along the shores of Lakes Erie and Ontario. The Woodland Period is also marked by the establishment of complex long distance trading networks. The Woodland Period is divided into three sub-periods, Early, Middle and Late Woodland. During the Late Woodland Period, there is increasing sedentarism and the establishment of horticulture, a reliance on tribal warfare, and the introduction of semi-permanent villages with large protective palisades. The Late Woodland period also envelops the emergence of Iroquoian tribes and confederacies.

The historic period (from A.D. 1650 to 1900) begins with the arrival of Euro-Canadian groups. Sites of this period document European exploration, trade, and the displacement and devastation of native groups caused by warfare and infectious disease. The most common sites of this period include Euro-Canadian homesteads, industries, churches, schools, and cemeteries.

While North America had been visited by Europeans on an increasing scale since the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, the first European to venture into what would become southern Ontario was Étienne Brûlé. Brûlé was sent by Samuel de Champlain in the summer of 1610 to consolidate an emerging friendship between the French and the First Nations, and to learn their languages and customs. Other Europeans would subsequently be sent by the French to train as interpreters. These men played an essential role in communications with the First Nations (Gervais and Rothe, 2004:182).

The late 17<sup>th</sup> and early 18<sup>th</sup> centuries saw the growth and spread of the fur trade, with the establishment and maintenance of trading posts along the Great Lakes. In 1754, hostilities over trade and the territorial ambitions of the French and the British led to the Seven Years' War, which ended when the French surrendered in 1760 (Smith, 1987:22). In addition to cementing British control over the Province of Quebec, the British victory over the French also proved pivotal in catalyzing the Euro-Canadian settlement process.

During pre-contact and early contact times, the vicinity of the subject property would have contained a mixture of deciduous trees, coniferous trees, and open areas. In the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, Euro-Canadian settlers arrived via easily accessible colonization routes and began to clear the forests for agricultural purposes. In the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, the subject property and surrounding land were primarily used for agricultural purposes. Mixed farming was common, with wheat crops and beef cattle dominating the landscape (Chapman and Putnam, 1984:177).

The subject property was historically located within Part of Lot 6 and all of Lots 7, 8, 9, and 10, Concession 5, in the Geographic Township of Glanford, Wentworth County. In 1791, the provinces of Lower Canada and Upper Canada were created from the former province of Quebec by a British parliamentary act. Colonel John Graves Simcoe was appointed as the Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada and was tasked with governing and

directing its settlement, as well as establishing a constitutional government based on Britain's model (Coyne et al, 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 land purchases were subsequently arranged. The lands within the vicinity of the subject property were 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 (Government of Canada, 2016).

In 1792, Simcoe divided Upper Canada into 19 counties. Wentworth County was once part of the Gore District, which was surveyed in 1791 by Augustus Jones. When the districts were broken up into counties, Wentworth and Halton formed a single municipality until 1854. Early settlement took place largely along the lakeshore as settlement elsewhere was hindered by a lack of transportation routes. Wentworth County was named after Sir John Wentworth, Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia between 1792 and 1808 (Mika & Mika, 1983:624). The earliest settlers in the county were United Empire Loyalists who settled in the area following the American Revolution. As early as 1791, a grist mill was built on what is present day Ancaster. Upper Canada's first paper mill was established in Wentworth County in 1826.

During the War of 1812, Stoney Creek was the centre of a decisive battle credited with preventing American forces from overtaking Upper Canada. An invading force of 3,000 soldiers, having just seized Fort George and Niagara, moved inland and set up camp near Stoney Creek in 1813. British soldiers staged a surprise attack, and the British forces were victorious (Mika & Mika, 1983:625).

The Township of Glanford was named for the parish of Glanford Briggs in England, 40 km from London. The township originally belonged to the County of Lincoln but was transferred to Wentworth County in 1854 (Local History & Archives, 2023). The township was originally slow in settling due to the barrier of the Niagara escarpment. In 1815, there were only fifty ratepayers (Page & Smith, 1875:xi). The area remained primarily agrarian for a long time despite nearby industrialization, but achieved some prosperity once the Hamilton and North Western Railway was completed in 1872.

The subject property exists near the town of Mount Hope. The town was originally known as Swazie's corners, after the prominent owner of a hotel in town. It became known as Hines' Corners after Mr. Swayze left and Mr. Hines replaced him as the hotel owner. The first land grants were issued in the Mount Hope area as early as 1802, but no European settlers arrived until 1810. In the 1850s, a meeting was held to determine a name for the town. John Renton suggested "Mount Hope", "Mount" in part because it is the highest point between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, and "Hope" either in hope for the temperance movement or hope for a larger future for the town. With the development of Port Dover Road, the town became larger and more profitable. By 1841 the population had increased to over 1,000, and the town boasted three

blacksmith shops, two hotels, three butchers, two wagon-makers, a shoemaker, two carriage-makers and an undertaker (Glanbrook Heritage Society, 2007).

Historical records and mapping were examined for evidence of early Euro-Canadian occupation within and near the subject property in the mid- to late 19<sup>th</sup> century. Baron De Rottenburg's 1850 *Map of the Principal Communications in Canada West* shows the major transportation routes present at that time. Airport Road, Upper James Street, and White Church Road are all illustrated on the map (Figure 3).

Hardy Gregory's 1859 *Map of Wentworth County* indicates that at that time there were 13 landowners listed within the subject property. Table 2 lists the landowners as well as the parcel of land each owned. The subject property is shown adjacent to four concession roads, now Airport Road East, Miles Road, White Church Road East, and Upper James Street. Town lots for the community of Mount Hope are shown to the northwest of the subject property. A toll gate and church are shown on Lot 5, near the subject property. A railroad is shown to the east of the subject property. No structures are shown within the subject property (Figure 4).

Table 2: Landowners Listed on Hardy Gregory's 1859 Map of Wentworth County

LOT	PART	LANDOWNER
6	N ¼	Seth Howard
	S ¼ of N ½	William Young
	S ½	Abraham Young
7	All	C. Penfold & James McKee
8	N ¼	J. Mason
	SW part	Anthony Murray
	S-central part	Thomas Parker
	SE part	none listed
9	N ½	Thomas Webber
	S ½	William Young
10	W ½	Isaac Duffield
	NE ¼	J. Hostein
	SE ¼	David Marr

Page & Smith's 1875 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth, Ontario* indicates that at that time there were 14 landowners listed within the subject property. Table 3 lists the landowners as well as the parcel of land each owned. The subject property is shown adjacent to four concession roads, now Airport Road East, Miles Road, White Church Road East, and Upper James Street. Fourteen farmsteads and 12 orchards are illustrated throughout the subject property, largely fronting the nearby concession roads. Town lots for the community of Mount Hope are shown to the northwest of the subject property. The Glanford post office and a farmstead and orchard are illustrated just outside the subject property in Lot 6. A church and cemetery are shown on Lot 5, west of Upper James Street. The Hamilton & Lake Erie Railroad is shown to the east of the subject property (Figure 5).



Table 3: Landowners Listed on Page & Smith’s 1875 Map of Glanford Township

LOT	PART	LANDOWNER	COMMENT
6	N ¼	N. Reed	-Glanford post office to NW -Mt. Hope to NW
	S ¼ of N ½	William Young	-farmstead and orchard just outside subject property
	N ½ of S ½	Jacob Yong	-farmstead in subject property
	S ¼	E & L Young	-farmstead and orchard in subject property
7	N ½	Joseph Gray	-two farmsteads and orchard in subject property
	S ½	James McKee	-farmstead and orchard in subject property
8	N ¼	J. Mason	-farmstead and orchard in subject property
	SW part	R. Mulligan	-farmstead and orchard in subject property
	S-central part	Thomas Parker	-farmstead and orchard in subject property
	SE part	William Young	-farmstead and orchard in subject property
9	N ½	Thomas Webber	-farmstead and orchard in subject property
	S ½	William Young	-farmstead and orchard in subject property
10	W ½	Isaac Duffield Sr.	-farmstead and orchard in subject property
	NE ¼	J. Hostein	-farmstead and orchard in subject property
	SE ¼	David Marr	-farmstead and orchard in subject property

It should be noted that while numerous structures are illustrated within the subject property on the historical atlas maps, it does not necessarily mean that one or more structures were not present at that time, earlier or later. Not all features of interest were mapped systematically on the Ontario series of historical maps and atlases, given that they were financed by subscription, and subscribers were given preference regarding the level of detail provided on the maps (Caston, 1977:100). Given that the subject property fronts four concession roads there is the potential for 19<sup>th</sup> century buildings to be present, depending on the level of disturbance.

### 1.3 Archaeological Context

#### 1.3.1 Natural Environment

The subject property is located within the Haldimand Clay Plain physiographic region (Chapman and Putnam, 1984:113). Lying between the Niagara Escarpment and Lake Erie, this area is made up of a series of parallel belts that were once submerged in Lake Warren. The highest ground adjoins the Niagara Escarpment. The main part of Welland County is characterized by level topography and poor drainage and several square miles are covered in peat bogs. The drainage in the belt is controlled by several parallel streams, such as Twenty Mile Creek, Forty Mile Creek, and the Welland River (Chapman and Putman, 1984:157). The study area is in the central part of the clay plain, where the land has been dissected by tributary drainage. The dominant physiographic landform over most of the subject property is till moraine, with the northeast and southwest portions made up of clay plain (Ministry of Northern Development and Mines, 2007).

The *Soils of Wentworth County* (Presant et al., 1965) indicates that there are six dominant surface soil types within the subject property, Binbrook silt loam, Beverly silt loam, Brantford silt loam, Smithville silt loam, Toledo silty clay loam, and Bottom Land (Figure 6). Much of the northern



portion of the subject property consists of Beverly silt loam. This soil is imperfectly drained and stone free, with gently sloping topography. The southernmost portion of the subject property is made up of Binbrook silt loam. This soil is imperfectly drained and stone free, with gentle to moderate sloping topography. Sections along the northern edge and southwestern portion of the subject property are made up of Brantford silt loam. This soil is well drained and stone free, with moderately sloping topography. Small sections of the northeast portion of the subject property are made up of Smithville silt loam. This soil is moderately well drained and stone free, with moderately sloping topography. The east-central portion of the subject property is made up of Toledo silty clay loam. This soil is poorly drained and stone free, with gently sloping topography. Areas surrounding seasonal streams within the subject property are made up of Bottom Land, alluvial soils surrounding stream courses.

Water has been identified as the major determinant of site selection and the presence of potable water is the single most important resource necessary for any extended human occupation or settlement. Primary water sources include, among others, lakes, rivers, creeks, and streams. Secondary water sources include intermittent streams, creeks, springs, marshes, and swamps. Past water sources, such as raised beach ridges, relic water channels, and glacial shorelines are also considered to have archaeological potential. Swamps and marshes are also important as resource extraction areas, and any resource areas are considered to have archaeological potential. There are eighteen small ponds within the subject property and eleven seasonal watercourses within the subject property, including tributaries of the Welland River and tributaries of Twenty Mile Creek (Figure 7).

### 1.3.2 Current Land Use

Figure 8 provides the current land use of the subject property. The subject property is currently largely made up of rural residential and agricultural land, with numerous residences along the concession roads. Commercial areas include a sod farm and a Christmas tree farm. The Southern Pines Golf and Country Club is located on the western edge of the subject property. Steel City Storage Inc. is located along Airport Road in the northwestern portion of the subject property. A pipeline corridor runs through a portion of the property. The subject property is surrounded largely by agricultural land and rural residences, with the community of Mount Hope to the northwest.

Figure 9 shows aerial imagery of the subject property in 1954. The property is largely unchanged from that time, when it was made up of predominantly agricultural land. Southern Pines Golf and Country Club was not present, and the extension of Upper James Street was also not present. Mount Hope, to the west of the subject property was less developed at that time.

No fieldwork was completed for this Stage 1 assessment.

### 1.3.3 Previous Archaeological Investigations

#### 1.3.3.1 Registered Archaeological Sites

Previously registered archaeological sites can be used to indicate archaeological potential. To determine if any previous assessments have yielded archaeological sites, either within or

surrounding the current subject property, two main sources were consulted. These include the *Ontario Archaeological Sites Database* (OASD) and the *Public Register of Archaeological Reports*, both of which are maintained by MCM.

The OASD contains archaeological sites registered within the Borden system (Borden, 1952). The Borden system divides Canada into 13 km by 18.5 km blocks based on longitude and latitude. Each Borden block is designated with a four-letter label and sites identified within the block are numbered sequentially as they are registered. The subject property is located within the AgGx Borden block.

According to the OASD, 187 sites have been registered within one km of the subject property (MCM, 2023). Nine of these sites have been registered within the subject property, while an additional 23 sites are located within 300 metres (m) of the subject property. Sites include Indigenous, Euro-Canadian, and multi-component sites, and span from the Paleoindian period through to the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. Indigenous site types include campsites, hamlets, findspots, scatters, and hunting losses. Euro-Canadian site types include cabins, homesteads, farmsteads, and mills.

Table 4 lists the sites within 1 km along with the current Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI) for each site. CHVI is a term used by MCM and consultant archaeologists to describe archaeological resources that meet one or more criteria that recommend further fieldwork in MCM’s *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. Under the OHA and its regulations, archaeological resources that have been determined to possess CHVI are protected as archaeological sites under Section 48 of the act. Information in Table 4 is provided by MCM through the OASD (MCM, 2023).

Table 4: Registered Archaeological Sites within 1 km of the Subject Property

REG. #	NAME	TIME PERIOD	CULTURAL AFFILIATION	SITE TYPE	STATUS
AgGx-5	Weylie	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
AgGx-63	S. Brigham	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
AgGx-114	Jerome 4	Archaic	Indigenous	unknown	unknown
AgGx-128	Jerome 5	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
AgGx-162	Babyzac	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
AgGx-163	Hotz	Other	unknown	camp/campsite	unknown
AgGx-164	White Church	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	camp/campsite	unknown
AgGx-172	-	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
AgGx-173	-	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
AgGx-174	-	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
AgGx-175	-	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
AgGx-177	Chippewa Creek	Paleoindian, Late, Woodland, Middle	Indigenous	unknown	unknown
AgGx-179	Palermo	Archaic	Indigenous	unknown	unknown
AgGx-180	West Bank	Archaic, Early	Indigenous	unknown	unknown
AgGx-181	Many Splendors A	Archaic, Late	Indigenous	unknown	unknown
AgGx-182	Many Splendors B	Archaic	Indigenous	unknown	unknown
AgGx-183	Many Splendors C	Archaic, Late	Indigenous	unknown	unknown



Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment  
White Church Urban Boundary Expansion  
City of Hamilton, ON

REG. #	NAME	TIME PERIOD	CULTURAL AFFILIATION	SITE TYPE	STATUS
AgGx-184	Jerome Historic	Post-Contact	Euro-Canadian	cabin, homestead	unknown
AgGx-185	Kennedy Point	Woodland, Early	Indigenous	unknown	unknown
AgGx-186	Many Splendors D	Archaic	Indigenous	unknown	unknown
AgGx-187	Many Splendors E	Woodland, Late	Iroquoian	unknown	unknown
AgGx-257	Lancaster	Woodland, Late	Iroquoian	hamlet	Further CHVI
AgGx-285	Strathearne	Archaic, Early	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AgGx-286	Southern Pine	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	unknown
AgGx-287	Marion	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
AgGx-288	Ferris	Archaic, Late	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AgGx-289	Miles	Archaic, Early	Indigenous	scatter	unknown
AgGx-290	Nebo	Archaic, Late	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AgGx-291	Tyneside	Archaic, Middle	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AgGx-292	Tisdale	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	unknown
AgGx-293	Longview	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	unknown
AgGx-294	Mount Hope	Archaic, Early, Archaic, Middle	Indigenous	camp/campsite	unknown
AgGx-295	Kirk	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	unknown
AgGx-296	Woodbrook	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	unknown
AgGx-297	Glanford	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AgGx-298	Southampton	Archaic, Middle	Indigenous	camp/campsite	unknown
AgGx-299	Trimble	Archaic, Early, Archaic, Middle, Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	unknown
AgGx-300	Niapenco	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AgGx-332	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AgGx-333	-	Post-Contact	Euro-Canadian	findspot	unknown
AgGx-334	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AgGx-335	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AgGx-336	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AgGx-337	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	unknown
AgGx-338	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AgGx-339	-	Other	Neutral	findspot	unknown
AgGx-340	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AgGx-341	-	Archaic, Early	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AgGx-342	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AgGx-343	-	Archaic	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AgGx-344	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AgGx-345	-	Woodland, Middle	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AgGx-346	-	Archaic, Late	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AgGx-360	Colonel Brandon	Archaic, Late	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AgGx-361	Wolverine	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
AgGx-470	Mountain Gate I	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
AgGx-471	Mountain Gate II	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	camp/campsite	No further CHVI
AgGx-472	Mountain Gate III	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
AgGx-473	Mountain Gate IV	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
AgGx-474	Mountain Gate V	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
AgGx-475	-	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown



Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment  
White Church Urban Boundary Expansion  
City of Hamilton, ON

REG. #	NAME	TIME PERIOD	CULTURAL AFFILIATION	SITE TYPE	STATUS
AgGx-476	-	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
AgGx-477	-	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
AgGx-478	Mountain Gate IX	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
AgGx-479	-	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
AgGx-480	-	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
AgGx-481	-	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
AgGx-499	-	Woodland, Late	Neutral	unknown	No further CHVI
AgGx-500	-	Archaic, Middle	Indigenous	unknown	No further CHVI
AgGx-501	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-587	-	Archaic, Late, Archaic, Middle	unknown	scatter	Further CHVI
AgGx-588	-	Other	unknown	unknown	Further CHVI
AgGx-590	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-591	-	Woodland, Late	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-596	-	Pre-Contact	-	scatter	Further CHVI
AgGx-597	-	Archaic, Late	Indigenous	scatter	Further CHVI
AgGx-603	-	Archaic, Middle, Woodland, Middle	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-604	-	Woodland, Middle	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-605	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-606	-	Archaic, Early, Archaic, Middle	Indigenous	unknown	Further CHVI
AgGx-607	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-608	-	Pre-Contact, Post-Contact	Indigenous	scatter, homestead	No further CHVI
AgGx-609	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot	No further CHVI
AgGx-616	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-617	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-618	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot	Further CHVI
AgGx-619	-	Archaic, Middle	Indigenous	findspot	No further CHVI
AgGx-620	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-621	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-622	-	Woodland, Late	Indigenous	findspot	No further CHVI
AgGx-623	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-624	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-625	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-626	-	Archaic, Late	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-627	-	Archaic, Middle	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-726	-	Post-Contact	unknown	farmstead	No further CHVI
AgGx-727	Homestead 2	Archaic, Late	Indigenous	findspot	No further CHVI
AgGx-728	-	Pre-Contact	unknown	camp/campsite	No further CHVI
AgGx-729	-	Pre-Contact	unknown	camp/campsite	No further CHVI
AgGx-730	Homestead 5	Archaic, Late	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-731	-	Pre-Contact, Post-Contact	unknown	camp/campsite, farmstead	No further CHVI
AgGx-758	H1	Post-Contact	Euro-Canadian	unknown	No further CHVI
AgGx-759	P1	Archaic, Late	unknown	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-760	P2	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI



Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment  
White Church Urban Boundary Expansion  
City of Hamilton, ON

REG. #	NAME	TIME PERIOD	CULTURAL AFFILIATION	SITE TYPE	STATUS
AgGx-761	P3	Woodland, Late	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-762	P4	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-763	P8	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-764	P9	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-765	P10	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-766	P14	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-965	-	Post-Contact	Euro-Canadian	residential	No further CHVI
AgGx-992	-	Pre-Contact, Post-Contact	Indigenous, Euro-Canadian	scatter, farmstead	No further CHVI
AgGx-993	-	Pre-Contact, Post-Contact	Indigenous, Euro-Canadian	scatter, farmstead	No further CHVI
AgGx-1001	AgGx-1001	Woodland	unknown	camp/campsite	No further CHVI
AgGx-1002	AgGx-1002	Pre-Contact	unknown	camp/campsite	No further CHVI
AgGx-1021	-	Pre-Contact	unknown	unknown	No further CHVI
AgGx-1026	-	Archaic, Middle	unknown	findspot	No further CHVI
AgGx-1027	-	Archaic, Late	unknown	findspot	No further CHVI
AgGx-1030	WCR-2	Pre-Contact, Post-Contact	unknown	scatter	Further CHVI
AgGx-1033	P2	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	camp/campsite	No further CHVI
AgGx-1034	P3	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	camp/campsite	No further CHVI
AgGx-1035	P7	Woodland, Middle	Indigenous	camp/campsite	Further CHVI
AgGx-1036	-	Archaic, Late	Indigenous	hunting	No further CHVI
AgGx-1037	H6	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	camp/campsite	No further CHVI
AgGx-1038	H4	Post-Contact	Euro-Canadian	farmstead	No further CHVI
AgGx-1061	-	Archaic, Late	Indigenous	hunting loss	No further CHVI
AgGx-1062	-	Archaic, Late	Indigenous	hunting loss	No further CHVI
AgGx-1063	-	Woodland, Middle	Indigenous	hunting loss	No further CHVI
AgGx-1064	-	Archaic, Middle	Indigenous	hunting loss	No further CHVI
AgGx-1065	-	Archaic, Late	Indigenous	hunting loss	No further CHVI
AgGx-1066	-	Archaic, Late	Indigenous	hunting loss	No further CHVI
AgGx-1067	-	Woodland, Late	Indigenous	hunting loss	No further CHVI
AgGx-1068	-	Archaic, Late	Indigenous	hunting loss	No further CHVI
AgGx-1071	Terryberry Sawmill	Pre-Contact, Post-Contact	Indigenous, Euro-Canadian	scatter, mill	Further CHVI
AgGx-1072	-	Pre-Contact, Post-Contact	Indigenous, Euro-Canadian	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-1073	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-1075	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	camp/campsite	No further CHVI
AgGx-1076	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	camp/campsite	No further CHVI
AgGx-1077	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	camp/campsite	No further CHVI
AgGx-1078	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-1079	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-1080	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-1081	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AgGx-1082	-	Pre-Contact	unknown	unknown	No further CHVI
AgGx-1083	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI



Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment  
White Church Urban Boundary Expansion  
City of Hamilton, ON

REG. #	NAME	TIME PERIOD	CULTURAL AFFILIATION	SITE TYPE	STATUS
AgGx-1084	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AhGx-14	G Smith	Woodland, Late	Iroquoian	hamlet, village	unknown
AhGx-226	Thistle Hill	Other	unknown	camp/campsite	unknown
AhGx-275	Spruce	Archaic, Late	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AhGx-276	Pine	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AhGx-277	Poplar	Archaic, Late	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AhGx-570		Archaic, Late	Indigenous	unknown	unknown
AhGx-571	Wright-Maricle	Post-Contact	Euro-Canadian	farmstead	unknown
AhGx-572	The Aeropark 1	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot, scatter	unknown
AhGx-573	-	Archaic, Early	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AhGx-574	The Aeropark 2 Site	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AhGx-575	The Aeropark 3 Site	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AhGx-576	The Aeropark 4 Site	Archaic, Late	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AhGx-577	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AhGx-610	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot	unknown
AhGx-647	Twenty Road	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	unknown
AhGx-851	-	Archaic, Middle, Woodland, Middle	Indigenous	camp/campsite	Further CHVI
AhGx-852	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	Further CHVI
AhGx-853	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AhGx-854	-	Pre-Contact, Post-Contact	Indigenous, Euro-Canadian	scatter	No further CHVI
AhGx-860	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AhGx-862	-	Woodland, Late	Indigenous	camp/campsite	Further CHVI
AhGx-863	-	Archaic, Early	Indigenous	scatter	Further CHVI
AhGx-864	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AhGx-865	-	Archaic, Early, Archaic, Middle, Woodland, Middle	Indigenous	camp/campsite	Further CHVI
AhGx-866	-	Archaic, Early, Archaic, Middle	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AhGx-867	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No further CHVI
AhGx-868	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No Further CHVI
AhGx-869	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	Further CHVI
AhGx-870	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No Further CHVI
AhGx-871	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No Further CHVI
AhGx-872	-	Woodland, Middle	Indigenous	scatter	Further CHVI
AhGx-873	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No Further CHVI
AhGx-876	-	Woodland	Indigenous	scatter	Further CHVI
AhGx-877	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot	No Further CHVI
AhGx-878	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	scatter	No Further CHVI
AhGx-879	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	camp / campsite	Further CHVI
AhGx-880	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot	No Further CHVI
AhGx-881	-	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	findspot	No Further CHVI
AhGx-882	-	Woodland, Early	Indigenous	scatter	No Further CHVI



Thirteen of the 187 registered archaeological sites are located within the current subject property (MCM, 2023a). A summary of each of these sites is provided below.

- Archaeological site AgGx-603 is located within the subject property. The site was first documented by Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants Inc. (TMHC) during Stage 2 pedestrian survey. Two projectile points and two flakes were recovered from a 13.5 m by 5 m area (TMHC, 2017a:197). The projectile points included a Stanly Stemmed type dating to the Middle Archaic period, circa 8,000 to 7,500 years before present, and a Jack's Reef type dating to the Middle Woodland to early Late Woodland period, circa 600 to 400 years before present. The site was determined to retain CHVI and was recommended for Stage 3 assessment (TMHC, 2017a:226). TMHC conducted a Stage 3 assessment at the site, which yielded 7 artifacts from a 10 m by 10 m area (TMHC, 2017d). The site was determined to have no further CHVI (TMHC, 2017d:11).
- Archaeological site AgGx-606 is located within the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during pedestrian survey and test pit survey. A total of 471 artifacts were recovered from a 150 m by 195 m area, with a dense concentration of artifacts measuring 100 m by 90 m. All artifacts were lithic, and included flakes, bifaces, scrapers, and projectile points (TMHC, 2017a:185). The projectile points included a Brewerton side-notched type dating to the Middle Archaic period, circa 5,500 to 4,500 years before present, and a possible Nettling type dating to the Early Archaic period, circa 10,000 to 9,500 years before present. The site was determined to retain CHVI and was recommended for Stage 3 assessment (TMHC, 2017a:235). The site was discovered during work for an Enbridge pipeline replacement. Given the large size and density of artifacts, the proposed pipeline was rerouted to avoid the site (TMHC, 2017a:252). The site retains CHVI and requires Stage 3 assessment. TMHC also indicated that given the large size and density of artifacts found at the site, Stage 4 mitigation of impacts would likely be required (TMHC, 2017a:235).
- Archaeological site AgGx-618 is located within the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during test pit survey. One flake was recovered from one artifact bearing, or “positive” test pit. A test unit was not excavated for the site during the Stage 2 assessment (TMHC, 2017a:186). The site was discovered during work for an Enbridge pipeline replacement and because of its proximity to AgGx-606, the proposed pipeline was rerouted to avoid this site as well (TMHC, 2017a:253). As no test unit has been excavated at the site, AgGx-618 retains CHVI and was recommended for Stage 3 assessment by TMHC (TMHC, 2017a:253).
- Archaeological site AgGx-619 is located within the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during a pedestrian survey. The site consists of a single isolated Otter Creek type projectile point dating to the Middle Archaic period, circa 6,000 to 5,000 years before present (TMHC, 2017a:196). The site was determined to have no further CHVI (TMHC, 2017a:218).



- Archaeological site AgGx-620 is located within the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during a pedestrian survey and consists of four flakes found in a 6 m by 22 m area (TMHC, 2017a:197). The site was determined to have no further CHVI (TMHC, 2017a:243).
- Archaeological site AgGx-621 is located within the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during a pedestrian survey and test pit survey and consists of three flakes and a biface found in a 13.5 m by 10 m area (TMHC, 2017a:200). The site was determined to have no further CHVI (TMHC, 2017a:243).
- Archaeological site AgGx-623 is located within the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during a pedestrian survey and test pit survey. The site consists of 17 flakes from a 72 m by 43 m area (TMHC, 2017a:187). The site was determined to have no further CHVI (TMHC, 2017a:242).
- Archaeological site AgGx-624 is located within the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during a pedestrian survey and consists of 22 flakes, one scraper, and one indeterminate projectile point tip fragment found within a 123 m by 40 m area (TMHC, 2016:188). The site was determined to have no further CHVI (TMHC, 2017a:242).
- Archaeological site AgGx-625 is located within the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during a pedestrian survey and consists of 4 flakes found within a 10 m by 18 m area (TMHC, 2017a:190). The site was determined to have no further CHVI (TMHC, 2017a:242).
- Archaeological site AgGx-626 is located within the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during a pedestrian survey and consists of 4 flakes and a projectile point found within a 10 m by 30 m area (TMHC, 2016:190). The projectile point was a Lamoka type dating to the Late Archaic period, circa 4,500-4,000 years before present. The site was determined to have no further CHVI (TMHC, 2017a:242).
- Archaeological site AgGx-627 is located within the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during a pedestrian survey and consists of a core, a biface, and a projectile point found within a 31 m by 2 m area (TMHC, 2017a:191). The projectile point was a possible Brewerton type dating to the Middle Archaic period, circa 5,500-4,500 years before present. The site was determined to have no further CHVI (TMHC, 2017a:242).
- Archaeological site AgGx-1029, the WCR-1 Site, is located within the subject property. The site was first documented by Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec) during Stage 2 survey and consisted of 501 Indigenous and Euro-Canadian artifacts found within a 95 m by 15 m area (Stantec, 2022). Stantec conducted a Stage 3 assessment at the site, which yielded 3,165 Indigenous and 6 Euro-Canadian artifacts from 45 units excavated across a 105 m by 15 m area (Stantec, 2022). The Indigenous component of the site was determined to have further CHVI and Stage 4 mitigation was recommended (Stantec,



2023a). The Euro-Canadian component of the site was determined to have no further CHVI (Stantec, 2023a). Stantec completed Stage 4 mitigation of AgGx-1029 through hand excavation of 267 units, with 2,103 artifacts recovered (Stantec, 2023c). Stantec noted that all artifacts were recovered from a disturbed gravel and mottled topsoil layer, with a second natural topsoil layer containing no artifacts or other cultural deposits (Stantec, 2023c:30). Stantec determined that the site had no further CHVI.

- Archaeological site AgGx-1030, the WCR-2 Site, is located within the subject property. The site was first documented by Stantec during Stage 2 survey and consisted of 141 Indigenous and Euro-Canadian artifacts found within a 40 m by 15 m area (Stantec, 2022). Stantec conducted a Stage 3 assessment at the site, which yielded 426 Indigenous artifacts and 679 Euro-Canadian artifacts from a 45 m by 15 m area (Stantec, 2023b). Both the Indigenous and Euro-Canadian components of the site were determined to have further CHVI and Stage 4 mitigation was recommended (Stantec, 2023b). Stantec completed Stage 4 mitigation of AgGx-1030 through hand excavation of 104 units, with 168 Indigenous artifacts and 3,791 Euro-Canadian artifacts recovered (Stantec, 2024). Stantec noted that all the Indigenous artifacts were recovered from a disturbed gravel and mottled topsoil layer, with a second natural topsoil layer containing the majority of the Euro-Canadian artifacts (Stantec, 2024:41-42). Stantec determined that the site had no further CHVI, but the site likely extended beyond their project limits.

An additional 23 registered archaeological sites are located within 300 m of the subject property (MCM, 2023a). A summary of each of these sites is provided below.

- Archaeological site AgGx-285, the Strathearne Site, is located 75 m from the subject property. The site was documented by Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) in 2001 and consisted of an isolated Early Archaic period Nettling type projectile point (ASI, 2001). No further fieldwork was recommended for this site (MCM, 2023a).
- Archaeological site AgGx-286, the Southern Pine Site, is located 165 m from the subject property. The site was documented by ASI in 2001 and consisted of six flakes within a 30 m radius area (ASI, 2001). ASI determined the site had further CHVI and recommended Stage 3 assessment (MCM, 2023a).
- Archaeological site AgGx-287, the Marion Site, is located 185 m from the subject property. The site was first documented by ASI in 2001 and consisted of three bifaces and 15 flakes within a 25 m radius area (ASI, 2001). The site was redocumented by New Directions Archaeology Ltd. (“NDA”) in 2003. A total of 33 lithic artifacts were recovered during NDA’s survey (NDA, 2003). NDA determined the site had further CHVI and recommended Stage 3 assessment (MCM, 2023a).
- Archaeological site AgGx-288, the Ferris Site, is located 190 m from the subject property. The site was documented by ASI in 2001 and consisted of an isolated Late Archaic period Lamoka type projectile point (ASI, 2001). No further fieldwork was recommended for this site (MCM, 2023a).



- Archaeological site AgGx-289, the Miles Site, is located 270 m from the subject property. The site was first documented by ASI in 2001 and consisted of eight flakes and an Early Archaic period Nettling type projectile point within a 5 m by 5 m area (ASI, 2001). The site was redocumented by NDA in 2003. A total of 13 lithic artifacts were recovered during NDA's survey, with Stage 3 test unit excavations also completed at the site (NDA, 2003). NDA determined the site required no further fieldwork (MCM, 2023a).
- Archaeological site AgGx-290, the Nebo Site, is located 130 m from the subject property. The site was documented by ASI in 2001 and consisted of an isolated Late Archaic period Genesee type projectile point (ASI, 2001). No further fieldwork was recommended for this site (MCM, 2023a).
- Archaeological site AgGx-337 is located 280 m from the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during a pedestrian survey and consists of 12 artifacts within a 70 m by 25 m area (TMHC, 2017a:149). The site was interpreted as a lithic scatter dating to the Early Archaic to Middle Archaic period. TMHC determined the site had further CHVI and recommended Stage 3 assessment (TMHC, 2017a:228).
- Archaeological site AgGx-338 is located 210 m from the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during a pedestrian survey and consists of 45 artifacts within a 75 m by 52 m area (TMHC, 2017a:143). The site was interpreted as a lithic scatter. TMHC determined the site had further CHVI and recommended Stage 3 assessment (TMHC, 2017a:228).
- Archaeological site AgGx-343 is located 300 m from the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during a pedestrian survey and consists of a single Early Archaic period corner-notched projectile point (TMHC, 2017a:90). TMHC determined the site had further CHVI and recommended Stage 3 assessment (TMHC, 2017a:225).
- Archaeological site AgGx-344 is located 295 m from the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during a pedestrian survey and consists of a flake and three bifaces within a 30 m by 20 m area (TMHC, 2017a:91). The site was interpreted as a diffuse lithic scatter. Based on a Collingwood chert biface, the site was interpreted as a possible Paleoindian or 17<sup>th</sup> century Attawandaron site (TMHC, 2017:91). TMHC determined the site had further CHVI and recommended Stage 3 assessment (TMHC, 2017a:226).
- Archaeological site AgGx-346 is located 295 m from the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during test pit survey and consists of a Late Archaic period Crawford Knoll projectile point (TMHC, 2017a:95). The site was interpreted as an isolated findspot, however because it was recovered during test pit survey, TMHC determined the site had further CHVI and recommended Stage 3 assessment (TMHC, 2017a:244).





- Archaeological site AgGx-587 is located 170 m from the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during a pedestrian survey and consists of 171 artifacts within a 150 m by 120 m area (TMHC, 2017a:178). The site was interpreted as a lithic scatter dating to the Middle Archaic to Late Archaic period. TMHC determined the site had further CHVI and recommended Stage 3 assessment (TMHC, 2017a:229).
- Archaeological site AgGx-596 is located 190 m from the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during a pedestrian survey and consists of 34 flakes found within a 23 m by 54 m area (TMHC, 2017a:180). The site was interpreted as a lithic scatter. TMHC determined the site had further CHVI and recommended Stage 3 assessment (TMHC, 2017a:229).
- Archaeological site AgGx-597 is located 150 m from the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during a pedestrian survey and consists of 3 artifacts flakes found within a 1 m by 10 m area (TMHC, 2017a:182). The site was interpreted as a lithic scatter dating to the Late Archaic period. TMHC determined the site had further CHVI and recommended Stage 3 assessment (TMHC, 2017a:226).
- Archaeological site AgGx-604 is located 35 m from the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during a test pit survey and consists of 8 flakes found in 5 positive test pits within a 5 m by 20 m area (TMHC, 2017a:183). The site was interpreted as a possible camp. TMHC determined the site had further CHVI and recommended Stage 3 assessment (TMHC, 2017a:232).
- Archaeological site AgGx-605 is located 70 m from the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during a test pit survey and consists of 7 flakes found in two positive test pits and a test unit dug 2.5 m apart (TMHC, 2017a:184). The site was interpreted as a possible camp. TMHC determined the site had further CHVI and recommended Stage 3 assessment (TMHC, 2017a:232).
- Archaeological site AgGx-616 is located 270 m from the subject property. The site was first documented by TMHC during a pedestrian survey and consists of 24 flakes found within a 38 m by 94.5 m area (TMHC, 2017a:182). The site was interpreted as a lithic scatter. TMHC determined the site had no further CHVI (TMHC, 2017a:221).
- Archaeological site AgGx-622 is located 75 m from the subject property). The site was first documented by TMHC during a pedestrian survey and consists of two mending fragments of a Late Woodland projectile point (TMHC, 2017a:202). The site was interpreted as an isolated find and was determined to have no further CHVI (TMHC, 2017a:243).
- Archaeological site AgGx-727, the Homestead 2 Site, is located 225 m from the subject property. The site was first documented by Detritus Consulting Ltd. (DCL) during a pedestrian survey and consists of a single Normanskill type projectile point dating to the Late Archaic period (DCL, 2017a:14). The site was interpreted as an isolated find and was determined to have no further CHVI (DCL, 2017a:20).



- Archaeological site AgGx-728, the Homestead 3 Site, is located 210 m from the subject property. The site was first documented by DCL during a pedestrian survey and consists of 10 flakes and a biface found within a 13 m by 14 m area (DCL, 2017a:14). DCL determined the site had further CHVI and recommended Stage 3 assessment (DCL, 2017:20). Stage 3 assessment, also conducted by DCL, resulted in the recovery of 32 lithic artifacts from 25 units excavated over a 20 m by 20 m area. The site was interpreted as a small lithic reduction activity area and was determined to have no further CHVI (DCL, 2018:41).
- Archaeological site AgGx-729, the Homestead 4 Site, is located 195 m from the subject property. The site was first documented by DCL during a pedestrian survey and consists of 10 Indigenous artifacts and seven Euro-Canadian artifacts found within a 16 m by 24 m area (DCL, 2017a:14). DCL determined the Indigenous component of the site had further CHVI and recommended Stage 3 assessment (DCL, 2017:21). The Euro-Canadian component was considered to be sufficiently documented during Stage 2 survey. Stage 3 assessment, also conducted by DCL, resulted in the recovery of 59 lithic artifacts from 13 units excavated over a 25 m by 30 m area. The site was interpreted as a medium sized lithic reduction activity area and was determined to retain CHVI and require Stage 4 mitigation (DCL, 2018:42). Stage 4 mitigation involved the hand excavation of 8 units within a 3 m by 3 m area, resulting in the recovery of 36 flakes (DCL, 2017b:11). DCL determined that the site has now been fully excavated and has no further CHVI (DCL, 2017b:16).
- Archaeological site AgGx-730, the Homestead 5 Site, is located 145 m from the subject property. The site was first documented by DCL during a pedestrian survey and consists of six Late Archaic period Indigenous artifacts found within a 15 m by 8 m area (DCL, 2017a:14). DCL determined that the site had no further CHVI (DCL, 2017a:21).
- Archaeological site AgGx-965 is located 110 m from the subject property. The site was first documented by DCL during test pit survey and consists of 76 Euro-Canadian artifacts found within a 23 m by 13 m area (DCL, 2018a). DCL determined the site had further CHVI and recommended Stage 3 assessment (DCL, 2018a). Stage 3 assessment, also conducted by DCL, resulted in the recovery of 1,499 artifacts from unit excavation across a 26 m by 31 m area. The site was determined to date largely to the 20<sup>th</sup> century and was noted to be disturbed. DCL determined the site had no further CHVI (DCL, 2018b).

#### 1.3.3.2 Previous Archaeological Reports within the Current Subject Property

A review of archaeological reports within the *Public Register of Archaeological Reports* indicated that 15 archaeological reports detailing previous archaeological fieldwork within the subject property had been filed with MCM at the time this report was written (MCM, 2023b). Reports were searched through the register based on site information, historic lots and concessions, communities, and nearby streets. A summary of each of these reports is provided



below. Figure 10 shows the location of these assessments in relation to the current subject property.

***The 2015 Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of the Proposed Enbridge Pipelines Inc. Line 10, Westover Segment Replacement Project, City of Hamilton, Ontario. D.R. Poulton & Associates Inc. Report dated July 7, 2015. PIF P316-0306-2015.***

DPA completed a Stage 1 assessment for the decommissioning and replacement of an Enbridge pipeline, Line 10. DPA assessed a 33 km Line 10 corridor for the preferred replacement route along with a 1 km radius surrounding the preferred pipeline route. A portion of the Line 10 corridor is located within the current subject property and the 1 km radius around the pipeline included the entirety of the current subject property. Stage 2 survey was recommended for the preferred route and associated impact areas as far in advance of construction as possible (DPA, 2015:1). While the current subject property has been subject to Stage 1 assessment, DPA's report focused largely on the pipeline corridor itself, and as it was done nearly a decade ago, additional assessments and research have been completed on the current subject property.

***Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment: Proposed Temporary Access and Workspaces in Glanford Township (CWP 1436S), Enbridge Line 10, Parts of Various Lots, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, former Wentworth County, now City of Hamilton, Ontario. Stantec. Report dated September 23, 2015. PIF P256-0309-2014.***

Stantec was contracted by Enbridge Pipelines Inc. to complete a Stage 1 & 2 archaeological assessment of 10 proposed temporary access roads and workspaces for their Line 10 Integrity Dig program. Four of Stantec's workspace areas are located within the current subject property. A fifth workspace is located within 45 m of the current subject property. No archaeological resources were identified during the assessment, and no further assessment was recommended (Stantec, 2015:5.1).

***Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment: Proposed Temporary Access and Workspaces in Glanford Township, Various Integrity Digs (CWP 1511S), Enbridge Line 11, Part of Lots 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, and 12, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, former Wentworth County, now City of Hamilton, Ontario. Stantec. Report dated April 14, 2016. PIF P256-0326-2015.***

Stantec was contracted by Enbridge Pipelines Inc. to complete a Stage 1 & 2 archaeological assessment of 10 proposed temporary access roads and workspaces for their Line 11 Integrity Dig program. One of these workspace areas was located within the current subject property. No archaeological resources were identified during the assessment, and no further assessment was recommended (Stantec, 2015:5.1).

***Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, Enbridge Pipelines Inc., Line 10 Westover Segment Replacement Project, Geotechnical Borehole Work Areas and Access Routes, City of Hamilton, Ontario. Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants. Report dated December 22, 2015. PIF P1075-0017-2015.***



TMHC was contracted by Enbridge to complete a Stage 2 assessment along a corridor for the proposed replacement of their Line 10. The assessment included survey of 23 geotechnical borehole areas and access routes. While none of the geotechnical borehole areas were located within the current subject property or within 50 m of the current subject property, Stage 2 assessment was recommended for unassessed portions of the pipeline corridor, including areas within the current subject property (TMHC, 2015:83-85). Three sites, all isolated findspots, were documented during TMHC's survey, however none of these are within or near the current subject property and none were determined to retain CHVI (TMHC, 2015).

***Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, Enbridge Pipelines Inc., Line 10 Westover Segment Replacement Project, 2015 Fieldwork, City of Hamilton, Ontario. Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants. Report dated April 19, 2016. PIF P1075-0018-2016.***

TMHC was contracted by Enbridge to complete a Stage 2 assessment along a corridor for the proposed replacement of their Line 10. The assessment included survey of portions of the corridor as well as testing for three geotechnical borehole areas and access routes. While none of the tested areas were located within the current subject property or within 50 m of the current subject property, Stage 2 assessment was recommended for unassessed portions of the pipeline corridor, including areas within the current subject property (TMHC, 2016:73-75). Nine sites were documented during TMHC's survey, two of which were determined to retain CHVI. None of these sites were in close proximity to the current subject property (TMHC, 2016).

***Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, Enbridge Pipelines Inc., Line 10 Westover Segment Replacement Project Spring, Summer and Early Fall 2016 Fieldwork, City of Hamilton, Ontario. Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants. Report dated March 2, 2017. PIF P324-0098-2016.***

TMHC was contracted by Enbridge to complete a Stage 2 assessment along a corridor for the proposed replacement of their Line 10. The assessment included a portion of the current subject property. A total of 162 sites were recorded during the assessment. Eleven sites were registered within the current subject property as a result of the assessment. Three of these sites were determined to retain CHVI and were recommended for further assessment, AgGx-603, AgGx-606, and AgGx-618. Due to the large size of AgGx-606, the proposed pipeline replacement route was realigned to avoid this site. As AgGx-618 was in close proximity to this site, it was also avoided because of the realignment (TMHC, 2017a:252). Seven additional unregistered findspots were also documented within TMHC's Line 10 corridor, none of these were deemed to retain CHVI. Twelve additional registered sites were documented within 300 m of the current subject property.

***Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, Enbridge Pipelines Inc., Line 10 Westover Segment Replacement Project, Hydro One Networks Inc. (HONI) Re-Route and Later Fall 2016 Fieldwork, City of Hamilton, Ontario. Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants. Report dated March 29<sup>th</sup>, 2017. PIF P1075-0018-2016.***

TMHC was contracted by Enbridge to complete a Stage 2 assessment along a corridor for the proposed replacement of their Line 10. The assessment included survey of portions of the

---



corridor as well as a corridor for the pipeline to be rerouted. While none of the tested areas were located within the current subject property or within 50 m of the current subject property, the report reiterated recommendations for sites found within the current subject property as discussed in their previous fieldwork for the project (TMHC, 2017b:93). Stage 2 assessment was recommended for remaining unassessed portions of the pipeline corridor; however, none of these were within or near the current subject property (TMHC, 2017b). Twenty-eight sites were documented during TMHC's survey, none of these sites were in close proximity to the current subject property (TMHC, 2017b).

***Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, Enbridge Pipelines Inc., Line 10 Westover Segment Replacement Project, Hydro One Networks Inc. (HONI) re-Route and Later Fall 2016 Fieldwork, City of Hamilton, Ontario. Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants. Report dated June 29<sup>th</sup>, 2017. PIFs P324-0201-2017, P324-0228-2017.***

TMHC was contracted by Enbridge to complete a Stage 2 assessment along a corridor for the proposed replacement of their Line 10. The assessment included survey of outstanding portions of the corridor as well as minor workspace area changes throughout the corridor. While none of the tested areas were located within the current subject property or within 50 m of the current subject property, the report reiterated recommendations for sites found within the current subject property as discussed in their previous fieldwork for the project (TMHC, 2017c). Stage 2 assessment was recommended for remaining unassessed portions of the pipeline corridor; however, none of these areas were within or near the current subject property (TMHC, 2017c). Seventeen were documented during TMHC's survey, none of these sites were in close proximity to the current subject property (TMHC, 2017c).

***Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment Enbridge Pipelines Inc. Line 10 Westover Segment Replacement Pipeline Tract 110 Location 1 (AgGx-603) within Lot 7, Concession 5 Geographic Township of Glanford Former Wentworth County Now City of Hamilton, Ontario. Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants. Report dated February 27, 2017. PIF P324-0139-2016.***

TMHC was contracted by Enbridge to complete a Stage 3 assessment at AgGx-603 as part of Enbridge's proposed replacement of their Line 10. The assessment consisted of hand excavation of 11 test units across a 10 m by 10 m area and resulted in the recovery of seven artifacts and a determination that the site had no further CHVI and required no further fieldwork ((TMHC, 2017d:11).

***Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment: White Church Road Pipeline Installation Project: Part of Lot 6, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, former County of Wentworth, now City of Hamilton, Ontario. Stantec Consulting Ltd. Report dated March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2022. PIF P1060-0110-2021.***

Stantec was contracted by Enbridge to complete a Stage 1 & 2 assessment of an ha area for the proposed White Church Road Pipeline Installation Project. The assessment included a portion of land in the southwest portion of the current subject property. Two sites were identified during the assessment, registered in the OASD as AgGx-1029 and AgGx-1030. Both sites contain

Indigenous and Euro-Canadian components and both sites were determined to retain CHVI and require Stage 3 assessment (Stantec, 2022).

***Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment: White Church Road Pipeline Installation, WCR-1 (AgGx-1029) Part of Lot 6, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, former County of Wentworth, now City of Hamilton, Ontario. Stantec Consulting Ltd. Report dated May 2, 2023. PIF P256-0692-2021.***

Stantec was contracted by Enbridge to complete a Stage 3 assessment of site AgGx-1029 along a corridor for the proposed White Church Road Pipeline Installation Project. The assessment included a portion of the current subject property. The Stage 3 assessment resulted in the recovery of 3,165 Indigenous artifacts and 6 Euro-Canadian artifacts from 45 test units covering a 105 m by 15 m area. The Indigenous component of AgGx-1029 was determined to retain CHVI and was recommended for Stage 4 mitigation through excavation, as avoidance and protection was not a viable option for the project (Stantec, 2023a). The Euro-Canadian component of the site was determined to be sufficiently documented.

***Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment: White Church Road Pipeline Installation, WCR-2 (AgGx-1030) Part of Lot 6, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, former County of Wentworth, now City of Hamilton, Ontario. Stantec Consulting Ltd. Report dated May 3, 2023. PIF P256-0708-2022.***

Stantec was contracted by Enbridge to complete a Stage 3 assessment of site AgGx-1030 along a corridor for the proposed White Church Road Pipeline Installation Project. The assessment included a portion of the current subject property. The Stage 3 assessment resulted in the recovery of 426 Indigenous artifacts and 679 Euro-Canadian artifacts from 33 test units. Both the Indigenous and Euro-Canadian components of AgGx-1030 were determined to retain CHVI and were recommended for Stage 4 mitigation through excavation, as avoidance and protection was not a viable option for the project. Specifically, block excavation was recommended to focus on Stage 3 test units with greatest artifact density (i.e., 10 or more Indigenous artifacts, and/or 85 or more Euro-Canadian artifacts) (Stantec 2023b). Following hand excavation, mechanical topsoil removal of the remainder of the site was recommended, extending a minimum of 10 m beyond any uncovered cultural feature, while remaining within Stantec's project boundary and 3 m from buried utilities (Stantec 2023b).

It was further noted that AgGx-1030 may extend outside of Stantec's project limits to the north, on lands that have not been subject to Stage 2 archaeological assessment. A Stage 2 archaeological assessment was recommended for future development impacts within lands to the north of the site (Stantec, 2023b).

***Stage 4 Archaeological Mitigation by Excavation: White Church Road Pipeline Installation, WCR-1 (AgGx-1029) Part of Lot 6, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, former County of Wentworth, now City of Hamilton, Ontario. Stantec Consulting Ltd. Report dated June 29, 2023. PIF P1148-0030-2022.***



Stantec has completed Stage 4 mitigation of AgGx-1029, located within the subject property. Stage 4 mitigation was conducted through the hand excavation of 267 units, with 2,103 Indigenous artifacts recovered (Stantec 2023c). During the Stage 4 block excavation, the stratigraphy across the site was determined to consist of two layers. Level 1 was determined to be not in-situ and disturbed, containing intrusive deposits of chert gravel and mottled soils related to existing buried utility lines and remains of modern fence posts. Level 2 was a natural soil or ploughzone layer. All artifacts were recovered from the disturbed Level 1. No intact cultural deposits were encountered within Level 2, and no subsurface Indigenous cultural features were identified. Consequently, AgGx-1029 was determined to consist of a disturbed, intrusive deposit. The site was determined to have no further CHVI (Stantec, 2023c:31).

***Stage 4 Archaeological Mitigation by Excavation: WCR-2 (AgGx-1030) White Church Road Pipeline Installation, Part of Lot 6, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, former County of Wentworth, now City of Hamilton, Ontario. Stantec Consulting Ltd. Report dated February 7, 2024. PIF P1148-0058-2022.***

Stantec has completed Stage 4 mitigation of AgGx-1030, located within the subject property. Stage 4 mitigation was conducted through the hand excavation of 104 units, with 168 Indigenous artifacts and 3,791 Euro-Canadian artifacts recovered (Stantec 2024). During the Stage 4 block excavation, the stratigraphy across the site was determined to consist of two layers. Level 1 was determined to be not in-situ and disturbed, containing intrusive deposits of chert gravel and mottled soils related to existing buried utility lines and remains of modern fence posts. Level 2 was a natural soil or ploughzone layer. All Indigenous artifacts were recovered from the disturbed Level 1. Most of the Euro-Canadian artifacts were recovered from Level 2. The Euro-Canadian component of AgGx-1030 was determined to represent a scatter of mid- to late-19<sup>th</sup> century artifacts corresponding to occupation by the Young family. No features were identified. The Indigenous component of AgGx-1030 was determined to consist of a disturbed, intrusive deposit.

Site AgGx-1030 within Stantec's project limits was determined to have no further CHVI (Stantec, 2024:47); however, Stantec noted that AgGx-1030 may extend outside of Stantec's project limits to the north, on lands that have not been subject to Stage 2 archaeological assessment. A Stage 2 archaeological assessment was recommended for future development impacts within lands to the north of the site (Stantec, 2024:47).

***Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, Proposed Development, 8113 Airport Road, Part of Lot 8, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, Wentworth County, now in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. Archaeological Consultants Canada. Report dated February 27, 2023. PIF P1208-0198-2023.***

ACC was contracted to conduct a Stage 1 assessment of 34.81 ha of lands located in the northcentral portion of the current subject property. ACC recommended the property for Stage 2 assessment including pedestrian survey at 5 m intervals for agricultural fields, test pit survey at 5 m intervals for non-ploughable areas, and confirmation and documentation of all areas of low archaeological potential (ACC, 2023a:22-23).

***Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, Proposed Development, 7505 Airport Road, Part of Lots 9 and 10, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, Wentworth County, now in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. Archaeological Consultants Canada. Report dated February 28, 2023. PIF P1208-0197-2023.***

ACC was contracted to conduct a Stage 1 assessment of 93.88 ha of lands located in the eastern portion of the current subject property. ACC recommended the entire property for Stage 2 assessment including pedestrian survey at 5 m intervals for agricultural fields, test pit survey at 5 m intervals for non-ploughable areas, and confirmation and documentation of all areas of low archaeological potential (ACC, 2023b:22-23).

### 1.3.3.3 Previous Archaeological Reports within 50 m of the Current Subject Property

A review of archaeological reports within the *Public Register of Archaeological Reports* indicated that 11 archaeological reports detailing previous archaeological fieldwork within 50 m of the subject property had been filed with MCM at the time this report was written (MCM, 2023b). Figure 10 shows the location of these assessments in relation to the current subject property.

***Archaeological Assessment (Stages 1-2), 3097 Homestead Drive, Mount Hope; Parts of Lots 6 & 7 Registered Plan 313 and Part of Lot 6, Concession 4, and Part of Undeveloped Road Allowance Between Lots 5 and 6, Geographic Township of Glanford, Historical County of Wentworth, now in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. Detritus Consulting Ltd. Report dated January 9, 2018. PIF P017-0568-2017.***

***Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment, Four Locations, 3097 Homestead Drive; Parts of Lots 6 & 7 Registered Plan 313; Part of Lot 6, Concession 4; and Part of Undeveloped Road Allowance Between Lots 5 & 6, Geographic Township of Glanford, Historical County of Wentworth, now in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. Detritus Consulting Ltd. Report dated April 20, 2018. PIFs P389-0283-2017, P389-298-2017, P389-297-2017, P389-0291-2017.***

***Stage 4 Mitigation, Homestead 4 (AgGx-729), 3097 Homestead Drive, Mount Hope, Part of Lot 6, Concession 4, Geographic Township of Glanford, Historical County of Wentworth, now in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. Detritus Consulting Ltd. Report dated October 13, 2017. PIF P389-0301-2017.***

DCL was contracted to conduct a Stage 1 & 2 assessment of a 4.81 ha parcel of land located within 50 m to the northwest of the current subject property. The Stage 2 survey resulted in the documentation of six archaeological sites, registered as AgGx-726 to AgGx-731. Four of the six sites are within 300 m of the current subject property, however, the closest of these sites is 110 m away (MCM, 2023a). Four of the six sites were recommended for Stage 3 assessment (DCL, 2018c).

DCL conducted subsequent Stage 3 assessments on the four sites with CHVI, AgGx-726, AgGx-728, AgGx-729, and AgGx-731 (DCL, 2018d). As a result of the Stage 3 assessments, only AgGx-729, an Indigenous scatter, was recommended for Stage 4 mitigation. The other three





sites were determined to have no further CHVI (DCL, 2018d:45-46). Stage 4 mitigation of AgGx-729 was completed by DCL, who fully excavated and documented the site (DCL, 2017

***Stage 1-2 Archaeological Property Assessment, 8521 and 8527 Airport Road, Lot 6, Concession 5, (Geographic Township of Glanford, County of Wentworth), City of Hamilton. AMICK Consultants Limited. Report dated January 29, 2019. PIF P038-0948-2018.***

AMICK Consultants Limited (AMICK) was contracted by Enbridge to complete a Stage 1 & 2 assessment for a proposed development. The assessed area was located within 50 m to the west of the current subject property. No archaeological resources were identified during the assessment and no further fieldwork was recommended for the property (AMICK, 2019:33).

***Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment, 3311 Homestead Drive, Part of Lot 6, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, County of Wentworth, now in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. Detritus Consulting Limited. Report dated June 27, 2019. PIF P017-0648-2018.***

DCL was contracted to conduct a Stage 1 & 2 assessment of a 0.33 ha parcel of land located within 50 m to the west of the current subject property. No archaeological resources were identified during the assessment and no further fieldwork was recommended for the property (DCL, 2019a:12).

***Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment, 3323 Homestead Drive, Part of Lot 6, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, County of Wentworth, now in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. Detritus Consulting Limited. Report dated July 10, 2019. PIF P017-0411-2018.***

DCL was contracted to conduct a Stage 1 & 2 assessment of a 0.14 ha parcel of land located within 50 m to the west of the current subject property. No archaeological resources were identified during the assessment and no further fieldwork was recommended for the property (DCL, 2019b:16).

***Stage 1 and Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, 3530 Upper James Street, Part of Lot 5, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, County of Wentworth, now in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. WSP Canada. Report dated April 25, 2023. PIFs P1078-0096-2020 and P1078-0100-2020.***

WSP Canada (WSP) was contracted to conduct a Stage 1 & 2 assessment of a 0.14 ha parcel of land located within 50 m to the west of the current subject property. No archaeological resources were identified during the assessment, however a portion of the study area adjacent to the White Church Cemetery was recommended for Stage 3 Cemetery Investigation (WSP, 2023).

***Stage 1 and Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, 3530 Upper James Street, Part of Lot 5, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, County of Wentworth, now in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. WSP Canada. Report dated April 25<sup>th</sup>, 2023. PIFs P1078-0096-2020 and P1078-0100-2020.***



WSP was contracted to conduct a Stage 1 & 2 assessment of a 0.14 ha parcel of land located within 50 m to the west of the current subject property. No archaeological resources were identified during the assessment, however a portion of the study area adjacent to the White Church Cemetery was recommended for Stage 3 Cemetery Investigation (WSP, 2023).

***Stage 4 Construction Monitoring, Enbridge Pipelines Inc. Line 10 Westover Segment Replacement Project, Tract 105 Location 1 (AgGx-596), within Lot 6, Concession 6 Geographic Township of Glanford, Former Wentworth County, Now City of Hamilton, Ontario. Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants. Report dated August 2018. PIF P324-0253-2017.***

***Stage 4 Construction Monitoring, Enbridge Pipelines Inc. Line 10 Westover Segment Replacement Project, Tract 99 Location 1 (AgGx-587), within Lot 5, Concession 6 Geographic Township of Glanford, Former Wentworth County, Now City of Hamilton, Ontario. Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants. Report dated September 2018. PIF P324-0257-2017.***

***Stage 4 Construction Monitoring, Enbridge Pipelines Inc. Line 10 Westover Segment Replacement Project, Tract 99 Location 2 (AgGx-588), within Lot 5, Concession 6 Geographic Township of Glanford, Former Wentworth County, Now City of Hamilton, Ontario. Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants. Report dated September 2018. PIF P324-0259-2017.***

The above three reports prepared by TMHC documented Stage 4 construction monitoring at three archaeological sites for the proposed replacement of Enbridge's Line 10 TMHC, 2018a, b, c). The reports divided the pipeline into tracts of land for the purposes of their study areas, with Tract 99 located within 50 m to the southwest of the current subject property and Tract 105 located within 50 m to the south of the current subject property. While the tracts of land are located within 50 m of the subject property, none of the fieldwork conducted at any of the three sites documented in the reports was within 50 m of the current subject property. AgGx-587 is located 170 m from the subject property, and AgGx-588 and AgGx-596 are both over 300 m from the subject property. The above three reports were included in this document for completeness but are not mapped in Figure 10.

#### 1.3.4 Archaeological Master Plans

Archaeological site predictive models and master plans are tools used to assist in determining the probability of encountering archaeological sites. Probability models are created using consideration of variables such as distance to water, soil type, drainage, physiographic region, degree of slope, proximity to registered archaeological sites, and degree of disturbance.

The City of Hamilton has developed the *City of Hamilton Archaeological Management Plan* (2016) for both the urban and rural portions of the city. The management plan outlines any lands within the City of Hamilton that, should development be proposed, are required to have archaeological assessments prior to development. From the management plan, two maps of archaeological potential were generated, the purpose of which was to evaluate, and inventory

known archaeological sites and the presence or absence, and extent of soil disturbance within urban and rural lands. The *Rural Hamilton Archaeological Potential Map* (City of Hamilton, 2022) indicates that most of the subject property is designated as an urban expansion area (Figure 11). Most of the northwest corner, outside the urban expansion area is shown as having archaeological potential. However, an earlier version of the City of Hamilton's *Archaeology Management Plan* indicated that most of the subject property, aside from smaller areas in the eastern central and southeastern portions, retained overall archaeological potential (City of Hamilton, 2012; see Figure 12).



## 2.0 FIELD METHODS

No fieldwork was conducted for this Stage 1 archaeological assessment as there was no optional visual property inspection completed for the project. However, the entirety of the property was assessed and documented through background research of the geography, topography, and current condition of the property. This research was sufficient to identify the presence or absence of features of archaeological potential, and to make appropriate recommendations regarding further fieldwork.



### 3.0 RECORD OF FINDS

The subject property measures 364.55 ha. Small ponds are found throughout the subject property and account for 2.90 ha, or 1 percent (%) of the subject property.

#### 3.1 Areas of Low Archaeological Potential

Areas of low to no archaeological potential include lands that have been previously disturbed, lands that have steeply sloping topography, and lands that are low-lying and permanently wet. There were no low-lying and permanently wet areas or areas of steeply sloping topography identified within the subject property.

10.87 ha of the subject property, 3%, has been previously disturbed by construction of residential, agricultural, and commercial structures, as well as laneways, and parking areas. Extensive and intensive landscaping and construction activities involving grading below topsoil have removed archaeological potential from these areas.

Figure 13 shows the areas of low to no archaeological potential. As no visual property inspection has been completed for this Stage 1 assessment, the Stage 2 assessment must confirm, document, and map all areas of low to no archaeological potential identified during this Stage 1 archaeological assessment.

#### 3.2 Previously Assessed Areas

18.88 ha of the subject property, 5%, has been previously subject to Stage 2 archaeological assessments (Stantec, 2015, 2016, 2022, TMHC, 2015, 2016; see Figures 10 and 13 of this report). The reports documenting this fieldwork have been accepted by MCM into their *Public Register of Archaeological Reports*. As such, no additional Stage 2 assessment is required for the lands. However, 13 locations containing archaeological resources were identified within these previously assessed areas. Three sites within the subject property have further CHVI and are recommended for additional assessment, and these areas cannot be considered free of archaeological concern until the sites have been fully documented.

#### 3.3 Areas of Archaeological Potential

331.90 ha, 91%, of the subject property retains archaeological potential as there is no evidence for previous ground disturbance that would have damaged or removed archaeological resources from the subject property. Figure 13 shows the areas determined to retain archaeological potential.

247.88 ha, 68%, of the subject property is agricultural field. As the fields are ploughable land, the Stage 2 assessment of the fields should be completed by pedestrian survey at 5 m intervals.

84.02 ha, 23%, of the subject property is manicured lawn in areas of existing infrastructure, scrubland, tree rows, or forest. These areas meet the requirements of Section 2.1.2 1e of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*, that ploughing or cultivation is not

viable. Because these portions of the property cannot be ploughed, the Stage 2 assessment of these areas should be completed by test pit survey at 5 m grid intervals.

### 3.4 Documentary Record

A detailed list of records is presented in Table 5. All digital items have been duplicated and all paper items have been scanned and stored as digital documents. All items are housed in the corporate offices of ACC.

Under Section 6 of Regulation 881 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, ACC will keep in safekeeping all objects of archaeological significance that are found under the authority of the license and all field records that are made in the course of the work authorized by the license, except where the objects and records are donated to His Majesty the King in right of Ontario or are directed to be deposited in a public institution under subsection 66 (1) of the Act.

Table 5: Inventory of Documentary and Material Records

PROJECT INFORMATION		
ACC project number	195-01-23	
Licensee	Matthew Muttart	
MCM PIF number	P1208-0301-2023	
DOCUMENT/MATERIAL	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION
project notes	2	pages (paper, with digital copies)
maps	1	aerial photograph of subject property
	1	White Church Boundary Expansion Area map



## 4.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

### 4.1 Potential for Archaeological Resources

Archaeological potential is defined as the likelihood of finding archaeological sites within a subject area. For planning purposes, determining archaeological potential provides a preliminary indication that significant sites might be found within the subject area, and consequently, that it may be necessary to allocate time and resources for archaeological survey and mitigation.

The framework for assigning levels of potential archaeological significance is drawn from provincial guidelines found in the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (MCM, 2011: Sections 1.3.1 and 1.3.2). The following are features or characteristics that can indicate archaeological potential:

- 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 (e.g., lakes, rivers, streams, creeks)
  - secondary water sources (e.g., 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, plateaus)
- pockets of well-drained sandy soil, especially near areas of heavy soil or rocky ground
- distinctive land formation 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 Euro-Canadian industry (e.g., fur trade, logging, prospecting, mining)



- areas of early Euro-Canadian 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 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, portages)
- property listed on a municipal register or designated under the OHA or that is in a federal, provincial, or municipal historic landmark site
- property that local histories or informants have identified with possible archaeological sites, historical events, activities, or occupations

Archaeological potential can be determined not to be present for either the entire property or parts 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:

- quarrying
- major landscaping involving grading below topsoil
- building footprints
- sewage and infrastructure development
- activities such as agricultural cultivation, gardening, minor grading, and landscaping do not necessarily affect archaeological potential.

## 4.2 Discussion

Section 1.3.1 of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (MCM, 2011) lists criteria indicative of archaeological potential. Stage 1 background research indicated that the subject property has general archaeological potential due to the following factors:

- The subject property is largely comprised of well-drained land that is suitable for human habitation and agriculture
- Fourteen farmsteads are illustrated within the subject property in 1875 historical mapping (Page & Smith, 1875).
- The subject property is adjacent to four concession roads, Airport Road East, Miles Road, White Church Road East, and Upper James Street.
- The subject property is located within 300 m of the historic limits of the community of Mount Hope.
- There are water sources within the subject property including 18 ponds and eleven seasonal tributaries of the Welland River and Twenty Mile Creek.





- There are 187 registered sites located within 1 km of the subject property, including 13 registered sites located within the subject property.
- The City of Hamilton’s *Archaeological Management Plan* indicates that portions of the subject property have archaeological potential.

Given the above criteria, background archival research indicates that the subject property exhibits general archaeological potential for the discovery of both pre/post-contact Indigenous and Euro-Canadian archaeological resources.

The subject property measures 364.55 ha. 18.88 ha, 5%, of the subject property has been previously subject to Stage 2 archaeological assessments for proposed pipeline assessments (Stantec, 2015, 2016, 2022, TMHC, 2015, 2016; see Figures 10 and 13 of this report). Thirteen locations containing archaeological resources were identified within the subject property during these assessments. Some of the sites documented during the Stage 1 & 2 assessments have undergone subsequent Stage 3 and 4 excavations. Of the 13 sites, ten sites have been sufficiently documented and have no further CHVI. Table 6 lists the development review status and fieldwork recommendations for the registered sites documented within the subject property.

Table 6: Status of Registered Archaeological Sites within the Subject Property

BORDEN	SITE TYPE	DEVELOPMENT REVIEW STATUS	RECOMMENDED FIELDWORK
AgGx-603	Indigenous scatter	No further CHVI	none
AgGx-606	Indigenous large scatter	Further CHVI	Stage 3 assessment required (TMHC, 2017a)
AgGx-618	Indigenous findspot	Further CHVI	Stage 3 assessment required (TMHC, 2017a)
AgGx-619	Indigenous findspot	No further CHVI	none
AgGx-620	Indigenous scatter	No further CHVI	none
AgGx-621	Indigenous scatter	No further CHVI	none
AgGx-623	Indigenous scatter	No further CHVI	none
AgGx-624	Indigenous scatter	No further CHVI	none
AgGx-625	Indigenous scatter	No further CHVI	none
AgGx-626	Indigenous findspot	No further CHVI	none
AgGx-627	Indigenous scatter	No further CHVI	none
AgGx-1029	Indigenous/Euro-Canadian	No further CHVI	none
AgGx-1030	Indigenous/Euro-Canadian	Further CHVI	Stage 4 mitigation has been completed for the southern portion of the site. Stage 2 assessment plus additional stages as necessary are required for the unassessed northern portion of the site (Stantec, 2024).

Three registered archaeological sites located within the subject property retain CHVI. AgGx-606 and AgGx-618 have been recommended for Stage 3 excavation (TMHC, 2017a). AgGx-1030 has been subject to partial Stage 3 assessment and Stage 4 assessments by Stantec (Stantec, 2023b, 2024). Stantec determined that the site potentially extended beyond their project area limits and the portion of the site that extended outside Stantec’s project area has been

recommended for Stage 2 assessment followed by Stage 3 and/or Stage 4 assessments as necessary (Stantec, 2024:47). Site-specific recommendations are presented in Section 5.0, below.

Background research of the geography, topography, and current condition of the property determined that 2.90 ha, 1%, of the subject property consists of waterbodies. If impacts to these waterbodies are proposed, marine archaeological potential may be evaluated through a separate process following the MCM's 2016 *Criteria for Evaluating Marine Archaeological Potential* checklist.

10.87 ha, 3%, of the subject property has low to no archaeological potential because it has been previously disturbed by major landscaping and construction activities involving grading below topsoil.

The balance of the subject property, 231.90 ha, 91%, does not display evidence for disturbance that would have destroyed or removed archaeological resources; therefore, further assessment of the subject property in the form of a Stage 2 archaeological assessment will be required prior to development.

247.88 ha, 68%, of the subject property is agricultural field that can be ploughed and therefore, Stage 2 archaeological assessment in these areas should be conducted by pedestrian survey at 5 m intervals. 84.02 ha, 23%, of the subject property is comprised of manicured lawn, treerows, scrubland, or forest. As such it meets the requirements of Section 2.1.2 1e of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*, that ploughing, or cultivation is not viable. Therefore, Stage 2 archaeological assessment in these areas should be conducted by test pit survey at 5 m intervals (Figure 13).



## 5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Subject to acceptance of the results and approval of the recommendations, MCM is requested to deem this report compliant with ministry requirements for archaeological fieldwork and reporting and to issue a letter accepting this report into the *Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports*.

The following recommendation is provided for consideration by the Proponent and by the MCM:

1. Aerial imagery and topographic mapping indicates that 10.87 ha of the subject property exhibits low potential for the recovery of archaeological resources due to previous disturbance. The Stage 2 assessment should confirm the presence and extent of these areas of low archaeological potential, and they should be mapped and documented by photography.
2. Stage 2 assessment has been conducted on 18.88 ha of the subject property. As the reports documenting this fieldwork have been approved by MCM, these lands do not require any further Stage 2 survey.
3. There are 13 registered sites documented within the subject property. Ten of these sites, AgGx-603, AgGx-619, AgGx-620, AgGx-621, AgGx-623, AgGx-624, AgGx-625, AgGx-626, AgGx-627, and AgGx-1029, have no further CHVI and require no additional fieldwork.

Three sites, AgGx-606, AgGx-618, and AgGx-1030 retain further CHVI. Recommended fieldwork for each site includes the following:

- a. Site AgGx-606 is a large Indigenous scatter. Stage 3 assessment is required for the site prior to development (TMHC, 2017a; PIF P324-0098-2016). Given the extent of the site and density of artifacts, it is evident that the level of CHVI at this site will result in a recommendation to proceed to Stage 4 excavations. This site was found during test pit assessment and pedestrian survey; therefore, controlled surface artifact collection is required for the artifacts recovered from within the agricultural field. The agricultural field should be ploughed and weathered sufficiently for the surface artifact collection. Stage 3 fieldwork will involve the hand-excavation of 1 m by 1 m square units placed in a 10 m grid across the extent of the site. Grid unit excavation should be followed by excavation of additional test units, amounting to 40% of the grid unit total, focusing on areas of interest within the site extent (such as distinct areas of higher concentrations of artifacts or adjacent to high-yield units) as per Section 3.2.2 and Table 3.1 of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. If any features are encountered, they will be addressed as per Section 3.2.2 Standard 6 where their planview will be recorded, be covered in geotextiles and backfilled.
- b. Site AgGx-618 is an Indigenous findspot. Stage 3 assessment is required for the site prior to development (TMHC, 2017a; PIF P324-0098-2016). It is not yet



evident that the level of CHVI at this site will result in a recommendation to proceed to Stage 4 excavations. This site was found during test pit assessment; therefore, no controlled surface artifact collection is required. Stage 3 fieldwork will involve the hand-excavation of 1 m by 1 m square units placed in a 5 m grid across the extent of the site. Grid unit excavation should be followed by excavation of additional test units, amounting to 20% of the grid unit total, focusing on areas of interest within the site extent (such as distinct areas of higher concentrations of artifacts or adjacent to high-yield units) as per Section 3.2.2 and Table 3.1 of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. If any features are encountered, they will be addressed as per Section 3.2.2 Standard 6 where their planview will be recorded, be covered in geotextiles and backfilled.

- c. Site AgGx-1030 is a multi-component Indigenous and Euro-Canadian site that retains CHVI. As per Stantec's (2024:47; PIF P1148-0058-2022) Stage 4 mitigation recommendations, the portion of the site within Stantec's project area has been fully documented and has no further CHVI. AgGx-1030 may extend outside of the confines of Stantec's project limits to the north. These lands have not been subject to Stage 2 archaeological assessment. Stage 2 archaeological assessment, followed by additional fieldwork stages, as necessary, is required for any unassessed portions of the site. future development impacts to these lands.
4. Stage 2 archaeological assessment in the form of a pedestrian survey should be conducted on the agricultural fields which account for 247.88 ha of the subject property. The land to be assessed must be recently ploughed and must be disked after ploughing if the soils are heavy clay. Direction should be provided to the contractor undertaking the ploughing that the ploughing should be deep enough to provide total topsoil exposure, but not deeper than previous ploughing. The ploughed lands must be weathered by one heavy rainfall or several light rains to improve the visibility of archaeological resources. At least 80% of the ground surface must be visible to conduct a pedestrian survey. If the fields to be assessed do not meet the above conditions, then the land may need to be reploughed prior to survey. The ploughed lands should be surveyed at 5 m intervals.

When archaeological resources are found, the survey intervals will be decreased to 1 m intervals over a minimum of 20 m radius around the archaeological find to determine if it is an isolated find or part of a larger scatter. The 1 m interval survey should continue until the full extent of the surface scatter has been identified. All formal artifact types and diagnostic categories are to be collected, and enough artifacts should be left in-situ to relocate the site if it is necessary to conduct further assessment.

5. Stage 2 archaeological assessment in the form of a test pit survey should be conducted in all areas where ploughing is not possible or viable, including manicured lawn, treerows, scrubland, and forested areas, which account for 84.02 ha of the subject property. The test pits should be excavated by hand at 5 m intervals. Test pits should be at least 30 centimetres in diameter and should be dug into the first 5 centimetres of subsoil. Test pits should be conducted to within 1 m of any disturbances or until test pits show



evidence of recent ground disturbance. Each pit should be examined for stratigraphy, cultural features, or evidence of fill. Soils should be screened through wire mesh with an aperture no greater than 6 millimetres to facilitate artifact recovery. All artifacts should be collected according to their associated test pit. All test pits should be backfilled unless otherwise instructed.

When artifacts are found, the survey grid should be continued to determine whether there are further positive test pits. This may produce sufficient archaeological resources to meet criteria for requiring a Stage 3 archaeological assessment. When insufficient archaeological resources are found through continued grid survey to meet criteria for Stage 3 assessment, survey coverage around the positive test pit should be continued, by means of eight additional test pits and one or more 1 m by 1 m square test unit placed above the positive test pit.



## 6.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION

The following advice on compliance with current legislation is provided for consideration:

- a. This report is submitted to the Minister of Citizenship and Multiculturalism as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 2005, c O.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 Citizenship and Multiculturalism, 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 a 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 consultant archaeologist to carry out archaeological fieldwork, in compliance with Section 48 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.
- d. The *Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act*, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33 requires that any person discovering human remains must notify the local police or coroner and the Registrar, Burials Unit, at the Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery.
- e. It is an offence to destroy or alter an archaeological site without approval from the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism. 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 license.



## 7.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES

Adams, Nick

1994 *Field Manual for Avocational Archaeologists in Ontario*. Publication No.16, Ontario Archaeological Society Inc.

AMICK Consultants Limited (AMICK)

2019 *Stage 1-2 Archaeological Property Assessment, 3311 Homestead Drive, Part of Lot 6, Concession 5, (Geographic Township of Glanford, County of Wentworth), City of Hamilton*. Report on File, MCM, Toronto. PIF P038-0948-2018.

Archaeological Consultants Canada (ACC)

2023a *Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, Proposed Development, 8113 Airport Road, Part of Lot 8, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, Wentworth County, now in the City of Hamilton, Ontario*. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P1208-0198-2023.

2023b *Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, Proposed Development, 7505 Airport Road, Part of Lots 9 and 10, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, Wentworth County, now in the City of Hamilton, Ontario*. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P1208-0197-2023.

Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI)

2001 *Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment of the Proposed Southampton Estates, Mount Hope, Township of Glanbrook, City of Hamilton, Ontario*. Report on file, MCM, Toronto.

Borden, Charles E.

1952 A Uniform Site Designation Scheme for Canada. *Anthropology in British Columbia*, No. 3, 44-48.

Caston, Wayne

1997 Evolution in the Mapping of Southern Ontario and Wellington County. *Wellington County History*. 10:91-106.

Chapman, L.J. and D.F. Putnam

1984 *The Physiography of Southern Ontario (Third Edition)*. Ontario Geological Survey *Special Volume 2*. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Toronto.

City of Hamilton

2012 *Archaeology Management Plan*.

2016 *City of Hamilton Archaeological Management Plan*.

2022 *Rural Hamilton Archaeological Potential Map*.

<https://www.hamilton.ca/develop-property/policies-guidelines/archaeology-management-plan>.

[Accessed November 4, 2024].

Coyne, James, C. O. Ermatinger, K. W. McKay

1895 *Historical Sketches of the County of Elgin*. Elgin Historical and Scientific Institute, St. Thomas.

D.R. Poulton & Associates (DPA)

2015 *The 2015 Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of the Proposed Enbridge Pipelines Inc. Line 10, Westover Segment Replacement Project, City of Hamilton, Ontario*. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P316-0306-2015.

De Rottenburg, M.B.

1850 *Map of the Principal Communications in Canada West. Compiled from the Most Authentick Sources, Actual Surveys, District Maps &c.* National Map Collection 3500 sheet 2. Ottawa.

Detritus Consulting Ltd. (DCL)

2017 *Stage 4 Mitigation, Homestead 4 (AgGx-729), 3097 Homestead Drive, Mount Hope, Part of Lot 6, Concession 4, Geographic Township of Glanford, Historical County of Wentworth, now in the City of Hamilton, Ontario*. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P389-0301-2017.

2018a *Archaeological Assessment (Stages 1-2) 3253, 3263, 3269, 3287, 3307, 3311, 3313 Homestead Drive, and 8533 Airport Road West, Mount Hope Part of Lot 6, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, Historical County of Wentworth, now in the City of Hamilton, Ontario*. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P017-0625-2017.

2018b *Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment AgGx-965 3311 Homestead Drive, Part of Lot 6, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, Historical County of Wentworth, City of Hamilton, Ontario*. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P389-0335-2018.

2018c *Archaeological Assessment (Stages 1-2), 3097 Homestead Drive, Mount Hope; Parts of Lots 6 & 7 Registered Plan 313 and Part of Lot 6, Concession 4, and Part of Undeveloped Road Allowance Between Lots 5 and 6, Geographic Township of Glanford, Historical County of Wentworth, now in the City of Hamilton, Ontario*. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P017-0568-2017. 2018c

2018d *Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment, Four Locations, 3097 Homestead Drive; Parts of Lots 6 & 7 Registered Plan 313; Part of Lot 6, Concession 4; and Part of Undeveloped Road Allowance Between Lots 5 & 6, Geographic Township of Glanford, Historical County of Wentworth, now in the City of Hamilton, Ontario*. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIFs P389-0283-2017, P389-298-2017, P389-297-2017, P389-0291-2017.

2019a *Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment, 3311 Homestead Drive, Part of Lot 6, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, County of Wentworth, now in the City of Hamilton, Ontario*. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P017-0648-2018.

2019b *Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment, 3323 Homestead Drive, Part of Lot 6, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, County of Wentworth, now in the City of Hamilton, Ontario*. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P017-0411-2018.





Ellis, Chris & Neal Ferris

1990 *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*. Occasional Publication No. 5. London Chapter, Ontario Archaeological Society Inc.

Gervais, Gaetan and Kathe Roth

2004 Champlain and Ontario (1603-35). In *Champlain: The Birth of French America*, edited by R. Litalien and D. Vaugeois, pp. 180-190. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press.

Glanbrook Heritage Society

2007 *Mount Hope*.

<http://www.glanbrookheritage.ca/mounthope.htm>

[Accessed February 14, 2023].

Government of Canada

2016 *Treaty Texts – Upper Canada Land Surrenders*.

Hardy Gregory

1859 *Map of the County of Wentworth, Canada West*. Hardy Gregory, Publisher.

Local History and Archives

2023 *Chronology of Cities, Towns and Townships in Hamilton*,

<https://lha.hpl.ca/articles/chronology-cities-towns-and-townships-hamilton?page=0%2C1#:~:text=The%20township%20of%20Glanford%20was,to%20Wentworth%20County%20in%201854>.

[Accessed July 24, 2023]

Mika, Nick and Helma Mika

1983 *Places in Ontario: Their Name Origins and History. Part II, N-Z*. Mika Publishing Company, Belleville.

Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM)

2005 *The Heritage Act, R.S.O. 2005*. Queen's Printer, Toronto.

2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. Toronto.

2016 *Criteria for Evaluating Marine Archaeological Potential*. Toronto.

2023 Sites within a 1 km radius of the subject property. Provided from the *Ontario Archaeological Sites Database*.

2024 Archaeological assessments completed within the subject property or within 50 m of the subject property. Provided from the *Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports*.

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry

2019 *Topographic Map, Land Information Ontario*

[https://www.lioapplications.lrc.gov.on.ca/MakeATopographicMap/index.html?viewer=Make\\_A\\_Topographic\\_Map.MATM&locale=en-CA](https://www.lioapplications.lrc.gov.on.ca/MakeATopographicMap/index.html?viewer=Make_A_Topographic_Map.MATM&locale=en-CA) [Accessed July 20, 2023]



Ministry of Northern Development and Mines

- 2007 *Physiography of Southern Ontario*. Chapman, L.J. and D.F. Putnam, authors. GIS map data layer distributed by the Ontario Geological Survey as Miscellaneous Release – Data (MRD) 228. Queen’s Printer for Ontario.  
<http://www.mndm.gov.on.ca/en/mines-and-minerals/applications/ogsearch>.  
[Accessed November 4, 2024].

Natural Resources Canada

- 1999 *Map 30-M/06, Hamilton-Burlington*. 1:50,000 scale National Topographic System map.

New Directions Archaeology Ltd. (NDA)

- 2003 *Stage 2-3 Archaeological Assessment of the Proposed Southampton Estates, Town of Mount Hope, R. M. of Hamilton-Wentworth (25T-98002 & 25T-200301)*. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P018-008

Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs

- 2012 *GIS Layers for Soils and Physiography in the Province of Ontario*.  
<http://sis.agr.gc.ca/cansis/publications/surveys/on/index.html>  
[Accessed July 20, 2023].

Page & Smith

- 1875 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth, Ont.*. Toronto.

Presant, E. W., R. E. Wicklund and B. C. Matthews

- 1965 *The Soils of Wentworth County*. Report No. 32 of the Ontario Soil Survey. Research Branch, Canada Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, and the Ontario Department of Agriculture, Toronto.

Smith, D. B.

- 1987 *Sacred Feathers: The Reverend Peter Jones (Kahkewaquonaby) and the Mississauga Indians*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec)

- 2015 *Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment: Proposed Temporary Access and Workspaces in Glanford Township (CWP 1436S), Enbridge Line 10, Parts of Various Lots, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, former Wentworth County, now City of Hamilton, Ontario*. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P256-0309-2014.
- 2016 *Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment: Proposed Temporary Access and Workspaces in Glanford Township, Various Integrity Digs (CWP 1511S), Enbridge Line 11, Part of Lots 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, and 12, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, former Wentworth County, now City of Hamilton, Ontario*. Stantec. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P256-0326-2015.
- 2022 *Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment: White Church Road Pipeline Installation Project: Part of Lot 6, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, former County of*



- Wentworth, now City of Hamilton, Ontario. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P1060-0110-2021.*
- 2023a *Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment: White Church Road Pipeline Installation, WCR-1 (AgGx-1029) Part of Lot 6, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, former County of Wentworth, now City of Hamilton, Ontario. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P256-0692-2021.*
- 2023b *Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment: White Church Road Pipeline Installation, WCR-2 (AgGx-1030) Part of Lot 6, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, former County of Wentworth, now City of Hamilton, Ontario. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P256-0708-2022.*
- 2023c *Stage 4 Archaeological Mitigation by Excavation: White Church Road Pipeline Installation, WCR-1 (AgGx-1029) Part of Lot 6, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, former County of Wentworth, now City of Hamilton, Ontario. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P1148-0030-2022.*
- 2024 *Stage 4 Archaeological Mitigation by Excavation: WCR-2 (AgGx-1030) White Church Road Pipeline Installation, Part of Lot 6, Concession 5, Geographic Township of Glanford, former County of Wentworth, now City of Hamilton, Ontario. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P1148-0058-2022.*

Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants (TMHC)

- 2015 *Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, Enbridge Pipelines Inc., Line 10 Westover Segment Replacement Project, Geotechnical Borehole Work Areas and Access Routes, City of Hamilton, Ontario. Report in Register, MCM, Toronto. P1075-0017-2015.*
- 2016 *Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, Enbridge Pipelines Inc., Line 10 Westover Segment Replacement Project, 2015 Fieldwork, City of Hamilton, Ontario. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P1075-0018-2016.*
- 2017a *Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Enbridge Pipelines Inc. Line 10 Westover Segment Replacement Project Spring, Summer and Early Fall 2016 Fieldwork City of Hamilton, Ontario. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P324-0098-2016.*
- 2017b *Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, Enbridge Pipelines Inc., Line 10 Westover Segment Replacement Project, Hydro One Networks Inc. (HONI) Re-Route and Later Fall 2016 Fieldwork, City of Hamilton, Ontario. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P1075-0018-2016.*
- 2017c *Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, Enbridge Pipelines Inc., Line 10 Westover Segment Replacement Project, Hydro One Networks Inc. (HONI) re-Route and Later Fall 2016 Fieldwork, City of Hamilton, Ontario. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIFs P324-0201-2017, P324-0228-2017.*
- 2017d *Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment Enbridge Pipelines Inc. Line 10 Westover Segment Replacement Pipeline Tract 110 Location 1 (AgGx-603) within Lot 7, Concession 5 Geographic Township of Glanford Former Wentworth County Now City of Hamilton, Ontario. Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P324-0139-2016.*
- 2018a *Stage 4 Construction Monitoring, Enbridge Pipelines Inc. Line 10 Westover Segment Replacement Project, Tract 105 Location 1 (AgGx-596), within Lot 6, Concession 6*



- Geographic Township of Glanford, Former Wentworth County, Now City of Hamilton, Ontario.* Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P324-0253-2017.
- 2018b *Stage 4 Construction Monitoring, Enbridge Pipelines Inc. Line 10 Westover Segment Replacement Project, Tract 99 Location 1 (AgGx-587), within Lot 5, Concession 6 Geographic Township of Glanford, Former Wentworth County, Now City of Hamilton, Ontario..* Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P324-0257-2017.
- 2018c *Stage 4 Construction Monitoring, Enbridge Pipelines Inc. Line 10 Westover Segment Replacement Project, Tract 99 Location 2 (AgGx-588), within Lot 5, Concession 6 Geographic Township of Glanford, Former Wentworth County, Now City of Hamilton, Ontario.* Report on file, MCM, Toronto. PIF P324-0259-2017.

University of Toronto

- 1954 *1954 Air Photos of Southern Ontario.*  
<https://mdl.library.utoronto.ca/collections/air-photos/1954-air-photos-southern-ontario/index>  
[Accessed November 4, 2024]

Urban Solutions

- 2024 *White Church Boundary Expansion Area.*

Wright James V.

- 1968 *Ontario Prehistory: an eleven thousand-year archaeological outline.* Archaeological Survey of Canada, National Museums of Canada, Ottawa.



## 8.0 FIGURES

See the following pages for detailed assessment mapping and figures.



Figure 1: Location of the Subject Property on a 1:50,000 Scale Topographic Map




Figure 2: White Church Boundary Expansion Area Showing the Subject Property




Figure 3: Location of the Subject Property on Baron De Rottenburg's 1850 Map of the Principal Communications in Canada West





Figure 4: Location of the Subject Property on Hardy Gregory's 1859 Map of the County of Wentworth, Canada West



Figure 5: Location of the Subject Property on Page & Smith's 1875 Illustrated Historical Atlas Map of Glanworth Township, County of Wentworth




Figure 6: Location of the Subject Property on a Map of Wentworth County Soils




Figure 7: Water Sources within the Subject Property





Figure 8: Current Land Use of the Subject Property



Scale:  
0 500  
metres

Reference:  
ESRI, 2023

Legend:  
□ subject property



Figure 9: Location of the Subject Property on 1954 Aerial Imagery




Figure 10: Previous Archaeological Assessments Conducted Within 50 m of the Subject Property




Figure 11: Location of the Subject Property On the City of Hamilton’s Rural Hamilton Archaeological Potential Map






Figure 12: Location of the Subject Property on the City of Hamilton Archaeological Management Plan Map of Areas of Archaeological Potential





Figure 13: Results and Recommendations of the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of the Subject Property



Supplemental Figure: Aerial Imagery Showing the Location of Registered Archaeological Sites within the Subject Property

