Samsung Renewable Energy Inc. and
Pattern Renewable Holdings Canada ULC

5A Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment

For

Armow Wind Project
The following Report includes an assessment of the entire Project Study Area. The references to Project infrastructure found in this Report may reflect more than the current Project Layout proposes.

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport has also reviewed and provided sign-off accepted the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment and Additional Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports. Please refer to these Reports, provided under a separate cover.
STAGE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT

SP Ontario Armow Wind Energy Project
Various Lots and Concessions
Geographic Townships of Bruce and Kincardine
now Municipality of Kincardine
Bruce County, Ontario

Submitted to:
Brian Edwards
SP Ontario Wind Development LP Inc.
c/o Samsung Renewable Energy Inc.
55 Standish Court, 9th Floor
Mississauga, ON L5R 4B2
Tel: 905-285-1832

PIF Number: P084-223-2010

Report Number: 11-1151-0247-3000-R01

Distribution:
3 Copies - SP Ontario Wind Development LP Inc.
3 Copies - Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture
3 Copies - Golder Associates Ltd.
Executive Summary

A Stage 1 archaeological background study was conducted by Golder Associates Ltd. for the proposed SP Ontario Wind Energy Project on behalf of SP Ontario Wind Development LP Inc (SP Ontario). This wind energy project was originally commenced by Acciona Wind Energy Canada Inc. but purchased by SP Ontario in 2011. This assessment was undertaken in order to meet the requirements for an application for a Renewable Energy Approval, as outlined in Ontario Regulation 359/09 section 22(3) of the Environmental Protection Act.

Golder Associates Ltd. applied archaeological potential criteria commonly used by the Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture to determine areas of archaeological potential within the study area. The archaeological potential for Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian sites was deemed to be moderate to high on these properties. For pre-contact Aboriginal sites this assessment is based on the presence of nearby potable water sources, level topography, agriculturally suitable soils and known archaeological sites. For post-contact Aboriginal sites this assessment is based on the presence of nearby potable water sources, level topography and historic documentation. The determination of historic Euro-Canadian archaeological potential is based on the documentation indicating occupation from the middle of the 19th century onwards as well as the presence of historic transportation routes. As a result, Stage 2 archaeological assessment is recommended for potential wind turbine sites and their associated infrastructure.

Further Stage 2 archaeological assessment is recommended for any areas to be impacted by turbine construction, access road construction, or other infrastructure construction related activities. The Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture is asked to review the results presented and to accept this report into the Provincial Register of archaeological reports. Additional archaeological assessment is still required; hence the archaeological sites recommended for further archaeological fieldwork remain subject to Section 48(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act and may not be altered, or have artifacts removed, except by a person holding an archaeological licence.

This report is submitted to the Minister of Tourism and Culture as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c 0.18. The report is reviewed to ensure that the licensed consultant archaeologist has met the terms and conditions of their archaeological licence, and that the archaeological fieldwork and report recommendations ensure the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario.

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

The Cemeteries Act requires that any person discovering human remains must notify the police or coroner and the Registrar of Cemeteries, Ministry of Consumer Services.

The Executive Summary highlights key points from the report only; for complete information and findings, as well as the limitations, the reader should examine the complete report.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

A Stage 1 archaeological background study was conducted by Golder Associates Ltd. (Golder) for proposed SP Ontario Wind Energy Project on behalf of SP Ontario Wind Development LP (SP Ontario) (Figure 1). This wind energy project was originally commenced by Acciona Wind Energy Canada Inc. but purchased by SP Ontario in 2011. This assessment was undertaken in order to meet the requirements for an application for a Renewable Energy Approval, as outlined in Ontario Regulation 359/09 section 22(3) of the Environmental Protection Act.

The objective of the Stage 1 assessment was to compile all available information about the known and potential cultural heritage resources within the study area and to provide specific direction for the protection, management and/or recovery of these resources, consistent with Ministry of Tourism and Culture guidelines (Government of Ontario 1993).

The site visit component of the Stage 1 assessment was conducted on May 26, 2010 under archaeological consulting licence P084, issued to Adam Hossack, B.A., by the Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture. Golder applied archaeological potential criteria commonly used by the Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture to determine areas of archaeological potential within the study area. The archaeological potential for Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian sites was deemed to be moderate to high on these properties. For pre-contact Aboriginal sites this assessment is based on the presence of nearby potable water sources, level topography, agriculturally suitable soils and known archaeological sites. For post-contact Aboriginal sites this assessment is based on the presence of nearby potable water sources, level topography and historic documentation. The determination of historic Euro-Canadian archaeological potential is based on the documentation indicating occupation from the middle of the 19th century onwards as well as the presence of historic transportation routes. As a result, Stage 2 archaeological assessment is recommended for potential wind turbine sites and their associated infrastructure.

Further Stage 2 archaeological assessment is recommended for any areas to be impacted by turbine construction, access road construction, or other infrastructure construction related activities. The Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture is asked to review the results presented and to accept this report into the Provincial Register of archaeological reports. Additional archaeological assessment is still required; hence the archaeological sites recommended for further archaeological fieldwork remain subject to Section 48(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act and may not be altered, or have artifacts removed, except by a person holding an archaeological licence.
2.0 STUDY METHODS

In compliance with the provincial standards and guidelines set out in the Draft Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 1993), the Stage 1 Archaeological Overview/Background Study included:

- a review of the land use history, including pertinent historic maps;
- a property inspection of the study area; and
- an examination of the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database (ASDB) to determine the presence of known archaeological sites in and around the study area.

In addition to the property inspection of the study area, background research was conducted at the Ministry of Tourism and Culture Office in Toronto, the University of Western Ontario Map Library, the Crown Land Survey Records Office at the Ministry of Natural Resources in Peterborough, Bruce County Museum and Cultural Centre in Southampton and Golder’s corporate library.
3.0 BACKGROUND RESEARCH

3.1 The Natural Environment

The study area is an approximate 18,800 hectare parcel located in the Geographic Townships of Bruce and Kincardine, now Municipality of Kincardine, Bruce County. The study area encompasses Lots 4 to 35, Concession 1 and Lots 6 to 35, Concession 2 within the Geographic Township of Bruce plus Lots 1 to 35, Concessions 3 to 12 within the Geographic Township of Kincardine.

The study area is situated within the physiographic region of the Huron Slope (Chapman and Putnam 1984:113):

> Occupying an area of about 1,000 sq miles along the eastern side of Lake Huron, the land between the Algonquian shorecliff and the Wyoming moraine slopes gently upward from 600 feet to 850 or 900 feet a.s.l. It is essentially a clay plain modified by a narrow strip of sand, and by the twin beaches of glacial Lake Warren which flank the moraine...Farmers generally emphasize the raising of livestock, grazing is featured, and grass farms...are common.

(Chapman and Putnam 1984:160-161)

The study area has 17 soil series present, with the three major ones being the Perth series (clay), Berrien Series (sandy loam) and the Brookston series (sandy loam) (Figure 2). Perth clay is the most widespread within the study area, is described as imperfectly drained and tends to produce fair crop yields even during dry seasons due to the soil’s reserve supply of moisture. This soil type is used generally for beef raising, and cereal grain growing as well as hay and pasture which have low yields (Hoffman and Richards 1954:49). The Berrien series is imperfectly drained sandy loam which is used for general farming but when drained properly can yield tree fruits, small fruits and vegetables (Hoffman & Richards 1954: 70). Brookston clay is poorly drained and therefore systematic tile systems and other drainage improvements are required in order for the land to produce good yields, it is generally used for pasture and general farming (Hoffman and Richards 1954:51).

The area’s topography is mostly level with some areas of gentle and steep sloping which can contribute to the soils’ drainage characteristic. The Perth and Berrien series soils would be suitable for pre-contact Aboriginal agriculture, but not ideal due to the seasonal drainage issues, while the Brookston series soils would be too poorly drained for pre-contact Aboriginal agricultural activity.

Numerous small creeks transect the study area at various locations. Four watersheds feed into the study area (Figure 1). The Penetangore watershed, which drains into Lake Huron, is located in the southwestern portion of the study area (Saugeen Conservation 2008c). The water sources from this watershed include one of the main tributaries, the North Penetangore River, and a secondary tributary, Kincardine Creek. The Lake Fringe watershed, which also drains into Lake Huron, is located in the northwestern portion of the study area (Saugeen Conservation 2008a). The water sources from this watershed include a main tributary, Andrews Creek, and streams from another main tributary, Lorne Creek. The Lower Main Saugeen River watershed, which drains into Lake Huron, is located in the northeastern portion of the study area (Saugeen Conservation 2008b). The water sources from this watershed include one of the main tributaries of the lower Saugeen River, Willow Creek. Finally, the Teeswater watershed, which drains into the Saugeen River, is located just along the northeastern boundary of the study area (Saugeen Conservation 2008d). No major water sources from the watershed travel through the study area, but Greenock swamp does just skirt the eastern edge of the study area. So, potable
water sources available within the study area include: the North Penetangore River, Kincardine Creek, Andrews Creek, Lorne Creek, Willow Creek and other smaller tributaries.

3.2 Pre-Contact Aboriginal Archaeological Resources and Surveys

In order that an inventory of archaeological resources could be compiled, the registered archaeological site records kept by the Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture were consulted. In Ontario, information concerning archaeological sites is stored in the OASD maintained by the Ministry of Tourism and Culture. This database contains archaeological sites registered according to the Borden system. Under the Borden system, Canada is divided into grid blocks based on latitude and longitude. A Borden Block is approximately 13 kilometres east to west and approximately 18.5 kilometres north to south. Each Borden Block is referenced by a four-letter designator and sites within a block are numbered sequentially as they are found.

According to the OASD (personal communication, Robert von Bitter 2010; Government of Ontario n.d.), there are eight registered archaeological sites located within the limits of the study area. Table 1 summarizes the nature of these sites. Five of the known sites are pre-contact Aboriginal sites and three are historic Euro-Canadian sites. If they were to be impacted by turbine or infrastructure construction, sites BaHi-2, BbHi-1, BbHi-3, BbHi-4, BbHi-5, BbHi-6 and BbHj-7 would merit further archaeological assessment. The other site within the study area, BbHi-2 has been determined to have limited cultural heritage value or interest and would not require further archaeological assessment.

Table 1: Registered Archaeological Sites Located within the Limits of the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borden #</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BaHi-2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>campsite</td>
<td>pre-contact Aboriginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BbHi-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>campsite</td>
<td>pre-contact Aboriginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BbHi-2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>campsite</td>
<td>pre-contact Aboriginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BbHi-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>campsite</td>
<td>pre-contact Aboriginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BbHi-4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>historic Euro-Canadian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BbHi-5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>historic Euro-Canadian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BbHi-6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>historic Euro-Canadian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BbHj-7 McDuff</td>
<td>campsite</td>
<td>Middle Archaic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2 provides a general outline of the culture history of the Bruce County area. Previous archaeological assessments and research surveys have demonstrated that Bruce County was extensively utilized by pre-contact Aboriginal peoples (Rankin 2000:11). As discussed in Section 3.3 below, there is evidence that the study area could have been inhabited by Iroquoian- or Algonquian-speaking groups, or a combination of groups.

**Table 2: Cultural Chronology for the Bruce County Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Paleo-Indian</td>
<td>Fluted Projectiles</td>
<td>9000 - 8400 B.C.</td>
<td>spruce parkland/caribou hunters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Paleo-Indian</td>
<td>Hi-Lo Projectiles</td>
<td>8400 - 8000 B.C.</td>
<td>smaller but more numerous sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Archaic</td>
<td>Kirk and Bifurcate Base Points</td>
<td>8000 - 6000 B.C.</td>
<td>slow population growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Archaic</td>
<td>Brewerton-like points</td>
<td>6000 - 2500 B.C.</td>
<td>environment similar to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Archaic</td>
<td>Lamoka (narrow points)</td>
<td>2000 - 1800 B.C.</td>
<td>increasing site size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadpoints</td>
<td></td>
<td>1800 - 1500 B.C.</td>
<td>large chipped lithic tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Points</td>
<td></td>
<td>1500 - 1100 B.C.</td>
<td>introduction of bow hunting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Archaic</td>
<td>Hind Points</td>
<td>1100 - 950 B.C.</td>
<td>emergence of true cemeteries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Woodland</td>
<td>Meadowood Points</td>
<td>950 - 400 B.C.</td>
<td>introduction of pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Woodland</td>
<td>Pseudo-Scallop/Dentate Pottery</td>
<td>500 B.C. - A.D. 700/1000</td>
<td>large fisher-gatherer-hunter basecamps, cemeteries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>Pre-Iroquoian Late Woodland</td>
<td>A.D. 1000 - 1250</td>
<td>continued pattern of traditional fishing, gathering and hunting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Iroquoian-like (Uren and Middleport)</td>
<td>A.D. 1250 - 1400</td>
<td>longhouse village, continued fishing, gathering and hunting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late Ontario Iroquoian-like</td>
<td>A.D. 1400 - 1650/1690</td>
<td>tribal warfare and displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Aboriginal</td>
<td>Various Algonkian Groups</td>
<td>A.D. 1690 - present</td>
<td>early written records and treaties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>A.D. 1818 - present</td>
<td>European settlement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 Post-Contact Aboriginal Archaeological Resources and Surveys

The study area within Bruce County was most likely occupied by Algonkian-speaking groups who also exhibited cultural influence from Iroquoian-speaking groups, both before and after European contact. Generally, the pre-contact Aboriginal presence in much of southern Ontario reflects occupation by Northern Iroquoian speakers. During and following the Iroquois Wars of the mid-17th century and the dispersal of the Iroquoian-speaking Huron-Petun and Neutral, a considerable reduction in the extent of territory occupied by Iroquoian speakers occurred in southern Ontario. Beginning about 1690, Algonkian speakers from northern Ontario began to move southwards (Ferris 2009; Rogers 1978:761; Schmalz 1991). It has been presumed that occupation of the Bruce County and the Bruce Peninsula before about 1690 would have been by Iroquoians, but the Middle Woodland Saugeen Complex, known best from locations in the Saugeen River valley such as the Donaldson site, is most often interpreted as Algonkian (Fiedel 1999), arguing for an occupation of Bruce County by Algonkian speakers for millennia. Dating somewhat later than the Donaldson site, Wright (1974:303; Fox 1990:461) believed that the
isolated occurrence of a palisaded village in Bruce County at the Middle Ontario Iroquoian-like (Middleport substage) Nodwell site established a case for immigration by the Iroquoian-speaking Huron. More recently, however, Rankin (2000) has argued that the Nodwell village represents a short-lived sedentary farming experiment by hunter-gatherers, probably indigenous Algonkian speakers, who may have been ancestral to the Odawa (see also Warrick 2008:159). French missionaries indicated relatively close ties between the Odawa and the Huron-Petun (Fox 1990; cf. Feest and Feest 1978:773).

Ferris (1999:119-120) has also pointed out the potential misuse in the literature of the designation “Huron” to describe sites in Bruce County. As Koenig (2005:61-61) indicates, there are some who argue that the ancestors of those Algonkian speaking First Nations now occupying the Bruce Peninsula only arrived in the mid-1800s, relating to known relocations from the U.S. and the establishment of reserves (Surtees 1971:48). In southwestern Ontario, however, members of the Three Fires Confederacy (Chippewa, Ottawa and Potawatomi) were immigrating from Ohio and Michigan in the late 1700s (Feest and Feest 1978:772-773). Still, archaeological sites in Bruce County point to much earlier settlement, probably by at least some of their ancestors. To Koenig, “it seems likely … that many of the Saugeen Indians the newcomers joined had ties to the peninsula going back at least several generations” (2005:61). So, during the Late Woodland period, there is evidence that the study area could have been inhabited by Algonkian- or Iroquoian-speaking groups, or a combination of groups.

While, it is difficult to trace ethnic affiliation during the period of initial contact between Aboriginal and European groups, Koenig states that “there is no doubt that some native groups regularly occupied sites on the [Bruce] peninsula at the end of [the early historic] period” (2005:62). Feest and Feest (1978:772-773) imply that the Bruce Peninsula was Odawa territory from 1616 and early 17th century French glass trade beads at the Glen and Cripps sites on the northern tip of the Bruce Peninsula appear to attest to this (Fox 1990:465-466). Fox not only points to Odawa (or Ottawa) settlement on the Bruce Peninsula during the mid-1600s at Hunter’s Point, but also to sites in the southern Bruce County littoral such as the Hunter site on the Saugeen Reserve, dating about 1600 (1990:462, 472), as well as the Inverhuron-Lucas site (1990:463). Abandonment of this area by the Odawa seems to have occurred, at least briefly, in the mid-1600s due to the Iroquois Wars (Fox 1990:472).

By 1690, Algonkian speakers from the north appear to have begun to repopulate Bruce County (Rogers 1978:761). This is the period in which the Mississaugas are known to have moved into southern Ontario and the Lower Great Lakes watersheds (Konrad 1981). Although noted as “MIS” (i.e. Mississauga), Tanner (1987: Plate 13) shows First Nation occupation at the mouth of the Saugeen River in the late 1700s. Villages, sometimes temporary, fishing camps and portage trails were documented by surveyors and other Euro-Canadian visitors and settlers (Koenig 2005:62). In 1818, First Nations people were living at the mouth of the Saugeen when the area was visited by a fur trader from Lower Canada, Pierre Piche (Koenig 2005:57). The Fishing Islands, just off the Huron shore, were charted in 1822 by Captain Bayfield as ‘Ghegheto’ (Koenig 2005:57). Fox (1990:462) notes the presence of earlier, possibly Odawa, ‘Puckasaw pits’, thought to represent storm shelters (Fox 1990:470), on these islands, similar to those found in on the Bruce Peninsula. A human burial was also discovered on the islands in the 1830s, reflecting earlier Aboriginal occupation (Koenig 2005:62). Missionaries arrived in the area in 1828 (Koenig 2005:64). In the 1830s, the village at Saugeen was inhabited by more than 300 people, but large-scale commercial fishing by Euro-Canadians was already underway in the area (Koenig 2005). The Chippewas of “Saginge” River along with Lieutenant-Governor Sir John Colborne, are reported to have granted fishing rights to the Huron Fishing Company, based in Goderich (Anonymous 1839; Fitzgerald 2004:3).
The study area also enters the historic record when the Saugeen and Manitoulin are recorded as having entered into Treaty No. 45½:

Sir Francis Bond Head, Lieut.-Governor of Upper Canada, met on August 9, 1836, at Manitowaning… the Saukings residents south of Owen Sound. <To the Saugeen> I now propose that you should surrender to your Great Father, the Sauking territory that you presently occupy, and that you shall repair either to this island <Manitoulin> or to that part of your territory which lies on the north of Owen Sound upon which proper houses shall be built for you, and proper assistance given to enable you to become civilized and to cultivate land which your Great Father engages for ever to protect for you from the encroachment of the whites.

(Morris 1943:27-29)

While it is difficult to exactly delineate treaty boundaries today, Figure 3 provides an approximate outline of the limits of Treaty Number 45½. A further surrender of territory occurred with the Oliphant Treaty (Treaty No. 72) in 1854 when most of the peninsula was ceded to the Crown except reserves at Chief’s Point, Nawash (at Owen Sound), Colpoys Bay and Cape Croker, as well as lands to the southwest at Saugeen (Koenig 2005:64; Morris 1943:34-36; Surtees 1971:48-49). In this period, the village of Saugeen is known to have hosted periodic “Grand Council” meetings for many Algonquian communities of the Lake Huron and Georgian Bay area (Rogers 1978:766).

3.4 Historic Euro-Canadian Archaeological Resources and Surveys

3.4.1 Bruce Township

Bruce Township was originally surveyed by Allan Park Brough in 1851 and completed by Chisholm Miller in 1852 using the 1000 acre section system (Bruce Township Historical Society 1984:4-5). One and a quarter mile square blocks were created from the survey, each containing ten 100 acre farms, with the lots fronting onto the concession road allowances (Bruce Township Historical Society 1984:5). Concession road allowances therefore occurred on every second concession line and side road allowances were accounted for after every fifth lot. Figure 4 shows the plan of Bruce Township as laid out by Brough and Miller. This early survey map does not reveal any evidence of squatters living on lands located within the study area or any notable First Nations activity in the general vicinity.

The first major influx of settlers into Bruce Township occurred in 1854 with the “Big Land Sale” (Bruce Township Historical Society 1984:5). At this time thousands of people fied to the land agent’s office in Southampton in the hopes of obtaining land. Many disputes followed this race for property due to the fact that land was being officially given to people where others had already been living. This led to several years of lawsuits and many families were forced to restart on new properties (Bruce Township Historical Society 1984:5-6).
FIGURE 3

TREATY BOUNDARIES BASED ON MORRIS 1943

**NOTES**

1. This drawing is schematic only and is to be read in conjunction with accompanying text. All locations are approximate.
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Produced by Golder Associates Ltd under licence from Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, © Queen Printer 2008.
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The southwest corner of Bruce Township was the earliest area to be settled, especially in the vicinity of Inverhuron (Bruce Township Historical Society 1984:7). The first settlers into the township were primarily Scottish immigrants or of Scottish descent (Robertson 1906:327).

A good resource for identifying potential historic Euro-Canadian archaeological sites is the 1880 *Bruce County Supplement to the Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada* (Belden and Company 1880). Due to the fact that this atlas was subscriber based, only families who agreed to purchase an atlas had their names and homestead locations appear on the map (Figure 5). This map illustrates the overall growth in the study area in comparison to the earlier 1852 and 1853 maps of Bruce Township (Figure 4). In addition to the houses of atlas subscribers, other historic structures noted in the study area include cemeteries, churches, mills, shops and schools. Table 3 lists those lots that hold a structure other than a house, along with the current status of these structures. Even though locations are only approximate on historic maps, they do give an idea of potential for significant archaeological historic remains that could be impacted within the study area. Typically these locations no longer exhibit any visible evidence of their former structure, but if they are to be impacted by a wind turbine placement the location would need to be archaeologically assessed to see if there are any archaeological remains. Organized communities and historic structures, or features that were once located in the study area and are no longer standing, are of potential archaeological concern and are therefore discussed in greater detail below. Figure 6 illustrates where each photograph was taken within the study area.

Table 3: Bruce Township Historic Properties with Potentially Significant Structures According to the 1880 *Bruce County Supplement to the Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structures</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steam Sawmill</td>
<td>Lot 16, Concession 1</td>
<td>No longer standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School House</td>
<td>Lot 31, Concession 1</td>
<td>No longer standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Hall</td>
<td>Lot 6, Concession 2</td>
<td>Could possibly be the house standing there today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School House</td>
<td>Lot 16, Concession 3</td>
<td>Incorrect on map; actually located on Lot 15, Concession 3 and now empty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.1.1 Eskdale

Eskdale was a post office first opened in 1875. It was originally located on Lot 17, Concession 1, Bruce Township in the home of H.P. Chapman and in 1876 was moved to the home of Donald Cameron located on Lot 20, Concession 12, Kincardine Township (Bruce Township Historical Society 1984:123), where it is noted on the 1880 map. Since Eskdale was located between the communities of Tiverton and Glammis, Eskdale residents would travel to those other communities for necessities, education and to attend church, meaning that the community never substantially developed (Bruce Township Historical Society 1984:123).

Although not many buildings were associated with this community, further archaeological investigation would be necessary if turbines and associated infrastructure were to be placed in the vicinity.
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3.4.1.2 Additional Structures in Bruce Township

A school house is indicated on the 1880 map of Bruce Township as standing on Lot 16, Concession 3 (Figure 5). During the property inspection it was noted that there was no structure at this location but there was a school house on Lot 15. The historical atlas map was in error since there is never any record of the school being located on Lot 16, only Lot 15. This schoolhouse, S.S. # 5, is now abandoned and was a brick replacement built in 1906. The original wood frame school had been built in 1874 and when the brick school opened it was moved to a nearby lot where it burnt down in 1959 (Bruce Township Historical Society 1984:70). An Orange Hall is indicated on Lot 6, Concession 2 on the 1880 map. There was never a separate Orange Hall built on the plot; the members merely used either the existing barn or house on the property until a purpose built structure was built outside the study area (Bruce Township Historical Society 1984:197). The existing structures present on the lot today could be the same buildings but further archival investigation would be necessary to confirm this. There is no evidence of the current landscape of the mill indicated on Lot 16, Concession 1 of the 1880 map. Also indicated on the 1880 map is a school house on Lot 31, Concession 1 which is no longer standing. This school, S.S. No. 4, had originally been a log school house built on the southwest corner of Lot 21, Concession 1, then a wood frame school house as shown on the historic atlas map that burnt down at the turn of the century. It was replaced by a school house on Lot 30, Concession 1 which was removed from the property in 1963 (Bruce Township Historical Society 1984:68). Given that all of these mentioned historic structures are no longer standing the general areas where they are indicated to have been located could be archaeologically significant if they are to be impacted by a wind turbine or turbine infrastructure.

In addition to the structures noted on the 1880 map of the township, two additional features that no longer exist are known within the study area. A log school house, S.S. No. 3, was originally built on the southeast corner of Lot 11, Concession 1 in 1854 but it was replaced by a wood frame school house in 1873 on Lot 15, Concession 1 where the (now bricked over) building still stands today (Bruce Township Historical Society 1984:66-67). Finally, the MacLean family plot existed on Lot 31, Concession 2 but little visible evidence of the cemetery remains (Bruce Township Historical Society 1984:121).

3.4.2 Kincardine Township

The survey of Kincardine Township was conducted in three phases. In 1847 Alexander Wilkinson surveyed the Lake Range Lots; in 1848 Allan Park Brough surveyed the Durham Road and three concessions on either side; and in 1850 the remaining portion of the township was surveyed by James W. Bridgland (Robertson 1906:429). The lake range lots were surveyed as three concessions – A, B and C – with long narrow lots of differing size due to variation along the Huron shore. The survey of the three concessions north and south of the Durham road created long and narrow 50 acre lots with side road allowances accounted for after every tenth lot. In the final portion of the township that was surveyed, the northeast portion, blocks consisting of ten 100 acre farms were created. In this portion concession road allowances occurred on every second concession line and side road allowances were accounted for after every fifth lot. Concessions 3 and 4, north of Durham road, are quite different as they are the concessions that bridge the gap between two separate surveys. Concession 4 is laid out north of Concession 3 with no concession road dividing them. Due to the fact that Concession 3 was surveyed with long and narrow 50 acre lots, Concession 4 was surveyed with square 50 acre lots so that the frontage of the farms would correspond with those on Concession 5.
Figure 7 shows the plan of Kincardine Township as laid out by Wilkinson, Brough and Bridgland, illustrating very well the fact that this township was surveyed in three phases. This early survey map does not reveal any evidence of squatters living on lands located within the study area or any notable First Nations activity in the general vicinity. James W. Bridgland’s 1851 report of the survey of Kincardine Township does however mention a First Nations camp existing in the area. When describing the conditions of Lots 15 and 16, Concession 9, he states that there was an “Indian Camp” located between two creeks that cut through the lots (Bridgland 1851b:113). The general area where Bridgland made note of the Aboriginal campsite is outlined in black on Figure 7.

The first Euro-Canadian settlers of the township, similar to that of Bruce Township, were primarily Scottish immigrants and people of Scottish descent. The first areas to be settled were along the lakefront lots, especially in the area of the future community of Kincardine and along the Durham Road.

A good resource for identifying potential historic Euro-Canadian archaeological sites is the 1880 Bruce County Supplement to the Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada (Belden and Company 1880). Due to the fact that this atlas was subscriber based, only families who agreed to purchase an atlas had their names and the locations of their homesteads appear on the map (Figure 8). This map illustrates the overall growth in the study area in comparison to the earlier 1851 map of Kincardine Township (Figure 7). In addition to the houses of atlas subscribers, other historic structures noted in the study area include cemeteries, churches, mills, shops and schools. Table 4 lists those lots that hold a structure other than a house, along with the current status of these structures. Even though locations are only approximate on historic maps, they do give an idea of potential for significant archaeological historic remains that could be impacted within the study area. Typically these locations no longer exhibit any visible evidence of their former structure, but if they are to be impacted by a wind turbine placement the location would need to be archaeologically assessed to see if there are any archaeological remains. Organized communities and historic structures, or features that were once located in the study area and are no longer standing, are of potential archaeological concern and are therefore discussed in greater detail below. Figure 6 illustrates where each photograph was taken within the study area.
Approximate location of an “Indian Camp” according to Bridgland (1851b).
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Table 4: Kincardine Township Historic Properties with Potentially Significant Structures According to the 1880 Bruce County Supplement to the Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structures</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School House (S.S. # 14)</td>
<td>Lot 27, Concession 3</td>
<td>No longer standing, there is a plaque indicating its location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith Shop</td>
<td>Lot 1, Concession 5</td>
<td>No longer standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School House</td>
<td>Lot 26, Concession 5</td>
<td>No longer standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam Saw and Grist Mill</td>
<td>Lot 16, Concession 6</td>
<td>No longer standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zion Church</td>
<td>Lot 26, Concession 6</td>
<td>No longer standing, there is a plaque indicating its location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School House</td>
<td>Lot 31, Concession 6</td>
<td>No longer standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School House</td>
<td>Lot 6, Concession 7</td>
<td>No longer standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam Sawmill</td>
<td>Lot 12, Concession 7</td>
<td>No longer standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School House</td>
<td>Lot 17, Concession 7</td>
<td>No longer standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith Shop</td>
<td>Lot 3, Concession 9</td>
<td>No longer standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawmill</td>
<td>Lot 16, Concession 9</td>
<td>No longer standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School House</td>
<td>Lot 18, Concession 9</td>
<td>No longer standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School House (S.S. # 10)</td>
<td>Lot 10, Concession 10</td>
<td>Still standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational Church</td>
<td>Lot 15, Concession 11</td>
<td>No longer standing, there is a plaque indicating its location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School House</td>
<td>Lot 27, Concession 11</td>
<td>No longer standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glammis Presbyterian Church 1886</td>
<td>Lot 34, Concession 12</td>
<td>Still standing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.2.1 Armow

The village of Armow is located in the centre of Kincardine Township (Figure 7). The village was founded in 1854 by William Reekie who built both a grist and a saw mill at the location of the future community (Robertson 1906:437). At its height, in addition to the two mills Armow had a church, a school house and a store (Robertson 1906:437). Even though Armow was a small community it was often referred to as “the hub of the township” due to the fact that the Township hall was located there (Robertson 1906:437).

In the 1880 historic atlas a church and school house are both indicated in Armow. The church that is indicated is no longer standing, however there is a cemetery at this location, the “Armow Methodist Cemetery”. A newer church, the Armow Methodist Church stands closer to the intersection of Armow on the north side of the street and was built in 1880. This church is now being used by the local Woman’s Institute. The school house that is indicated in the atlas is also no longer standing. A newer school house, S.S. # 6, is located beside the Methodist church.
3.4.2.2 Glammis

The community of Glammis is partially located within the study area on Lot 39, Concession 1, Bruce Township and on Lots 34 and 35, Concession 12, Kincardine Township (Figure 7). Glammis was initially settled in 1852 by two families, those of Allan Ross and Duncan Campbell (Bruce Township Historical Society 1984:124). Glammis opened its first post office in 1860 and by the late 1800’s it had become a centre of industry with several stores, a saw mill, a cheese box factory, a planing mill and a newspaper (Bruce Township Historical Society 1984:125-126). Around the turn of the century families started to move away from Glammis to other areas and stores had to evolve in order to survive (Bruce Township Historical Society 1984:126). A few businesses and also St. Paul's Presbyterian Church, which was built in 1896, remain in the hamlet today (Bruce Township Historical Society 1984:109).

Given the abandonment and destruction of former buildings in the area of Glammis over time, further archaeological investigation would be necessary if turbines and associated infrastructure were to be placed in the vicinity of the former outskirts of the community.

3.4.2.3 Kingarf

The community of Kingarf straddles both Bruce Township and Greenock Township. Kingarf is partially located within the study area along its eastern boundary in Lot 35, Concessions 5, Bruce Township; the remainder lies on Lot 35, Concessions 8 and 9, Greenock Township. The community was first established as a post office in 1866 which was in operation until December 1st, 1914. At its height in 1892, Kingarf had a population of 50 people which had decreased to 30 by 1926 (Carter 1984:614). The community was small enough that it was not even noted in the 19th century historical atlas supplement concerning Bruce County (H. Belden and Company 1880), although a store is noted on Lot 35, Concession 9, Greenock Township, just outside of the study area but where Kingarf is located today.

Although very few buildings were associated with this community, further archaeological investigation would be necessary if turbines and associated infrastructure were to be placed in the vicinity.

3.4.2.4 Tiverton

The village of Tiverton is located partially in the study area on Lots 1, 2 and 3 of Concession 12 in Kincardine Township and straddles the township line between Bruce and Kincardine townships (Figure 7). Tiverton was first called St. Andrews but was later changed so as not to be confused with St. Andrews, New Brunswick (Bruce Township Historical Society 1984:139). Tiverton started to be settled and take shape as a town in the mid-1850s with the establishment of three churches, a school, a tannery, several stores and trades shops (Bruce Township Historical Society 1984:139). In 1897 a fire spread through the town, which destroyed or caused extensive damage to several of the buildings in the central business section (Robertson 1906: 331). The damaged buildings were rebuilt and an attractive turn of the century streetscape still exists at Tiverton today (Plate 1).

Given the abandonment and destruction of former village buildings over time, further archaeological investigation in the area of Tiverton would be necessary if turbines and associated infrastructure were to be placed in the vicinity.
3.4.2.5 Additional Structures in Kincardine Township

A school house, indicated on Lot 27, Concession 3, is no longer standing today; it does however have a marker at its location (Plate 2). A blacksmith shop is indicated on Lot 1, Concession 5 on the 1880 map, which is no longer standing today. The school house indicated on Lot 26, Concession 5 of the 1880 map has also now disappeared (Plate 3). A steam saw and grist mill was located on Lot 6, Concession 6 but it too is no longer standing. Zion Church is indicated as being on Lot 26 Concession 6 on the 1880 map but is no longer standing; there is however a plaque indicating its location. A school house is indicated on Lot 31, Concession 6 of the 1880 map; Plate 4 shows the location of the former school house. The 1880 map illustrates on Concession 7 both a steam sawmill (Lot 12) and a school but neither are standing today. A blacksmith shop (Lot 3), a sawmill (Lot 16) and a school house (Lot 18) are no longer standing on Concession 9 today. Still standing on Lot 10 Concession 10 is S.S. # 10; the structure is now being used as a residence and has since been re-bricked, with a section on the back showing the original structure. A school house on Lot 27, Concession 11 is indicated on the 1880 map but it no longer standing. The Congregational Church on Lot 15, Concession 11 is no longer standing but there is a plaque erected in its former location and lastly the schoolhouse on Lot 27, Concession 11 is no longer standing. Given that all of these mentioned historic structures are no longer standing the general areas where they are indicated to have been located could be archaeologically significant if they are to be impacted by a wind turbine or turbine infrastructure.
Plate 2: Plaque indicating the former Location of S.S. No. 14, on Lot 27, Concession 3

Plate 3: Probable Location of Former School House on Lot 26, Concession 5
### 3.4.3 Summary

Given the evidence for Euro-Canadian settlement in both Bruce Township and Kincardine Township since the mid 19th century, as well as several villages, plus indications of abandoned village sites, the study area exhibits definite archaeological potential for historic Euro-Canadian occupation. Evidence for post-contact presence of Aboriginal peoples also exists in the general vicinity of the study area and therefore there is archaeological potential for post-contact Aboriginal occupation as well. Accordingly, the study area needs to be thoroughly examined for such evidence in areas that are to be impacted by turbine related activities.
4.0 PROPERTY INSPECTION

The study area was visually evaluated on May 13, 2010. Figure 6 illustrates where each photo was taken within the study area. Visibility was excellent and the weather was clear and bright when the photographs were taken. The photographs illustrate the relatively flat topography of the area (Plate 5) with the occasional slope (Plate 6) and the woodlots that stand in some of the fields (Plate 7). Plates 8 and 9 show the typical areas within the study area that have been previously disturbed due to aggregate extraction and landfill use, respectively, and have low archaeological potential.

Plate 5: Flat Topography of the Study Area; Facing Northwest from Sideroad 15 North, Between County Road 15 and County Road 2
Plate 6: A Portion of the Study Area Exhibiting Some Moderate Topography; Facing Southeast, East of Armow

Plate 7: Example of Woodlot; Looking Southeast on Sideroad 30, between County Road 7 and County Road 9
Plate 8: Gravel Pit Located Southeast of Sideroad 30 between County Road 2 and County Road 15

Plate 9: Kincardine Landfill Located Northwest of Sideroad 15 between County Road 7 and Concession Road 5
5.0 RESULTS

5.1 Potential for Pre-contact Aboriginal Archaeological Sites

Archaeological potential is established by determining the likelihood that archaeological resources may be present on a subject property. Archaeological potential criteria commonly used by the Ministry of Tourism and Culture (Government of Ontario 1997) were applied to determine areas of archaeological potential within the study area. These variables include: distance to various types of water sources, soil texture and drainage, glacial geomorphology, the general topographic variability of the area, and the existence of previously known archaeological sites.

Distance to modern or ancient water sources is generally accepted as the most important determinant of past human settlement patterns and, considered alone, may result in a determination of archaeological potential. However, any combination of two or more other criteria, such as well-drained soils, or topographic variability, may also indicate archaeological potential. Finally, extensive land disturbance can eradicate archaeological potential (Wilson and Horne 1995).

In archaeological potential modeling, a distance to water criterion of 300 metres is generally employed for primary water courses, including lakeshores, rivers and large creeks, while a criterion of 200 metres is applied to secondary water sources, including swamps and small creeks. For the present project, there are numerous small creeks within the study area and Lake Huron is located just greater than three kilometres to the west of the study area (Figure 1).

Soil texture can be an important determinant of past settlement, usually in combination with other factors such as topography. The study area is fairly level with no areas of steep slope that would not be suitable for settlement. With respect to soil texture, Aboriginal groups preferred well drained lighter (sandy) soils to heavier soils. The soils of the study area are imperfectly to poorly drained soils that are primarily clay. So, some portions of the study area would have been suitable for pre-contact Aboriginal agriculture, although not ideal. Therefore, these soils provide further archaeological potential for aboriginal sites within the study area.

Finally, five previously recorded pre-contact Aboriginal archaeological sites have been registered within the study area. This demonstrates that First Nations peoples have been within the study area for a considerable length of time.

When the above noted archaeological potential criteria are applied to the study area, the archaeological potential for pre-contact Aboriginal sites is deemed to be moderate to high (Figure 9). This assessment is due to the presence of water sources, the level land without areas of steep slope, the agriculturally suitable soils, and previously known archaeological sites.
5.2 Potential for Historic Archaeological Sites

The criteria used by the Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture to determine potential for historic archaeological sites include the presence of: 1) particular, resource-specific features that would have attracted past subsistence or extractive uses; 2) areas of initial, non-Aboriginal settlement; 3) early historic transportation routes; and 4) properties designated under the Ontario Heritage Act (Government of Ontario 1997:14).

The area has been the location of generalized agricultural practices in the past and is still used in that fashion today. There is evidence of historic Euro-Canadian settlement extending back to the mid 19th century, during the initial settlement of Bruce and Kincardine Townships. Five small communities located within the study area have decreased in size since the 19th century and may have left behind significant archaeological remains. Three historic Euro-Canadian archaeological sites have also been registered within the study area. Finally, James Bridgland’s surveyor notes mention a probable historic Aboriginal campsite. On account of these factors the post-contact Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian historic archaeological potential for the study area is judged to be moderate to high.
6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS AND ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION

Golder applied archaeological potential criteria commonly used by the Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture to determine areas of archaeological potential within the study area. The archaeological potential for Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian sites was deemed to be moderate to high on these properties. For pre-contact Aboriginal sites this assessment is based on the presence of nearby potable water sources, level topography, agriculturally suitable soils and known archaeological sites. For post-contact Aboriginal sites this assessment is based on the presence of nearby potable water sources, level topography and historic documentation. The determination of historic Euro-Canadian archaeological potential is based on the documentation indicating occupation from the middle of the 19th century onwards as well as the presence of historic transportation routes. As a result, Stage 2 archaeological assessment is recommended for potential wind turbine sites and their associated infrastructure.

Further Stage 2 archaeological assessment is recommended for any areas to be impacted by turbine construction, access road construction, or other infrastructure construction related activities. The Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture is asked to review the results presented and to accept this report into the Provincial Register of archaeological reports. Additional archaeological assessment is still required; hence the archaeological sites recommended for further archaeological fieldwork remain subject to Section 48(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act and may not be altered, or have artifacts removed, except by a person holding an archaeological licence.

This report is submitted to the Minister of Tourism and Culture as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c 0.18. The report is reviewed to ensure that the licensed consultant archaeologist has met the terms and conditions of their archaeological licence, and that the archaeological fieldwork and report recommendations ensure the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario.

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 sec. 48(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act.

The Cemeteries Act requires that any person discovering human remains must notify the police or coroner and the Registrar of Cemeteries, Ministry of Consumer Services.
7.0 IMPORTANT INFORMATION AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS REPORT

Golder Associates Ltd. (Golder) has prepared this report in a manner consistent with that level of care and skill ordinarily exercised by members of the archaeological profession currently practicing under similar conditions in the jurisdiction in which the services are provided, subject to the time limits and physical constraints applicable to this report. No other warranty, expressed or implied is made.

This report has been prepared for the specific site, design objective, developments and purpose described to Golder, by SP Ontario Wind Development LP Inc. The factual data, interpretations and recommendations pertain to a specific project as described in this report and are not applicable to any other project or site location.

The information, recommendations and opinions expressed in this report are for the sole benefit of the Client. No other party may use or rely on this report or any portion thereof without Golder’s express written consent. If the report was prepared to be included for a specific permit application process, then upon the reasonable request of the Client, Golder may authorize in writing the use of this report by the regulatory agency as an Approved User for the specific and identified purpose of the applicable permit review process. Any other use of this report by others is prohibited and is without responsibility to Golder. The report, all plans, data, drawings and other documents as well as electronic media prepared by Golder are considered its professional work product and shall remain the copyright property of Golder, who authorizes only the Client and Approved Users to make copies of the report, but only in such quantities as are reasonably necessary for the use of the report by those parties. The Client and Approved Users may not give, lend, sell or otherwise make available the report or any portion thereof to any other party without the express written permission of Golder. The Client acknowledges that electronic media is susceptible to unauthorized modification, deterioration and incompatibility and therefore the Client cannot rely upon the electronic media versions of Golder’s report or other work products.

Unless otherwise stated, the suggestions, recommendations and opinions given in this report are intended only for the guidance of the Client in the design of the specific project.

Special risks occur whenever archaeological investigations are applied to identify subsurface conditions and even a comprehensive investigation, sampling and testing program may fail to detect all or certain archaeological resources. The sampling strategies incorporated in this study comply with those identified in the Ministry of Tourism and Culture’s 1993 Archaeological Assessment Technical Guidelines (Stages 1-3 & Reporting Format).
8.0 REFERENCES CITED

Anonymous


Belden, H. and Company


Bridgland, James W.

1851a Kincardine; Bruce District. Number B41. Map on file with the Ministry of Natural Resources Crown Land Survey Records Office, Peterborough.


Bruce Township Historical Society


Carter, Floreen Ellen


Chapman, Lyman John and Donald F. Putnam


Devine, Thomas

1852 Plan of Part of Bruce, compiled from late D. P. Surveyor A.P. Brough’s field notes. Number B60. Map on file with the Ministry of Natural Resources Crown Land Survey Records Office, Peterborough.

Ellis, Chris J. and Neal Ferris (editors)


Feest, Johanna and Christian Feest


Ferris, Neal


Fiedel, Stuart


Fitzgerald, William

2004  *Ministry of Culture Stages 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment, Al Pfluegl Subdivision Development, Part of Lot 5, Concession 6 WBR, Town of South Bruce Peninsula (former Albemarle Township), Bruce County.*  Report on file, Ministry of Tourism and Culture, Toronto.

Fox, William


Government of Ontario

1983  *Soils of Bruce County, South Sheet.*  Land Resource Research Institute, Research Branch, Agriculture Canada, Ottawa.

1993  *Archaeological Assessment Technical Guidelines (Stages 1-3 & Reporting Format).*  Ministry of Culture, Tourism & Recreation, Cultural Programs Branch, Archaeology & Heritage Planning, Toronto

1997  *Conserving a Future for Our Past: Archaeology, Land Use Planning & Development in Ontario.*  Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation, Archaeology and Heritage Planning Unit, Toronto.

n.d.  Archaeological Data Base Files.  Culture Services Unit, Ministry of Tourism and Culture, Toronto.

Hoffman, D.W. and N.R. Richards


Koenig, Edwin

2005  *Cultures and Ecologies: A Native Fishing Conflict on the Saugeen-Bruce Peninsula.*  University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Konrad, Victor

1981  “An Iroquois Frontier: The North Shore of Lake Ontario during the Late Seventeenth Century."  *Journal of Historical Geography* 7(2):129-144.

Miller, Chisholm

1853  *Plan of that Part of the Township of Bruce.*  Number B59.  Map on file with the Ministry of Natural Resources Crown Land Survey Records Office, Peterborough.
Morris, J.L.

Robertson, Norman
1906 *The History of the County of Bruce*. William Briggs, Toronto.

Rankin, Lisa

Rogers, E.S.

Saugeen Conservation

Schmalz, Peter S.

Surtees, Robert

Tanner, Helen (editor)

Warrick, Gary

Wilson, J.A. and M. Horne

Wright, J.V.
STAGE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT
SP ONTARIO ARMOW WIND ENERGY PROJECT,
BRUCE COUNTY, ON

Report Signature Page

GOLDER ASSOCIATES LTD.

Tracie L. Carmichael, B.A., B.Ed.
Project Archaeologist

James A. Wilson, M.A.
Principal, Senior Archaeologist

AL/TLC/JAW/am/gf

January 23, 2012
Report No. 11-1151-0247-3000-R01

Golder Associates
At Golder Associates we strive to be the most respected global group of companies specializing in ground engineering and environmental services. Employee owned since our formation in 1960, we have created a unique culture with pride in ownership, resulting in long-term organizational stability. Golder professionals take the time to build an understanding of client needs and of the specific environments in which they operate. We continue to expand our technical capabilities and have experienced steady growth with employees now operating from offices located throughout Africa, Asia, Australasia, Europe, North America and South America.