



ACC

ARCHAEOLOGICAL
CONSULTANTS CANADA

Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment

Lisgar Fields, in Part of Lot 9, Concession 10, Geographic Township of Trafalgar,
City of Mississauga, Regional Municipality of Peel, 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

PIF# P1208-0358-2023

Project No. 227-12-23

22 November 2023

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Archaeological Consultants Canada (“ACC”) was contracted by the Proponent to conduct a Stage 1 & 2 archaeological resource assessment, including background research and property survey, for a proposed development. An archaeological assessment was required as part of the pre-approval process for future development under the *Planning Act, R.S.O 1990*. The subject property is located in part of Lot 9, Concession 10, Geographic Township of Trafalgar, in the City of Mississauga, Regional Municipality of Peel, Ontario. The subject property totals approximately 6.55 hectares (“ha”). The Proponent provided the subject property limits as defined within this report (Figure 6).

The Stage 1 & 2 assessment was conducted under Professional Archaeological License P1208, held by Matthew Muttart. Fieldwork was conducted under the direction of Leah Peacock (R1273). The Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (“MCM”) assigned Project Information Form (“PIF”) number P1208-0358-2023 (Stage 1 & 2) to this project. The licensee of ACC received permission from the Proponent to access the property and to conduct all required archaeological fieldwork activities including the removal of artifacts, as necessary. The property was accessed on November 22, 2023.

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

- Proximity of an unnamed creek
- Proximity of a historical homestead

A visual property inspection did not identify areas of previous disturbance, steep slope, or low lying and permanently wet conditions, but recent geotechnical reporting indicates that the entire subject property has been previously graded and covered in fill (Soil Engineers Ltd., 2023).

The entire subject property was subject to Stage 2 assessment by test pit survey in judgementally placed intervals to confirm the extent of disturbance. No artifacts or other archaeological resources were identified during the Stage 1 & 2 archaeological assessment.

The following recommendations are provided for consideration by the Proponent and by the MCM:

1. No artifacts or other archaeological resources were identified during the Stage 1 & 2 archaeological assessment. The subject property has now been fully assessed according to the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism’s 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. No further archaeological assessment of the subject property is required.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	2
Project Personnel	5
1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT	6
1.1 Development Context	6
1.2 Historical Context	7
1.2.1 Background Research	7
1.2.2 A Cultural Chronology for Southern Ontario	7
1.3 Archaeological Context	10
1.3.1 Natural Environment	10
1.3.2 Current Land Use	10
1.3.3 Previous Archaeological Investigations	10
1.3.3.1 Registered Archaeological Sites	10
1.3.3.2 Previous Archaeological Reports	12
1.3.3.3 Other Relevant Reports	12
1.3.4 Potential for Archaeological Resources	13
2.0 FIELD METHODS	15
3.0 RECORD OF FINDS	16
3.1 Soils	16
3.2 Archaeological Resources	16
3.3 Documentary Record	16
4.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS	17
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS	18
6.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION	19
7.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES	20
8.0 IMAGES	22
9.0 FIGURES	24

LIST OF TABLES

1. General Cultural Chronology for Southern Ontario	8
2. Registered Archaeological Sites within 1 km of the Subject Property	11
3. Inventory of Documentary and Material Record	16

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Location of the Subject Property on a 1:50,000 Scale Topographic Map
2. Location of the Subject Property on Tremaine's 1858 Historical Map of Halton County
3. Location of the Subject Property on Walker & Miles' 1877 Historical Atlas Map of Trafalgar Township, Halton County
4. Location of the Subject Property on a Map of the Soils of Halton County
5. Aerial Photograph of the Subject Property and Surrounding Area, Showing Previous Archaeological Assessments within 50 m
6. Aerial Photograph Showing the Results of the Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment of the Subject Property with Image Locations



PROJECT PERSONNEL

Project Manager:	Matthew Muttart, M.A., P1208
Professional Licence:	Matthew Muttart, M.A., P1208
Field Director:	Leah Peacock, B.A., R1273
Field Crew:	Michelle Volpe, M.L.I.S., R1241
Report Preparation:	Michelle Volpe, M.L.I.S., R1241
Graphics:	Michelle Volpe, M.L.I.S., R1241



Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment

Lisgar Fields, in Part of Lot 9, Concession 10, Geographic Township of Trafalgar, City of Mississauga, Regional Municipality of Peel, Ontario

1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT

1.1 Development Context

Archaeological Consultants Canada (“ACC”) was contracted by the Proponent to conduct a Stage 1 & 2 archaeological resource assessment, including background research and property survey, for a proposed development. An archaeological assessment was required as part of the pre-approval process for future development under the *Planning Act, R.S.O 1990*. The subject property is located in part of Lot 9, Concession 10, Geographic Township of Trafalgar, in the City of Mississauga, Regional Municipality of Peel, Ontario. The subject property totals approximately 6.55 hectares (“ha”). The Proponent provided the subject property limits as defined within this report (Figure 6).

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 objective of a Stage 2 property assessment is to document all archaeological resources present on the property and to make a determination about whether these resources, if present, have cultural heritage value or interest. Archaeological resources consist of artifacts (Indigenous stone tools, pottery and subsistence remains as well as Euro-Canadian objects), subsurface settlement patterns and cultural features (post moulds, trash pits, privies, and wells), and sites (temporary camps and special purpose activity areas, plus more permanent settlements such as villages, homesteads, grist mills and industrial structures). If any archaeological resources are present that exhibit cultural heritage value or interest, a Stage 2 survey will determine whether these resources require further assessment and, if necessary, recommend appropriate Stage 3 strategies for identified archaeological sites.

The Stage 1 & 2 assessment was conducted under Professional Archaeological License P1208, held by Matthew Muttart. Fieldwork was conducted under the direction of Leah Peacock (R1273). The Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (“MCM”) assigned Project Information Form (“PIF”) number P1208-0358-2023 (Stage 1 & 2) to this project. The licensee of ACC received permission from the Proponent to access the property and to conduct all required archaeological fieldwork activities including the removal of artifacts, as necessary. The property was accessed on November 22, 2023.

All fieldwork and reporting were completed using MCM’s 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. This report documents the research, the field methods and results, and the conclusions and recommendations based on the Stage 1 & 2 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*.

1.2 Historical Context

1.2.1 Background Research

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.

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 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 allowed access to the low-lying environments favoured by the 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 grave markers and by the preference for light colored cherts, such as Collingwood chert. The Paleoindian Period is divided into two sub-periods, Early Paleoindian, and Late Paleoindian.

Table 1: General Cultural Chronology for Southwestern 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
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		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: Neutral	600-450	
Late Woodland: Western Basin Tradition		Younge Phase	1200/1100-800	
		Springwells Phase	800-600	
	Wolf Phase	600-450		
HISTORIC	SW Ontario Iroquois	Historic Neutral	450-350	tribal warfare
	European Contact	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* 2,900 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. While North America had been visited by Europeans on an increasing scale since the end of the fifteenth century, it was not until the voyages of Jacques Cartier in the 1530s that Europeans visited Ontario Iroquoians in their home territories. 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.

The subject property is historically located in part of Lot 9, Concession 10, Township of Trafalgar, County of Halton. Formerly part of the Home District, Halton County was formed in 1816 when the Gore District was created from parts of the Niagara and Home Districts (Archives of Ontario). The newly formed county was named after Major William Mathew Halton, secretary to the Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada (Halton Region, n.d.). Halton County initially contained the Townships of Beverly, Dumfries, Esquesing, Flamboro West and East, Nassagaweya, Nelson, and Trafalgar (Walker and Miles, 1877).

Trafalgar Township was first settled in 1807 and named for Cape Trafalgar, Spain where England had claimed a complete naval victory over Spain and France just two years prior, in 1805 (Gardiner, 1899). Within ten years of its initial settlement, the township had grown to a population of 548, one grist mill, and four sawmills. By 1850 this population had grown to 4,513 people (Walker and Miles, 1877).

Historical records and mapping were examined for evidence of early Euro-Canadian occupation within and near the subject property. Figures 2 and 3 represent the Euro-Canadian settlement in and around the current subject property in the late nineteenth century. Tremaine's 1858 *Map of the County of Halton* shows that the subject property was lay across two parcels in Lot 9, Concession 10, owned by David Cordingly and Bartley Connor. Neither man appears in historical census records. An unnamed creek is depicted approximately 50 m east of the subject property (Figure 2). The nearest settlement at this time was Streetsville, approximately 4.5 km east of the subject property.

Walker and Miles' 1877 map of Trafalgar Township in the *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Halton* indicates that the subject property was now owned by John Cordingly and Charles O. Connor, presumably both heirs of the previously owners. Neither man appears in the historical census records. The unnamed creek is still depicted approximately 50 m east of the subject property. A homestead and orchard are now depicted approximately 100 m southwest of the subject property (Figure 3). The closest settlement at this time is still Streetsville.

There are no structures depicted within the subject property on any historical maps consulted. The absence of any structures on these maps, however, 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.

1.3 Archaeological Context

1.3.1 Natural Environment

The subject property is located within the Peel Plain physiographic region (Chapman and Putnam, 1984). This region consists of clay soils covering the central portion of the Regional Municipalities of York, Peel and Halton (Chapman and Putnam 1984:174). The area was once covered by hardwood forests and was settled during the early part of the nineteenth century due to its rich soil (Chapman and Putnam 1984:175-176). Until the 1940s, the land was used for agriculture, but since then been developed into urban areas.

The Soil Survey of Halton County (Gillespie et al., 1971) indicates that there is one dominant surface soil type within the subject property: Chinguacousy clay loam till (Figure 4). This soil is slightly stony and is characterized by imperfect drainage and gently rolling topography.

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 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. The nearest water source is an unnamed creek presently located approximately 120 m east of the subject property; this creek's historical path was approximately 50 m east of the subject property (Figures 1 to 3).

1.3.2 Current Land Use

The subject property is currently vacant infill land within a residential subdivision. It is surrounded by residences, soccer fields, parking lots, and a middle school.

Figure 1 provides the location of the subject property on a 1:50,000-scale topographic map. Fieldwork for the project was conducted on November 22, 2023.

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 kilometre (“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 *AjGw* Borden block.

No archaeological sites have been registered within the subject property. Twenty sites have been registered within one km of the subject property (MCM 2023a). Thirteen of these sites are Indigenous. Six of these sites are Euro-Canadian. Sites include homesteads, campsites, and findspots. There are two sites within 250 m of the subject property. Information in Table 2 is provided by MCM through the OASD.

Table 2: Registered Archaeological Sites within 1 km of the Subject Property

REG. #	NAME	TIME PERIOD	CULTURAL AFFILIATION	SITE TYPE	STATUS
AjGw-159	Thomas Robson	Post-Contact	-	Homestead	No further CHVI
AjGw-195	Venturon 1	Early Archaic, Late Archaic	Indigenous	Campsite	Unknown
AjGw-196	Venturon 2	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	Campsite	Unknown
AjGw-197	Venturon 3	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	Unknown	Unknown
AjGw-198	Venturon 4	Post-Contact	Euro-Canadian	Homestead	Unknown
AjGw-199	Venutron 5	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	Findspot	Unknown
AjGw-206	Venturon 6	Pre-Contact	Indigenous	Campsite	Unknown
AjGw-207	Venturon 7	Late Archaic	Indigenous	Findspot	Unknown
AjGw-233	Break	Late Archaic	Indigenous	Findspot	Unknown
AjGw-224	Wheel	Middle Woodland	Indigenous	Findspot	Unknown
AjGw-252	New Connection Methodist Church	Post-Contact	Euro-Canadian	Other, building	Unknown
AjGw-431	-	-	-	-	Unknown
AjGw-530	Parkway 6	Late Archaic	Indigenous	-	Unknown
AjGw-540	Parkway West Location 1	Pre-Contact	-	Camp/campsite	Further CHVI
AjGw-559	Douglas	Post-Contact	Euro-Canadian	Homestead	No further CHVI
AjGw-560	-	Late Archaic	Indigenous	Findspot	No further CHVI
AjGw-61	Ronald Plant	Middle Archaic	Indigenous	Campsite	Unknown
AjGw-624	McGregor Site	Post-Contact	-	Agricultural, homestead	No further CHVI
AjGw-625	-	Early Woodland	-	Findspot	No further CHVI
AjGw-665	-	Post-Contact	-	Unknown	No further CHVI

- Site AjGw-198, or the Venturon 4 Site, was first observed by Archaeological Services Inc. (“ASI”) in 1989. It is a Euro-Canadian homestead site that yielded 39 artifacts across a 20 m by 20 m area. No further work was recommended. Site AjGw-198 is located approximately 230 m west of the current subject property.
- Site AjGw-199, or the Venturon 5 Site, was first observed by ASI in 1989. It is a Indigenous findspot that yielded one lithic artifact. No further work was recommended. Site AjGw-199 is located approximately 240 m west of the current subject property.

1.3.3.2 Previous Archaeological Reports

A review of archaeological reports within the *Public Register of Archaeological Reports* indicated that one archaeological report detailing previous archaeological fieldwork within the subject property has been filed with MCM at the time this report was written (MCM, 2023b). Additionally, one report documenting fieldwork within 50 m of the subject property has been filed with the MCM (MCM, 2023b). Figure 5 shows the location of these assessments in relation to the current subject property.

An Archaeological Resource Assessment of Proposed Subdivision (21T-87053-M), Part of Lots 9 & 10, Concession 10 N.S., City of Mississauga. ASI, 1989. CIF 89-130B.

In 1989, ASI conducted an assessment of 60 ha of land on parts of Lots 9 and 10, Concession 10. This study area included approximately 0.80 ha of the current subject property (see Figure 5). Six loci yielded artifacts; five were bordanized: AjGw-195, AjGw-196, AjGw-197, AjGw-198, and AjGw-199. AjGw-195 and AjGw-196 were recommended for further fieldwork; the remainder of the subject property was cleared of archaeological concern.

Original Report: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment. Lisgar District Stormwater Pumping Station Municipal Class Environmental Assessment. Part of Lots 6 to 12, Concession 10, Geographic Township of Trafalgar, Halton County, now City of Mississauga, Ontario. Wood Environment & Infrastructure, 20 Sept 2022. PIF P362-0318-2021.

In 2021, Wood Environment & Infrastructure (“Wood”) conducted a Stage 1 assessment of 14 potential locations for stormwater pumping stations. One of these locations is located approximately 10 m northeast of the current subject property. The collective study area measured approximately 9.9 ha. The entire study area had general archaeological potential, but background research determined that its entirety had undergone extensive disturbance and did not require further Stage 2 assessment.

1.3.3.3 Other Relevant Reports

A geotechnical investigation was undertaken by Soil Engineers Ltd. in 2023 for the entirety of the current subject property. This investigation confirmed that the entire subject property was previously graded and covered with a fill layer in 1998 and 1999. A layer of topsoil was placed over this. The fill layer extends 1.6 to 3.3 m below ground surface and consists of silty clay with inclusions. Borehole testing confirmed that topsoil was encountered throughout the subject property with depths between 8 and 13 cm, followed by fill with depths ranging from 1.6 to 3.3

m. The fill layer consists of silty clay with gravel and wood inclusions. No original soils remain (Soil Engineers Ltd., 2023).

1.3.4 Potential for Archaeological Resources

Archaeological potential is defined as the likelihood of finding archaeological sites within a subject property. For planning purposes, determining archaeological potential provides a preliminary indication that significant sites might be found within the subject property, 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 *Ontario Heritage Act* 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.

Several factors can be used to assess the potential for recovery of Euro-Canadian and Indigenous archaeological resources on a property. The subject property was historically comprised of soils suitable for supporting human habitation and is in close proximity an unnamed creek. Additionally, it is in close proximity to a historical homestead.

Given the above, 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. Therefore, a Stage 2 archaeological assessment is required.

2.0 FIELD METHODS

The subject property measures 6.55 ha. The Stage 1 & 2 assessment was conducted on November 22, 2023, with advance permission to enter the subject property obtained from the Proponent. Weather conditions during the assessment were excellent, with overcast skies and a maximum daily temperature of 4 degrees Celsius. The ground was bare and dry at the time of inspection. As such, it is confirmed that the assessment met Section 1.2 Standard 2 of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* regarding weather and lighting.

The Stage 1 assessment of the subject property began with an on-site property inspection to gain first-hand knowledge of the geography, topography, and current condition of the property. The entirety of the subject property was accessible and was inspected. Appropriate photographic documentation was taken during the visual inspection. Coverage of the property was sufficient to identify the presence or absence of features of archaeological potential, meeting the requirements of Section 1.2 Standard 1 of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*.

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. No areas of previous disturbance, steep slope, or low-lying and permanently wet conditions could be visually confirmed. However, a recent geotechnical investigation reported that the entire subject property was graded and covered with fill (Soil Engineers Ltd., 2023).

The entire subject property, totalling 6.55 ha, consists of an overgrown vacant infill lot in a residential subdivision. The entire subject property was recommended for Stage 2 archaeological assessment by judgementally placed test pit survey, as geotechnical reporting indicates that it has been extensively disturbed. All soil was screened through 6 millimetre mesh to maximize the potential for artifact recovery. Appropriate photographic documentation was taken, and all test pits were backfilled upon completion. No artifact bearing, or “positive”, test pits were encountered, therefore no intensified survey was conducted.

Results of the Stage 1 & 2 assessment are shown on Figure 6. Images of the assessment are provided in Section 8.0.

3.0 RECORD OF FINDS

3.1 Soils

Topsoil encountered during the assessment consisted of approximately 5 to 10 centimetres of medium brown loam over a mottled, silty clay fill layer with inclusions of clay, gravel, and wood (Images 7 & 8). No original topsoil was observed in the subject property.

3.2 Archaeological Resources

No artifacts or other archaeological resources were recovered during the Stage 1 & 2 assessment of the subject property.

3.3 Documentary Record

All fieldwork-related activities were documented and kept, including field notes and observations and detailed maps. Appropriate photographic records were kept of the excavation, and all pictures were recorded in a photo log.

A detailed list of field records is presented in Table 3. 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 3: Inventory of Documentary and Material Records

PROJECT INFORMATION		
ACC project number	227-12-23	
Licensee	Matthew Muttart	
MCM PIF number	P1208-0358-2023	
DOCUMENT/MATERIAL	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION
field notes & photo logs	1	pages (paper, with digital copies)
maps	1	aerial photograph of subject property
	1	constraints/opportunities to development mapping of the subject property
photographs	8	digital colour photographs

4.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

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

- Proximity of an unnamed creek
- Proximity of a historical homestead

A visual property inspection did not identify areas of previous disturbance, steep slope, or low lying and permanently wet conditions, but recent geotechnical reporting indicates that the entire subject property has been previously graded and covered in fill (Soil Engineers Ltd., 2023).

The entire subject property was subject to Stage 2 assessment by test pit survey in judgementally placed intervals to confirm the extent of disturbance. No artifacts or other archaeological resources were identified during the Stage 1 & 2 archaeological assessment.



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 recommendations are provided for consideration by the Proponent and by the MCM:

1. No artifacts or other archaeological resources were identified during the Stage 1 & 2 archaeological assessment. The subject property has now been fully assessed according to the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism's 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. No further archaeological assessment of the subject property is required.



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 subject 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 of Cemeteries at the Ministry of Government and Consumer Services.
- 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.

Archaeological Services Inc.

1989 *An Archaeological Resource Assessment of Proposed Subdivision (21T-87053-M), Part of Lots 9 & 10, Concession 10 N.S., City of Mississauga*. Licence #89-130B. In MCM Register.

Borden, Charles E.

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

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

1984 *The Physiography of Southern Ontario*. 3rd ed. Ministry of Natural Resources

Ellis, Chris & Neal Ferris

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

Gardiner, H.F.

1899 *Nothing but names: An inquiry into the origin of the names of the counties and townships of Ontario*. Kessinger Publishing.

Gillespie, J.E., M.H. Miller and R.E. Wicklund

1971 *The Soils of Halton County*. Report No. 43 of the Ontario Soil Survey. Experimental Farms Service, Canada Department of Agriculture, and the Ontario Agriculture College, Guelph.

Halton Region

n.d. Halton's History: A Glance Back Through Halton's History.

<http://www.halton.ca/cms/One.aspx?portalId=8310&pageId=8861>

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.

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

2023b 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 (“MNR”)

2022 *Ontario Topographic Map*

https://www.lhoapplications.lrc.gov.on.ca/MakeATopographicMap/index.html?viewer=Make_A_Topographic_Map.MATM&locale=en-CA

[Accessed 22 November 2023]

Ministry of Northern Development and Mines (“MNDM”)

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 22 November 2023].

Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (“OMAFRA”)

2012 *GIS Layers for Soils and Physiography in the Province of Ontario*.

<http://sis.agr.gc.ca/cansis/publications/surveys/on/index.html>

[Accessed 22 November 2023].

Soil Engineers Ltd.

2023 A geotechnical investigation for proposed residential development. Northeast of Lisgar Drive and Doug Leavens Boulevard. City of Mississauga. Reference No 2302-S052. May 2023.

Tremaine, George R.

1858 *Tremaine’s Map of the County of Halton, Canada West*. Toronto.

Walker & Miles

1877 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Halton, Ontario*. Reprinted 1976. Cumming Atlas Reprints, Stratford.

Wood Environment & Infrastructure

2022 *Original Report: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment. Lisgar District Stormwater Pumping Station Municipal Class Environmental Assessment. Part of Lots 6 to 12, Concession 10, Geographic Township of Trafalgar, Halton County, now City of Mississauga, Ontario*. PIF P362-0318-2021. In MCM Register.

Wright James V.

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

8.0 IMAGES



Image 1: Subject area, facing southwest from northeastern corner.



Image 2: Subject area, facing northwest from northeastern corner.



Image 3: Subject area, facing southeast from northwestern corner.



Image 4: Subject area, facing southwest from northwestern corner.



Image 5: Subject area, facing northwest from southeastern corner.



Image 6: Subject area, facing northeast from near southwestern corner.



Image 7: Typical test pit throughout subject area.



Image 8: Typical test pit throughout subject area.

9.0 FIGURES



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




Figure 2: Location of the Subject Property on Tremaine's 1858 Historical Map of Halton County




Figure 3: Location of the Subject Property on Walker & Miles' 1877 Historical Atlas Map of
Trafalgar Township, Halton County




Figure 4: Location of the Subject Property on a Map of the Soils of Halton County




Figure 5: Aerial Photograph of the Subject Property and Surrounding Area, Showing Previous Archaeological Assessments within 50 m




Figure 6: Aerial Photograph Showing the Results of the Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment of the Subject Property with Image Locations

