

**Appendix A8
Stage 1 Archaeological
Assessments**



Appendix A8-1
Ministry of Citizenship and
Multiculturalism Acceptance Letter
(Project Information Form Number
P1148-0004-2021)



Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM)

Archaeology Program Unit
Heritage Branch
Citizenship, Inclusion and Heritage Division
5th Floor, 400 University Ave.
Toronto ON M7A 2R9
Tel.: (437) 339-8882
Email: Melissa.Wallace@ontario.ca

Ministère des Affaires civiques et du Multiculturalisme (MCM)

Unité des programme d'archéologie
Direction du patrimoine
Division de la citoyenneté, de l'inclusion et du patrimoine
5e étage, 400 ave. University
Toronto ON M7A 2R9
Tél. : (437) 339-8882
Email: Melissa.Wallace@ontario.ca



May 9, 2023

Heather Kerr (P1148)
Stantec Consulting
100 - 401 Wellington Toronto ON M5V 1E7

RE: Review and Entry into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports: Archaeological Assessment Report Entitled, "Addendum to Oshawa to Bowmanville Service Expansion Environmental Project Report: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment. Various Lots and Concessions, former Township of East Whitby, former County of Ontario, now City of Oshawa, and former Darlington Township, former County of Durham, now Municipality of Clarington; Regional Municipality of Durham, Ontario", Dated Apr 5, 2023, Filed with MCM Toronto Office on Apr 6, 2023, MCM Project Information Form Number P1148-0004-2021, MCM File Number 00EA044

Dear Ms. Kerr:

This office has reviewed the above-mentioned report, which has been submitted to this ministry as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c 0.18.¹ This review has been carried out in order to determine whether the licensed professional consultant archaeologist has met the terms and conditions of their licence, that the licensee assessed the property and documented archaeological resources using a process that accords with the 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* set by the ministry, and that the archaeological fieldwork and report recommendations are consistent with the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario.

The report documents the assessment of the study area as depicted in Figure 8.1 to 8.10 of the above titled report and recommends the following:

The Stage 1 archaeological assessment, involving background research and a property inspection, resulting in the determination that approximately 45.62% of the study area retains low to no archaeological potential as it includes extensive disturbance from buried utilities, municipally constructed drains, asphalt and gravel roadway, a railway corridor, and extant structures. In accordance with Section 1.3.2 and Section 7.7.4 of the MCM's 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011), further archaeological assessment is not required for any portion of the Project's anticipated construction which impacts an area of low to no archaeological potential (See Figure 8.1-8.10).

The recorded location of the Robertson site (AIGq-18) is recorded based on a landowner account only and has not been documented through formal archaeological investigation. The recorded location of the site has subsequently been extensively disturbed by the construction of a manufacturing facility. In accordance

with Section 1.1, Standard 1 and Section 7.5.8. Standard 4 of the MCM's 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011), further archaeological assessment is not recommended (see Supplementary Documentation).

Other portions of the study area, approximately 0.05%, retain low to no potential due to steep slope, while 0.08% of the study area was identified as low and wet, thus retaining low to no potential. In accordance with Section 2.1, Standard 2a-b of the MCM's 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011), further archaeological assessment is not recommended for any portion of the Project's anticipated construction which impacts an area of low to no archaeological potential (see Figures 8.1-8.10).

Background research also demonstrated that, approximately 11.49% of the study area, has been subject to previous archaeological assessment and not recommended for further study. In accordance with Section 1.1, Standard 1 and Section 7.5.8. Standard 4 of the MCM's 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011), further archaeological assessment is not recommended for any portion of the Project's anticipated construction which impacts area previously assessed and not recommended for further archaeological work (see Figures 8.1-8.10).

Approximately 0.31% of the study area fall within the boundaries of the St. Wolodymyr and St. Olha Ukrainian Cemetery which was established in 1969. The St. Wolodymyr and St. Olha Ukrainian Cemetery property retains archaeological potential for archaeological resources not related to the cemetery and Stage 2 archaeological assessment is recommended (see Figure 8.6). Test-pit survey within the St. Wolodymyr and St. Olha Ukrainian Cemetery property should avoid directly impacting known burials. A Cemetery Investigation Authorization issued by the Bereavement Authority of Ontario is required in advance of invasive archaeological fieldwork within the cemetery property.

Parts of the St. Wolodymyr and St. Olha Ukrainian Cemetery contain burials and cemetery investigation is recommended prior to construction impacts in these areas (see Figure 8.6). Cemetery investigation should only be completed after all required Stage 2 archaeological survey (and any subsequently recommended Stages of archaeological assessment) has been completed. Cemetery investigation should be conducted by the removal of the topsoil by mechanical means (Gradall or backhoe equipped with a smooth bucket) under the observation of a licensed archaeologist to expose potential grave shafts within the subsoil. A minimum buffer of at least 10 metres of subsoil free of burial features should be established beyond exposed burial shafts, where allowed by the study area's extent.

The remaining portion of the study area, approximately 42.45%, retains potential for the identification and documentation of archaeological resources.

The Osbourne site (AIGq-17) and the Elgin Farwell site (AIGq-22) have not been subject to formal archaeological investigation and their precise locations are unknown. Thus, in accordance with Section 1.3 and Section 7.7.4 of the MCM's 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011), Stage 2 archaeological assessment is recommended to identify the locations of these sites prior to construction impacts of the recorded sites' locations (see Supplementary Documentation).

The Bates site (AIGq-170) is located outside of the current construction footprint. No construction impacts to the Bates site (AIGq-170) are anticipated as part of this project, based on the current construction design. The Bates site (AIGq-170) has been previously recommended for Stage 4 archaeological mitigation. Based on a review of the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports, this work has not yet been completed. Thus, in accordance with Section 3.4 and Section 7.7.4 of the MCM's 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011), Stage 4 archaeological mitigation of the Bates site (AIGq-170) is recommended prior to construction impacts of the recorded site's location (see Supplementary Documentation). The Stage 4 recommendations made for the Bates site (AIGq-170) by ASI (2016a) are reproduced here (ASI 2016a:17):

“The recommended Stage 4 protocol is the hand-excavation of additional one-metre square units around high-yielding deposits, starting with Stage 3 units 475N-190E, 480N-190E, and 485N-185E, until yields drop to 200 artifacts per square, in order to salvage excavate the midden. A mechanical excavator with a smooth bucket should be used to remove the 70-120 cm thick stratum of landscape fill to expose the deposit under the direction of a licensed archaeologist. Following the block excavation, additional one-metre square units must be hand-excavated at least 2 metres beyond the potential nineteenth-century cultural features to fully expose them. The mitigation would continue with the removal of the remaining soil fills by mechanical means (Gradall or backhoe equipped with a smooth bucket) to expose other potential features within the subsoil. The stripped area must be buffered by at least 10 metres of subsoil free of features. The exposed subsoil should then be cleaned by shovel (“shovel shine”) or trowel and the resulting subsoil surface examined for cultural features. Afterward, full hand-excavation and documentation of all features should follow.”

In accordance with Section 1.3 and Section 7.7.4 of the MCM’s 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011), Stage 2 archaeological assessment is recommended for any portion of the Project’s anticipated construction which impacts an area of archaeological potential (see Figures 8.1-8.10).

Based on the information contained in the report, the ministry is satisfied that the fieldwork and reporting for the archaeological assessment are consistent with the ministry’s 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* and the terms and conditions for archaeological licences. This report has been entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports. Please note that the ministry makes no representation or warranty as to the completeness, accuracy or quality of reports in the register.

Should you require any further information regarding this matter, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Melissa Wallace
Archaeology Review Officer

cc. Archaeology Licensing Officer
Laura Filice, Metrolinx
Laura Filice, Metrolinx

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