

**Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport**

Culture Programs Unit  
Programs and Services Branch  
Culture Division  
435 S. James Street, Suite 334  
Thunder Bay ON P7E 6S7  
Tel.: 807-475-1628  
Email: paige.campbell@ontario.ca

**Ministère du Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport**

Unité des programmes culturels  
Direction des programmes et des services  
Division de culture  
435, rue James sud, bureau 334  
Thunder Bay ON P7E 6S7  
Tél.: 807-475-1628  
Email: paige.campbell@ontario.ca



March 5, 2013

Dr. Scott Martin  
Golder Associates Ltd.  
6925 Century Avenue, Suite #100  
Mississauga, ON L5N 7K2

Dear Dr. Martin,

**RE: Review and Entry into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports: Archaeological Assessment Report Entitled, *STAGE 2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT, Bluewater Wind Energy Centre, Location 26 through Location 35, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Townships of Stanley, Hay and Tuckersmith, now Municipalities of Bluewater and Huron East, Huron County, Ontario*, Revised Report Dated February 19, 2013, Filed by MTCS Toronto Office March 1, 2013, MTCS Project Information Form Number P218-275-2012, OPA Reference Number FIT-FJI7S7X, MTCS File Number HD00689**

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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

The report documents the assessment of the study area as depicted in Figures 9-01 to 9-19 of the above titled report and recommends the following (see next page):

---

<sup>1</sup> *This letter constitutes the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's written comments where required pursuant to section 22 of O. Reg. 359/09, as amended (Renewable Energy Approvals under the Environmental Protection Act), regarding the archaeological assessment undertaken for the above-captioned project. Depending on the study area and scope of work of the archaeological assessment as detailed in the report, further archaeological assessment reports may be required to complete the archaeological assessment for the project under O. Reg. 359/09. In that event Ministry comments pursuant to section 22 of O. Reg. 359/09 will be required for any such additional reports.*

<sup>2</sup> *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.*

A Stage 2 archaeological assessment was conducted by Golder on behalf of AECOM Canada Ltd. for NextEra Energy (NEEC) Canada's proposed Bluewater Wind Energy Centre. The study area is located on various lots and concessions in the Geographic Townships of Stanley, Hay and Tuckersmith, now Municipalities of Bluewater and Huron East, Huron County, Ontario (Figure 1). The study area is approximately 786.74 hectares in area. This area incorporates the proposed turbine locations, underground electric cable corridors, access roads, service roads, vehicle and crane turnarounds, substations, transmission lines, and equipment lay down and set-up locations for 37 wind turbines (although 41 potential locations will be permitted and are studied here) included in the NEEC Bluewater Wind Energy Centre.

The additional Stage 2 assessment of the Bluewater Wind Energy Project resulted in the identification of 10 archaeological sites, including 3 pre contact Aboriginal and seven historic Euro-Canadian. Recommendations for each location are found below.

### 5.1 Location 26 (AjHj-15)

The Stage 2 assessment of Location 26 (AjHj-15) resulted in the recovery of 30 mid-to-late 19th century historic Euro-Canadian artifacts and one pre contact Aboriginal artifact. Only the portion of the site located on the proposed T-line corridor was assessed and yielded a surface collection of 31 artifacts; a higher concentration of artifacts was observed to the outside of the study area but only artifacts located on the proposed T-line corridor were recovered. Given that mid-to-late 19th century whiteware and ironstone ceramics comprised 92.86% of the recovered ceramic assemblage, **it is recommended that Location 26 (AjHj-15) be subject to a Stage 3 assessment prior to any ground disturbance activities to further test the nature and density of the site.**

The Stage 3 assessment should employ both the controlled surface pick-up and hand excavated test unit methodology as outlined in Table 3.1 of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011). Prior to conducting the field work the area should be re-ploughed and allowed to weather for the controlled surface pick-up. The test unit excavation should consist of one metre by one metre square test units laid out in a five metre grid as well as additional units (amounting to 20% of the grid total) placed based on areas of interest within the site. All units should be excavated by hand to a depth of five centimetres within the subsoil. Site specific land registry research should also be conducted as part of the Stage 3 assessment.

### 5.2 Location 27

The Stage 2 assessment of Location 27 resulted in the recovery of two pre contact Aboriginal artifacts, a spent core and a piece of chipping detritus. Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 27.**

### 5.3 Location 28 (AiHj-15)

The Stage 2 assessment of Location 28 (AiHj-15) (AiHj-15) resulted in the recovery of 26 mid-to-late 19th century historic Euro-Canadian artifacts. Only the portion of the site located on the proposed collector cable corridor was assessed and yielded a collection of 26 artifacts

through test excavation; a higher concentration of artifacts was observed to the outside of the study area but only artifacts located on the proposed collector cable corridor were recovered. Given that mid-to-late 19th century ironstone and utilitarian ceramics comprised 100.00% of the recovered ceramic assemblage, **it is recommended that Location 28 (AiHj-15) be subject to a Stage 3 assessment prior to any ground disturbance activities to further test the nature and density of the site.**

The Stage 3 assessment should employ both the controlled surface pick-up and hand excavated test unit methodology as outlined in Table 3.1 of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011). Prior to conducting the field work the area should be re-ploughed and allowed to weather for the controlled surface pick-up. The test unit excavation should consist of one metre by one metre square test units laid out in a five metre grid as well as additional units (amounting to 20% of the grid total) placed based on areas of interest within the site. All units should be excavated by hand to a depth of five centimetres within the subsoil. Site specific land registry research should also be conducted as part of the Stage 3 assessment.

#### **5.4 Location 29 (AjHj-16)**

The Stage 2 assessment of Location 29 (AjHj-16) resulted in the recovery of 174 mid-to-late 19th century historic Euro-Canadian artifacts. Given that mid-to-late 19th century whiteware, ironstone and utilitarian ceramics comprised 60% of the recovered ceramic assemblage, **it is recommended that Location 29 (AjHj-16) be subject to a Stage 3 assessment prior to any ground disturbance activities to further test the nature and density of the site.**

The Stage 3 assessment should employ both the controlled surface pick-up and hand excavated test unit methodology as outlined in Table 3.1 of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011). The test unit excavation should consist of one metre by one metre square test units laid out in a five metre grid as well as additional units (amounting to 20% of the grid total) placed based on areas of interest within the site. All units should be excavated by hand to a depth of five centimetres within the subsoil. Site specific land registry research should also be conducted as part of the Stage 3 assessment.

#### **5.5 Location 30 (AjHi-12)**

The Stage 2 assessment of Location 30 (AjHi-12) resulted in the recovery of 64 mid-to-late 19th century historic Euro-Canadian artifacts. Only the portion of the site located on the proposed T-line corridor was assessed and yielded a surface collection of 64 artifacts; a higher concentration of artifacts was observed to the outside of the study area but only artifacts located on the proposed T-line corridor were recovered. Given that mid-to-late 19th century whiteware and ironstone ceramics comprised 73.33% of the recovered ceramic assemblage and the inclusion of early 19th century pearlware in the assemblage as well, **it is recommended that Location 30 (AjHi-12) be subject to a Stage 3 assessment prior to any ground disturbance activities to further test the nature and density of the site.**

The Stage 3 assessment should employ both the controlled surface pick-up and hand excavated test unit methodology as outlined in Table 3.1 of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011). Prior to conducting the field work the area should be re-ploughed and allowed to

weather for the controlled surface pick-up. The test unit excavation should consist of one metre by one metre square test units laid out in a five metre grid as well as additional units (amounting to 20% of the grid total) placed based on areas of interest within the site. All units should be excavated by hand to a depth of five centimetres within the subsoil. Site specific land registry research should also be conducted as part of the Stage 3 assessment.

### 5.6 Location 31 (AjHj-17)

The Stage 2 assessment of Location 31 (AjHj-17) resulted in the recovery of 199 mid-to-late 19th century historic Euro-Canadian artifacts. Given that mid-to-late 19th century whiteware and ironstone ceramics comprised 98.13% of the recovered ceramic assemblage, **it is recommended that Location 31 (AjHj-17) be subject to a Stage 3 assessment prior to any ground disturbance activities to further test the nature and density of the site.**

The Stage 3 assessment should employ both the controlled surface pick-up and hand excavated test unit methodology as outlined in Table 3.1 of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011). The test unit excavation should consist of one metre by one metre square test units laid out in a five metre grid as well as additional units (amounting to 20% of the grid total) placed based on areas of interest within the site. All units should be excavated by hand to a depth of five centimetres within the subsoil. Site specific land registry research should also be conducted as part of the Stage 3 assessment.

### 5.7 Location 32 (AjHj-18)

The Stage 2 assessment of Location 32 (AjHj-18) resulted in the recovery of 632 mid-to-late 19th century historic Euro-Canadian artifacts. Given that mid-to-late 19th century whiteware and ironstone ceramics comprised 67.67% of the recovered ceramic assemblage and the inclusion of early 19th century pearlware in the assemblage as well, **it is recommended that Location 32 (AjHj-18) be subject to a Stage 3 assessment prior to any ground disturbance activities to further test the nature and density of the site.**

The Stage 3 assessment should employ both the controlled surface pick-up and hand excavated test unit methodology as outlined in Table 3.1 of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011). The test unit excavation should consist of one metre by one metre square test units laid out in a five metre grid as well as additional units (amounting to 20% of the grid total) placed based on areas of interest within the site. All units should be excavated by hand to a depth of five centimetres within the subsoil. Site specific land registry research should also be conducted as part of the Stage 3 assessment.

### 5.8 Location 33 (AiHj-16)

The Stage 2 assessment of Location 33 (AiHj-16) resulted in the recovery of 632 mid-to-late 19th century historic Euro-Canadian artifacts. Given that mid-to-late 19th century whiteware and ironstone ceramics comprised 68.18% of the recovered ceramic assemblage, **it is recommended that Location 33 (AiHj-16) be subject to a Stage 3 assessment prior to any ground disturbance activities to further test the nature and density of the site.**

The Stage 3 assessment should employ both the controlled surface pick-up and hand excavated test unit methodology as outlined in Table 3.1 of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011). The test unit excavation should consist of one metre by one metre square test units laid out in a five metre grid as well as additional units (amounting to 20% of the grid total) placed based on areas of interest within the site. All units should be excavated by hand to a depth of five centimetres within the subsoil. Site specific land registry research should also be conducted as part of the Stage 3 assessment.

### 5.9 Location 34 (AjHj-19)

The Stage 2 assessment of Location 34 (AjHj-19) resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre contact Aboriginal projectile point. Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 34 (AjHj-19).**

### 5.10 Location 35 (AjHj-20)

The Stage 2 assessment of Location 35 (AjHj-20) resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre contact Aboriginal projectile point. Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 35 (AjHj-20).**

### 5.11 Summary

The above recommendations determine that seven sites require further Stage 3 assessment. In addition to the 7 recommended sites, three sites would not be recommended for further archaeological work. Table 41 provides a breakdown of Golder's recommendations:

**Table 41: Recommendations for Further Stage 3 Assessment**

Location	Borden Number	Affiliation	Stage 3 Recommended?
26	AjHj-15	Historic Euro-Canadian	Yes
27	N/A	Pre contact Aboriginal	No
28	AiHj-15	Historic Euro-Canadian	Yes
29	AjHj-16	Historic Euro-Canadian	Yes
30	AjHi-12	Historic Euro-Canadian	Yes
31	AjHj-17	Historic Euro-Canadian	Yes
32	AjHj-18	Historic Euro-Canadian	Yes
33	AiHj-16	Historic Euro-Canadian	Yes
34	AjHj-19	Pre contact Aboriginal	No
35	AjHj-20	Pre contact Aboriginal	No

While all of these sites were documented during the Stage 2 archaeological field work conducted within the NEEC Bluewater Wind Energy Centre study area, seven require further Stage 3 assessment. The remaining three sites have been sufficiently documented.

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport is asked to accept this report into the Ontario Public 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.

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,

Paige Campbell  
Archaeology Review Officer

cc. Mr. Mark Rose, AECOM Canada Ltd.