

Ministry of Tourism,
Culture and Sport

Culture Programs Unit
Programs & Services Br.
900 Highbury Avenue
London, ON N5Y 1A4
Tel: 519-675-6898
Fax: 519-675-7777
e-mail: shari.prowse@ontario.ca

Ministère du Tourisme,
de la Culture et du Sport

Unité des programmes culturels
Direction des programmes et des services
900, av. Highbury
London, ON N5Y 1A4
Tél: 519-675-6898
Télé: 519-675-7777
e-mail: shari.prowse@ontario.ca



April 5, 2012

Mr. Marc Rose
AECOM Canada Ltd.
300 Town Centre Boulevard, Suite 300
Markham, ON L3R 5Z6

RE: NextEra Energy Canada, ULC, Bluewater Wind Energy Centre Geographic Township of Stanley, Hay and Tuckersmith, Huron County, Ontario, FIT-FJI7S7X, MTCS File HD00689, P001-609-2010, P218-040-2011 and P316-017-2012

Dear Proponent:

This letter constitutes the Ministry of Tourism and Culture's written comments as required by s. 22(3)(a) of O. Reg. 359/09 under the *Environmental Protection Act* regarding archaeological assessments undertaken for the above project.

Based on the information contained in the reports you have submitted for this project, the Ministry believes the archaeological assessment complies with the *Ontario Heritage Act's* licensing requirements, including the licence terms and conditions and the Ministry's 1993 Archaeological Assessment Technical Guidelines or the 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (whichever apply). Please note that the Ministry makes no representation or warranty as to the completeness, accuracy or quality of the reports.*

The reports recommend the following:

Stage 1, P001-609-2010, February 13, 2012, Received February 14, 2012, Entered into Register March 19, 2012

Golder applied archaeological potential criteria commonly used by the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport 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 Euro-Canadian anecdotal evidence. 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.

Stage 2, P218-040-2011 and P319-017-2012, February 13, 2012, Revised March 23, 2012, Received March 26, 2012, Entered into Register April 5, 2012

The Stage 2 assessment of the Bluewater Wind Energy Project resulted in the identification of 25 archaeological sites, including seven historic Euro-Canadian and 18 pre-contact Aboriginal. Recommendations for each location are found below.

Location 1

The Stage 2 assessment of Location 1 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact Aboriginal biface.

*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 1.***

Location 2

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 2 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact 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 2.***

Location 3

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 3 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact 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 3.***

Location 4 (AjHj-5)

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 4 (AjHj-5) 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 4.***

Location 5

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 5 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact Aboriginal biface. 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 5.***

Location 6 (AjHj-12)

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 6 (AjHj-12) 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 6.***

Location 7

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 7 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact Aboriginal wedge. 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 7.***

Location 8 (AjHj-13)

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 8 (AjHj-13) 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 8.***

Location 9

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 9 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact Aboriginal scraper. 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 9.***

Location 10

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 10 resulted in the recovery of primarily late 19th century and early 20th century historic Euro-Canadian artifacts. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 10.***

Location 11

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 11 resulted in the recovery of two pre-contact Aboriginal artifacts, pieces 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 11.***

Location 12

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 12 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact Aboriginal biface. 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 12.***

Location 13 (AiHj-6)

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 13 (AiHj-6) resulted in the recovery of mid-to-late 19th century Euro-Canadian historic artifacts. Ironstone ceramics clearly dominate the recovered artifacts, making up 55.81% of the entire artifact assemblage. However given that a significant number of mid-19th century whiteware artifacts were also recovered **it is recommended that Location 5 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 and 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.

Location 14 (AiHk-1)

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 14 (AiHk-1) resulted in the recovery of mid-to-late 19th century Euro- Canadian historic artifacts. Only the central portion of the site was included in the study area and yielded a surface collection of 74 artifacts; a higher concentration of artifacts was observed to the north and south of the study area but only artifacts located on the proposed access corridor were recovered. Mid-to-late 19th century whiteware and ironstone ceramics comprised 90.00% of the recovered ceramic assemblage. Given that 47.50% of the ceramic assemblage consisted of mid 19th century whiteware ceramics, **it is recommended that Location 14 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 pickup. The test unit excavation should consist of one metre by one metre square test units laid out in a five metre grid and 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.*

Location 15 (AiHj-7)

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 15 (AiHj-7) 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 6.***

Location 16 (AiHk-2)

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 16 (AiHk-2) resulted in the recovery of 20 primarily late 19th century and early 20th century historic Euro-Canadian artifacts. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 16.***

Location 17

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 17 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact 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 17.***

Location 18

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 18 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact 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 18.***

Location 19

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 19 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact 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 19.***

Location 20 (AiHj-8)

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 20 (AiHj-8) resulted in the recovery of 39 primarily late 19th century and early 20th century historic Euro-Canadian artifacts. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 20.***

Location 21

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 21 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact Aboriginal biface. 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 21.***

Location 22

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 22 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact 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 22.***

Location 23

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 23 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact Aboriginal biface. 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 23.***

Location 24 (AiHj-9)

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 24 (AiHj-9) resulted in the recovery of 63 mid-to-late 19th century Euro-Canadian historic artifacts. Only the eastern portion of the site was included in the study area and yielded a surface collection of 63 artifacts; a higher concentration of artifacts was observed to the west of the study area but only artifacts located on the proposed access corridor were recovered. Given that mid-to-late 19th century whiteware and ironstone ceramics comprised 74.42% of the recovered ceramic assemblage, **it is recommended that Location 14 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 unit laid out in a five metre grid and 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.*

Location 25 (AjHj-14)

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 25 (AjHj-14) resulted in the recovery of 86 mid-to-late 19th century Euro- Canadian historic artifacts. Only the eastern portion of the site was included in the study area and yielded a surface collection of 63 artifacts; a higher concentration of artifacts was observed to the west of the study area but only artifacts located on the proposed access corridor were recovered. Given that mid-to-late 19th century whiteware and ironstone ceramics comprised 86.95% of the recovered ceramic assemblage, **it is recommended that Location 14 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 and 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.*

The Ministry is satisfied with these recommendations.

This letter does not waive any requirements which you may have under the Ontario *Heritage Act*. A separate letter addressing archaeological licensing obligations under the Act will be sent to the archaeologist who completed the assessment and will be copied to you.

This letter does not constitute approval of the renewable energy project. Approvals of the project may be required under other statutes and regulations. It is your responsibility to obtain any necessary approvals or licences.

Please feel free to contact me if you have questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,

Shari Prowse
Archaeology Review Officer

cc. Dr. Scott Martin and Ms. Irena Jurakic, Golder Associates Ltd.

** 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.*