## Proposed Caframo Expansion Evaluation of Archaeological Potential

January 9, 2015

Despite the Caframo property's proximity to Colpoy's Bay and its placement straddling the shorelines of the bay's ancestors – the Nipissing Great Lakes and Lake Algoma, the potential for the presence of Aboriginal or pre-20<sup>th</sup> century Euro-Canadian archaeological resources in the proposed development area can justifiably be considered to be non-existent [see attached pdf checklist for evaluating archaeological potential – notably Criterion 12].

A thorough documentation of the property's industrial history [see attached pdf presentation] clearly demonstrates the extent of landscape disturbance that has resulted from the post-1901 development of the Colonial Portland Cement Company's Wiarton cement works. While the property in general would have possessed high archaeological potential prior to the construction of the sizeable, tightly-packed structures of the industrial complex, any Aboriginal or pre-1901 Euro-Canadian cultural resources that may have existed would have been destroyed by extensive surface alteration and foundation/basement excavation. A December 12 visit to the site confirmed what was clearly evident in the photo documentation that spanned much of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

The two structures that are proposed for the Caframo expansion will be constructed on the footprints of two demolished buildings within the original Colonial Portland Cement Company complex: the expanded Office within the northern section of the main rotary building; the expanded Warehouse across a levelled area where the boiler house had once stood.

If this and any future development is confined within the disturbed limits of the post-1901Colonial Portland Cement Company complex, there are no archaeological concerns.

William R. Fitzgerald, Ph.D.

2207 Bruce Road 20 RR2 Tiverton, Ontario N0G 2T0

(519) 368-5899

dr\_dig@xplornet.com



Ministry of Tourism and Culture

Programs & Services Branch 401 Bay Street, Suite 1700 Toronto ON M7A 0A7

## Criteria for Evaluating Archaeological Potential A Checklist for the Non-Specialist

"Archaeological potential" is a term used to describe the likelihood that a property contains archaeological resources. This checklist is intended to assist non-specialists screening for the archaeological potential of a property where site alteration is proposed.

Note: for projects seeking a Renewable Energy Approval under Ontario Regulation 359/09, the Ministry of Tourism and Culture has developed a separate checklist to address the requirements of that regulation.

Project Name			
Caframo expansion			
Project Location			
501273 Grey Road 1, Georgian Bluffs, Ontario N0H 2T0			
<u>IPart Lot 3 Jones Range (Keppel Township)</u> , Township of Georgian Bluffs, Grev Ceppenent Name	ountvl		
Caframo Limited			
Proponent Contact Information			
Ron Davidson Land Use Planning Consultant Inc. 265 Beattie Street, Owen Sound,	Ontario	N4K 6X2	
Known Archaeological Sites	Yes	Unknown	No
1. Known archaeological sites within 300 m of property			$\boxtimes$
Physical Features	Yes	Unknown	No
<ol> <li>Body of water within 300 m of property If yes, what kind of water?</li> </ol>	$\boxtimes$		
a) Primary water source (lake, river, large creek, etc.)	$\boxtimes$		
b) Secondary water source (stream, spring, marsh, swamp, etc.)			
c) Past water source (beach ridge, river bed, relic creek, ancient shoreline, etc.)	$\square$		
<ol> <li>Topographical features on property (knolls, drumlins, eskers, or plateaus)</li> </ol>			
4. Pockets of sandy soil (50 m <sup>2</sup> or larger) in a clay or rocky area on property			$\boxtimes$
<ol> <li>Distinctive land formations on property (mounds, caverns, waterfalls, peninsulas, etc.)</li> </ol>			$\square$
Cultural Features	Yes	Unknown	No
<ol> <li>Known burial site or cemetery on or adjacent to the property (cemetery is registered with the Cemeteries Regulation Unit)</li> </ol>			$\boxtimes$
<ol> <li>Food or scarce resource harvest areas on property (traditional fishing locations, agricultural/berry extraction areas, etc.)</li> </ol>			$\square$
<ol> <li>Indications of early Euro-Canadian settlement within 300 m of property (monuments, cemeteries, structures, etc.)</li> </ol>			$\boxtimes$
<ol> <li>Early historic transportation routes within 100 m of property (historic road, trail, portage, rail corridor, etc.)</li> </ol>	$\boxtimes$		
Property-specific Information	Yes	Unknown	No
10. Property is designated and/or listed under the Ontario Heritage Act (municipal register and lands described in Reg. 875 of the Ontario Heritage Act)			$\boxtimes$
11. Local knowledge of archaeological potential of property (from aboriginal communities, heritage organisations, municipal heritage committees, etc.)			$\square$
12. Recent deep ground disturbance <sup>†</sup> (post-1960, widespread and deep land alterations)	$\boxtimes$		

<sup>†</sup> Archaeological potential can be determined not to be present for either the entire property or a part(s) of it when the area under consideration has been subject to widespread and deep land alterations that have severely damaged the integrity of any archaeological resources. Deep disturbance may include quarrying or major underground infrastructure development. Activities such as agricultural cultivation, gardening, minor grading and landscaping are not necessarily considered deep disturbance. Alterations can be considered to be extensive or widespread when they have affected a large area, usually defined as the majority of a property.

Scoring the results:	
If Yes to any of 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, 6, 10, or 11	→ high archaeological potential – assessment is required
If Yes to two or more of 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, or 9	→ high archaeological potential – assessment is required
If Yes to 12 or No to all of 1 - 10	→ low archaeological potential – assessment is not required
If 3 or more Unknown	ightarrow an archaeological assessment is required (see note below)

<sup>†</sup> Note: If information requested in this checklist is unknown, a consultant archaeologist licensed under the *Ontario Heritage Act* should be retained to carry out at least a Stage 1 archaeological assessment to further explore the archaeological potential of the property and to prepare a report on the results of that assessment. The Ministry of Tourism and Culture reviews all such reports prepared by consultant archaeologists against the ministry's Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists. Once the ministry is satisfied that, based on the available information, the report has been prepared in accordance with those guidelines, the ministry issues an acceptance letter to the consultant archaeologist and places the report into its registry where it is available for public inspection.

From: Doran Ritchie <d.ritchie@saugeenojibwaynation.ca> To: RON DAVIDSON <ronalddavidson@rogers.com> Sent: Monday, December 8, 2014 2:03 PM Subject: RE: Caframo

Ron,

I've met with Dr. Fitzgerald and upon his review, there is no need to conduct further archeological investigations. The property has been largely disturbed therefore the potential of uncovering cultural material is very low.

Thanks for taking the time to allow SON to be involved in the this project. Please give me a shout if you need to get in touch.

Take care, Doran