STAGE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT ROUGE PARK BRIDGES LOT 4,5, 8, CONCESSION 4 LOT 2, CONCESSION 3 (FORMER TOWNSHIP OF SCARBOROUGH, COUNTY OF YORK) CITY OF TORONTO, ONTARIO

ORIGINAL REPORT

Prepared for:

Dillon Consulting 235 Yorkland Boulevard Suite 800 Toronto, ON M2J 4Y8

Archaeological Licence #P1066 (Lytle) Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries PIF# P1066-0163-2020 ASI File: 19EA-117

20 April 2021



Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Rouge Park Bridges Lots 4, 5, 8 Concession 4 Lot 2, Concession 3 (Former Township of Scarborough, County of York) City of Toronto, Ontario

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ASI was contracted by Dillon Consulting to conduct a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (Background Research and Property Inspection) as part of the Rouge Park Bridges Transportation Master Plan Environmental Assessment in the City of Toronto. This project involves the development of a Transportation Master Plan that focuses on the development of a rehabilitation strategy for five municipal bridges located in Rouge National Urban Park. The Stage 1 Study Area includes these bridge locations and their approaches:

- Sewells Road Bridge
- Mine Bailey Bridge
- Hillside Bridge
- Stott's Bridge
- Maxwell's Bridge

The Stage 1 background study determined that 42 previously registered archaeological sites are located within one kilometre of the Study Area, one of which is within 50 metres and one which is an ancestral Huron-Wendat village site within the Study Area (AkGt-41). One additional ancestral Huron-Wendat village sites is located within one kilometre of the Study Area. The property inspection determined that parts of the Study Area exhibit archaeological potential and will require Stage 2 assessment. Part of the Study Area is within an area considered to have ossuary potential and will require a program of archaeological monitoring. Based on past recommendations, Stage 3 will also be required within the Sewell's Road right-of-way near the Milne Site (AkGt-41).

In light of these results, below is a summary of the recommendations:

- 1. Parts of the Study Area exhibit archaeological potential. These lands require Stage 2 archaeological assessment by test pit survey and pedestrian survey, both at five metre intervals, prior to any proposed construction activities;
- 2. AlGt-542 is a Pre-Contact Indigenous findspot with Cultural Heritage Value or Interest located within 50 metres of the Study Area. The location of the site should be noted while any Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment is undertaken in this area however it is not anticipated to extend into the Study Area;
- 3. Part of the Study Area was previously assessed by ASI (P392-0035-2013, P094-0192-2014, P094-0193-2014). In keeping with these previous recommendations, the Sewell's Road ROW in proximity to the Milne site (AkGt-41) requires Stage 3 site-specific assessment (Figure 11: areas highlighted in teal). Stage 2 test pit survey at a minimum of 5 m intervals should be



conducted prior to the Stage 3 assessment in these lands to confirm the presence of any intact soils. The Stage 3 should be conducted in accordance with Table 3.1 Standards 10-12 for Stage 3 excavation of Woodland Period village sites:

- 4. Part of Sewell's Road has been previously subject to a program of archaeological monitoring by ASI in 2015 during construction impacts which occurred above the existing granular surface. Additional construction monitoring is required in these areas for any construction impacts below the existing granular surface;
- 5. The Milne Site (AkGt-41) and the D. Reesor (AlGt-63) are ancestral Huron-Wendat villages adjacent to the Study Area. An associated ossuary has not yet been identified for either site. To minimize the risk of impacting an ossuary within the project limits, a licensed archaeologist should be engaged to conduct a program of archaeological monitoring during the removal of topsoil for all parts of the Study Area that are within both 1000 metres of the sites and 300 metres of water;
- 6. The remainder of the Study Area does not retain archaeological potential on account of deep and extensive land disturbance, low and wet conditions, slopes in excess of 20 degrees, or being previously assessed. These lands do not require further archaeological assessment; and,
- 7. Should the proposed work extend beyond the current Study Area, further Stage 1 archaeological assessment should be conducted to determine the archaeological potential of the surrounding lands.



PROJECT PERSONNEL

Senior Project Manager:	Lisa Merritt, MSc. (PO94) Partner / Director Environmental Assessment Division
Project Coordinator:	Hannah Brouwers, Hon. BA (R1270) Archaeologist / Project Administrator Environmental Assessment Division
	Katrina Thach, Hon. BA (R1225) Archaeologist / Project Coordinator Environmental Assessment Division
Project Director (Licensee):	Jessica Lytle, MSc (P1066) Associate Archaeologist / Project Manager Environmental Assessment Division
Project Manager:	Eliza Brandy, MA (R1109) Associate Archaeologist / Project Manager Environmental Assessment Division
Field Director:	John Sleath, MA (P382) Associate Archaeologist / Project Manager Cultural Heritage Division
Report Preparation:	Eliza Brandy
	Danielle Bella, Hon. BA Archaeologist / Technical Writer Environmental Assessment Division
	Hannah Brouwers
Graphics:	Jonas Fernandez, MSc (R281) Lead Archaeologist / Manager - Fleet & Geomatics Specialist Operations Division
	Robin Latour, MPhil, PDip Associate Archaeologist Geomatics Specialist Operations Division
	Carolyn Nettleton, BA (Hon) Archaeologist / Geomatics Specialist Operations Division
Report Reviewer:	Lisa Merritt



TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIV	E SUMMARY	i
PROJECT F	PERSONNELi	ii
TABLE OF	CONTENTSi	v
1.0 P	ROJECT CONTEXT	1
1.1	Development Context	1
1.1.1	1 Treaties	1
1.2	Historical Context	2
1.2.1	1 Indigenous Land Use and Settlement	2
1.2.2	2 Euro-Canadian Land Use: Township Survey and Settlement	3
1.2.2	3 Historical Map Review	6
1.2.4	4 Twentieth-Century Mapping Review	7
1.3	Archaeological Context	8
<i>1.3.</i>	1 Current Land Use and Field Conditions	8
1.3.2	2 Geography	8
1.3.3	<i>Previous Archaeological Research</i> 1	D
2.0 FI	IELD METHODS: PROPERTY INSPECTION1	3
3.0 A	NALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS1	4
3.1	Analysis of Archaeological Potential1	4
3.2	Conclusions1	5
4.0 R	ECOMMENDATIONS1	6
5.0 A	DVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION1	8
6.0 R	EFERENCES CITED1	9
7.0 N	IAPS 2	5
8.0 IN	MAGES 4	C

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Rouge Park Bridges Study Area	26
Figure 2: Study Area (Approximate Location) Overlaid on the 1860 Map of the County of York	27
Figure 3: Study Area (Approximate Location) Overlaid on the 1878 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of	of
York	27
Figure 4: Study Area (Approximate Location) Overlaid on the 1914 NTS Sheet	28
Figure 5: Study Area (Approximate Location) Overlaid on the 1954 Aerial Photography	28
Figure 6: Study Area (Approximate Location) Overlaid on the 1992 Aerial Photography	29
Figure 7: Study Area - Physiographic Landforms	30
Figure 8: Study Area - Surficial Geology	31
Figure 9: Study Area - Soil Drainage	32
Figure 10:Rouge Park Bridges Study Area - Results of Stage 1 (Key Map)	33
Figure 11:Rouge Park Bridges Study Area - Results of Stage 1 (Sheet 1)	34
Figure 12:Rouge Park Bridges Study Area - Results of Stage 1 (Sheet 2)	35
Figure 13:Rouge Park Bridges Study Area - Results of Stage 1 (Sheet 3)	36
Figure 14:Rouge Park Bridges Study Area - Results of Stage 1 (Sheet 4)	37
Figure 15:Rouge Park Bridges Study Area - Results of Stage 1 (Sheet 5)	38



Figure 16:Rouge Park Bridges Study Area - Results of Stage 1 (Sheet 6)
---	---

LIST OF PLATES

Plate 1: View of Sewells Road towards rail line; Area is disturbed, no potential	0
Plate 2: View of Sewells Road towards Sewells Road Bridge; Lands beyond disturbed road require Stage 2	
survey	0
Plate 3: View from Sewells Road; Area is sloped, no potential	41
Plate 4: View of Sewells Road towards river; Beyond disturbed road and right-of-way is sloped, no potential	41
Plate 5: View of Old Finch Avenue towards Milne Bailey Bridge; Area is disturbed, no potential	ł2
Plate 6: View from Old Finch Avenue; Area requires Stage 2	ł2
Plate 7: View of Old Finch Avenue; Road and right-of-way are disturbed, no potential	ŧ3
Plate 8: View of Meadowvale Road towards rail line; Road and right-of-way are disturbed, no potential4	ŧ3
Plate 9: View of Hillside Bridge; Area is low and wet, no potential	4
Plate 10: View from Meadowvale Road; Area is sloped and disturbed, no potential4	4
Plate 11: View from Meadowvale Road; Area beyond disturbed road and right-of-way requires Stage 2	ŧ5
Plate 12: View of Twyn Rivers Drive; Areas beyond disturbed road and right-of-way is sloped, no potential 4	ŧ5
Plate 13: View of Twyn Rivers Drive towards Stott's Bridge; Area beyond disturbed road and right-of-way	
requires Stage 2	16
Plate 14: View from Twyn Rivers Drive; Area beyond disturbed road and right-of-way requires Stage 24	16
Plate 15: View of Twyn Rivers Drive; Road and right-of-way are disturbed, no potential	ŧ7
Plate 16: View of Twyn Rivers Drive; Areas beyond disturbed road and right-of-way is sloped, no potential 4	ŧ7
Plate 17: View of Twyn Rivers Drive towards Maxwell's Bridge; Road and right-of-way are disturbed, no	
potential	8
Plate 18: View from Twyn Rivers Drive towards Orchard Trail; Area requires Stage 2	8
Plate 19: View from Twyn Rivers Drive; Area requires Stage 2	19
Plate 20: View of Twyn Rivers Drive towards Maxwell's Bridge; Road and right-of-way are disturbed, no	
potential	19
Plate 21: Photo taken during ASI 2014 survey (P392-0035-2013): Sewell's Road ROW north of CP rail crossing	
was recommended for Stage 3 assessment. This should be preceded by Stage 2 test pit survey	0



1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT

Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) was contracted by Dillon Consulting to conduct a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (Background Research and Property Inspection) as part of the Rouge Park Bridges Transportation Master Plan Environmental Assessment in the City of Toronto (Figure 1). This project involves the development of a Transportation Master Plan (TMP) that focuses on the development of a rehabilitation strategy for five municipal bridges located in Rouge National Urban Park. The Stage 1 Study Area includes these bridge locations and their approaches:

- Sewells Road Bridge
- Mine Bailey Bridge
- Hillside Bridge
- Stott's Bridge
- Maxwell's Bridge

All activities carried out during this assessment were completed in accordance with the *Ontario Heritage Act* (1990, as amended in 2018) and the 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (S & G), administered by the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI 2011), formerly the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport.

1.1 Development Context

All work has been undertaken as required by the *Environmental Assessment Act*, RSO (Ministry of the Environment 1990 as amended 2010) and regulations made under the Act, and are therefore subject to all associated legislation. This project is being conducted in accordance with the Municipal Engineers' Association document *Municipal Class Environmental Assessment* (2000 as amended in 2007, 2011 and 2015).

The Master Plan of Archaeological Resources for the City of Toronto (Interim Report) (ASI 2004) was also consulted.

Authorization to carry out the activities necessary for the completion of the Stage 1 archaeological assessment was granted by Dillon Consulting on August 6th, 2020.

1.1.1 Treaties

The Study Area is within the Johnson-Butler Purchases and in the traditional territory of the Michi Saagiig and Chippewa Nations, collectively known as the Williams Treaties First Nations, including the Mississaugas of Alderville First Nation, Curve Lake First Nation, Hiawatha First Nation, Scugog Island First Nation and the Chippewas of Beausoleil First Nation, Georgina Island First Nation and the Rama First Nation (Williams Treaties First Nations 2017).

The purpose of the Johnson-Butler Purchases of 1787/1788 was to acquire from the Mississaugas the Carrying Place Trail and lands along the north shore of Lake Ontario from the Trent River to Etobicoke Creek.



As part of the Johnson-Butler Purchases, the British signed a treaty, sometimes referred to as the "Gunshot Treaty" with the Mississaugas in 1787 covering the north shore of Lake Ontario, beginning at the eastern boundary of the Toronto Purchase and continuing east to the Bay of Quinte, where it meets the Crawford Purchase. It was referred to as the "Gunshot Treaty" because it covered the land as far back from the lake as a person could hear a gunshot. Compensation for the land apparently included "approximately £2,000 and goods such as muskets, ammunition, tobacco, laced hats and enough red cloth for 12 coats" (Surtees 1984:37–45). First discussions about acquiring this land are said to have come about while the land ceded in the Toronto Purchase of 1787 was being surveyed and paid for (Surtees 1984:37–45). During this meeting with the Mississaugas, Sir John Johnson and Colonel John Butler proposed the purchase of lands east of the Toronto Purchase (Fullerton and Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation 2015). However, descriptions of the treaty differ between the British and Mississaugas, including the depth of the boundaries: "Rice Lake and Lake Simcoe, located about 13 miles and 48 miles north of Lake Ontario, respectively, were not mentioned as landmarks in the First Nations' description of the lands to be ceded. Additionally, original descriptions provided by the Chiefs of Rice Lake indicate a maximum depth of ten miles, versus an average of 15-16 miles in Colonel Butler's description" (Fullerton and Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation 2015).

However, records of the acquisition were not clear regarding the extent of lands agreed upon (Surtees 1984:37–45). To clarify this, in October and November of 1923, the governments of Canada and Ontario, chaired by A.S. Williams, signed treaties with the Chippewa and Michi Saagiig for three large tracts of land in central Ontario and the northern shore of Lake Ontario, the last substantial portion of land in southern Ontario that had not yet been ceded to the government (Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs 2013).

In 2018 the Government of Canada reached a settlement with the Williams Treaties First Nations reaffirming the recognized Treaty harvesting rights in the Williams Treaties territories of each of the seven nations.

The Study Area is also within the active Rouge River Valley Tract Claim, filed in 2015 by MCFN (Fullerton and Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation 2015).

1.2 Historical Context

The purpose of this section, according to the S & G, Section 7.5.7, Standard 1, is to describe the past and present land use and the settlement history and any other relevant historical information pertaining to the Study Area. A summary is first presented of the current understanding of the Indigenous land use of the Study Area. This is then followed by a review of the historical Euro-Canadian settlement history.

1.2.1 Indigenous Land Use and Settlement

Southern Ontario has been occupied by human populations since the retreat of the Laurentide glacier approximately 13,000 years before present (BP) (Ferris 2013). Populations at this time would have been highly mobile, inhabiting a boreal-parkland similar to the modern sub-arctic. By approximately 10,000 BP, the environment had progressively warmed (Edwards and Fritz 1988) and populations now occupied less extensive territories (Ellis and Deller 1990).



Between approximately 10,000-5,500 BP, the Great Lakes basins experienced low-water levels, and many sites which would have been located on those former shorelines are now submerged. This period produces the earliest evidence of heavy wood working tools, an indication of greater investment of labour in felling trees for fuel, to build shelter, and watercraft production. These activities suggest prolonged seasonal residency at occupation sites. Polished stone and native copper implements were being produced by approximately 8,000 BP; the latter was acquired from the north shore of Lake Superior, evidence of extensive exchange networks throughout the Great Lakes region. The earliest evidence for cemeteries dates to approximately 4,500-3,000 BP and is indicative of increased social organization, investment of labour into social infrastructure, and the establishment of socially prescribed territories (Ellis et al. 1990; Ellis et al. 2009; Brown 1995:13).

Between 3,000-2,500 BP, populations continued to practice residential mobility and to harvest seasonally available resources, including spawning fish. The Woodland period begins around 2,500 BP and exchange and interaction networks broaden at this time (Spence et al. 1990:136, 138) and by approximately 2,000 BP, evidence exists for small community camps, focusing on the seasonal harvesting of resources (Spence et al. 1990:155, 164). By 1,500 BP there is macro botanical evidence for maize in southern Ontario, and it is thought that maize only supplemented people's diet. There is earlier phytolithic evidence for maize in central New York State by 2,300 BP - it is likely that once similar analyses are conducted on Ontario ceramic vessels of the same period, the same evidence will be found (Birch and Williamson 2013:13–15). As is evident in detailed Anishinaabek ethnographies, winter was a period during which some families would depart from the larger group as it was easier to sustain smaller populations (Rogers 1962). It is generally understood that these populations were Algonquian-speakers during these millennia of settlement and land use.

From the beginning of the Late Woodland period at approximately 1,000 BP, lifeways became more similar to that described in early historical documents. Between approximately 1000-1300 Common Era (CE), the communal site is replaced by the village focused on horticulture. Seasonal disintegration of the community for the exploitation of a wider territory and more varied resource base was still practised (Williamson 1990:317). By 1300-1450 CE, this episodic community disintegration was no longer practised and populations now communally occupied sites throughout the year (Dodd et al. 1990:343). From 1450-1649 CE this process continued with the coalescence of these small villages into larger communities (Birch and Williamson 2013). Through this process, the socio-political organization of the First Nations, as described historically by the French and English explorers who first visited southern Ontario, was developed.

By 1600 CE, the communities within Simcoe County had formed the Confederation of Nations encountered by the first European explorers and missionaries. In the 1640s, the traditional enmity between the Haudenosaunee and the Huron-Wendat (and their Algonquian allies such as the Nippissing and Odawa) led to the dispersal of the Huron-Wendat. Shortly afterwards, the Haudenosaunee established a series of settlements at strategic locations along the trade routes inland from the north shore of Lake Ontario. By the 1690s however, the Anishinaabeg were the only communities with a permanent presence in southern Ontario. From the beginning of the eighteenth century to the assertion of British sovereignty in 1763, there was no interruption to Anishinaabeg control and use of southern Ontario.

1.2.2 Euro-Canadian Land Use: Township Survey and Settlement

Historically, the Study Area is located in the Former Township of Scarborough, County of York in Lot 4,5 & 8 Concession 4 and Lot 2 Concession 3.



The S & G stipulates that areas of early Euro-Canadian settlement (pioneer homesteads, isolated cabins, farmstead complexes), early wharf or dock complexes, pioneer churches, and early cemeteries are considered to have archaeological potential. Early historical transportation routes (trails, passes, roads, railways, portage routes), properties listed on a municipal register or designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act* or a federal, provincial, or municipal historic landmark or site are also considered to have archaeological potential.

For the Euro-Canadian period, the majority of early nineteenth century farmsteads (i.e., those that are arguably the most potentially significant resources and whose locations are rarely recorded on nineteenth century maps) are likely to be located in proximity to water. The development of the network of concession roads and railroads through the course of the nineteenth century frequently influenced the siting of farmsteads and businesses. Accordingly, undisturbed lands within 100 m of an early settlement road are also considered to have potential for the presence of Euro-Canadian archaeological sites.

The first Europeans to arrive in the area were transient merchants and traders from France and England, who followed Indigenous pathways and set up trading posts at strategic locations along the well-traveled river routes. All of these occupations occurred at sites that afforded both natural landfalls and convenient access, by means of the various waterways and overland trails, into the hinterlands. Early transportation routes followed existing Indigenous trails, both along the lakeshore and adjacent to various creeks and rivers (ASI 2006).

Township of Scarborough

The township of Scarborough, originally called Glasgow Township, was partially laid out to the east of the township of York. Beginning in 1791, Augustus Jones surveyed the new township and a baseline was laid out. The early survey of the township was found to be faulty and carelessly done, resulting in numerous lawsuits among property owners. To remedy this situation, a new survey of the township was undertaken under F.F. Passmore in 1864 to correct and confirm the township concession lines. In August 1793, Mrs. Simcoe noted in her diary that she and her party "came within sight of what is named in the Map the high lands of Toronto—the shore is extremely bold and has the appearance of Chalk Cliffs... they appeared so well that we talked of building a Summer Residence there and calling it Scarborough" (Bonis 1968:38). The first land grants were patented in Scarborough in 1796, and were issued to Loyalists, high ranking Upper Canadian government officials, and some absentee Loyalist grantees. Among the first landowners were: Captain William Mayne (1796); David Thomson (1801); Captain John McGill (1797); Captain William Demont (1798); John McDougall (1802); Sheriff Alexander McDonell (1806); and Donald McLean, clerk of the House of Assembly (1805).

The Euro-Canadian settlement of Scarborough remained slow, and in 1802 there were just 89 settlers in the Township. In 1803, the township contained just one assessable house and no grist or sawmills. The livestock was limited to five horses, eight oxen, 27 milch cows, seven "horned cattle" and 15 swine. In 1809 the population had increased to 140 men, women and children. The settlement and improvement of the township was aided when the Danforth Road was constructed across the township, but was checked in 1812 with the outbreak of the war. By 1819, new settlement was augmented by settlers from Britain, Scotland and Ireland, but the population remained low at just 349 inhabitants (Bonis 1968:52).

Village of Scarborough

Scarborough Village, located at the intersection of Markham Road and Eglinton, emerged as a speculative railway town after it became known that the Grand Trunk Railway would extend a line through



Scarborough. A man named Isaac Stoner laid out a town plan on 40 acres of Lot 16, Concession D, and sold property by auction in lots of one-quarter to one-fifth of an acre in 1855. In 1856, the railway erected a station where the line crossed Markham Road in 1856 (Bonis 1968:165; Brown 1997:103 and 196).

Canadian Northern Railway

The Toronto, Simcoe, and Lake Huron Union Rail Road Company was incorporated in 1844 and in 1850 was renamed the Ontario, Simcoe, and Huron Union Rail Road Company. The rail line opened on May 16,1853, and connected Toronto to Aurora (formerly Matchell's Corners) via a 48 kilometre track (Andreae 1997). The line was expanded with service to Bradford beginning June 13, 1853, and further expanded to Barrie on October 11 1853 (forming the path for the present Barrie rail corridor). The inaugural trip on May 16, 1853 from Toronto to Aurora is commemorated by a plaque at Toronto's Union Station, as it was the first steam locomotive operated in Ontario (Mika and Mika 1977).

In 1858, the company underwent a third name change becoming the Northern Railway Company of Canada. Subsequently, the Ontario, Simcoe & Huron Railway became known simply as the Northern Railway, until 1888 when the ownership amalgamated with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, at which point the Northern Railway became part of the Grand Trunk Railway. Rail tracks were quickly laid across Ontario, as well as other parts of the country linking settlements and provinces. The population of Canada doubled between 1851 and 1901 but the miles of rail laid increased exponentially from 159 to 18,294 miles (Andreae 1997). The Northern Railway was a major draw factor for businesses in the Counties of York and Simcoe and caused many communities with a station to thrive and those without to dissipate (Town of Newmarket 2018). In 1923, the railway company was again amalgamated, this time with the government-owned Canadian National Railway (CN).

Commuter service began on the line in 1972, operated by CN as part of the CN Newmarket Subdivision. This commuter service was taken over by VIA Rail in 1978, and then by GO Transit in 1982. GO Transit continues to operate this commuter service to this day.

The Canadian Pacific Railway

In 1885 the CPR was completed, linking west and east Canada. The CPR was intended to link British Columbia with the east coast, and to bring it into the Canadian Confederacy. A condition of British Columbia for joining the Confederacy in 1868 was the construction of a 'transcontinental wagon road' within two years of their admission. However, a range of setbacks and issues with policy and funding, including dependency on American interests, delayed the construction of the CPR until the early 1880s. On October 21, 1880, the contract for the construction of the railroad was signed. The CPR was given Royal Assent on February 15th, 1881 and a Royal Charter shortly after. In May 1885 the final spike was set within the eastern section of the CPR, and on November 8th of the same year the last spike in the transcontinental railway was driven in (Churcher 2013).

There are various segments of the CPR line through southern Ontario. The Ontario and Quebec Railway travelled between Perth and Toronto via Tweed, Havelock, Peterborough, Agincourt, Leaside and North Toronto. The other, which runs through the subject study area, was the CP Lakeshore Railway, which travelled between Perth and Toronto via the communities on the north shore of Lake Ontario (Canadian Pacific 2020).



Rouge National Urban Park

The lands that now encompass the Rouge National Urban Park had formerly been used for various leisure, economic, and industrial activities, including historical apple orchards, agricultural farms, parks, mills, gravel pits, landfills, hotels and inns, and schoolhouses. The area remains the site of significant biodiversity, including forest, rivers, farmlands, and wetlands, as well as featuring unique wildlife and plants. In the early 1990s, the Province of Ontario partnered with various municipalities, the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA), the Friends of the Rouge Watershed, the Rouge Park Alliance, First Nations, conservationists, and community activists to create Rouge Park on lands in Scarborough, Pickering, and Markham. Beginning in 2011, efforts to create the first urban National Park in Canada was underway. Soon thereafter, land transfers, funding, and legislation came into effect, and in 2015, the Rouge National Urban Park was formally established. Subsequent land transfers have enabled the park to grow to 79.1 km². The Park is now home to environmental education initiatives, campgrounds, hiking trails, and public events (Parks Canada 2019).

1.2.3 Historical Map Review

The 1860 *Tremaine's Map of the County of York* (Tremaine 1860) and the 1878 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of York* (Miles & Co. 1878) examined to determine the presence of historic features within the Study Area during the nineteenth century (Table 1; Figures 2-3).

It should be noted, however, that not all features of interest were mapped systematically in the Ontario series of historical atlases, given that they were financed by subscription, and subscribers were given preference with regard to the level of detail provided on the maps. Moreover, not every feature of interest would have been within the scope of the atlases.

In addition, the use of historical map sources to reconstruct/predict the location of former features within the modern landscape generally proceeds by using common reference points between the various sources. These sources are then geo-referenced in order to provide the most accurate determination of the location of any property on historic mapping sources. The results of such exercises are often imprecise or even contradictory, as there are numerous potential sources of error inherent in such a process, including the vagaries of map production (both past and present), the need to resolve differences of scale and resolution, and distortions introduced by reproduction of the sources. To a large degree, the significance of such margins of error is dependent on the size of the feature one is attempting to plot, the constancy of reference points, the distances between them, and the consistency with which both they and the target feature are depicted on the period mapping.

	1860 Map of the County of York			1878 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of York		
Con #	Lot	Property	Historical	Property	Historical	
	#	Owner(s)	Feature(s)	Owner(s)	Feature(s)	
4	8	Wm. A. Milne	Waterway, saw mill	Wm. A. Milne	Waterway, roadway, saw mill	
4	7	Wm. A. Milne	Waterway	Wm. A. Milne	Rouge River, roadway	
4	5	G. Pierce	Roadway, waterway, saw mill, school house	Mrs. Pearce	Roadway, waterway	

Table 1: Nineteenth-century property owner(s) and historical features(s) within or adjacent to the Study Area



		1860 Map of the County of York		1878 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of York	
Con #	Lot #	Property Owner(s)	Historical Feature(s)	Property Owner(s)	Historical Feature(s)
4	4	P. Boyour	Roadway, waterway, sawmill	Jno. Diller	Roadway, waterway, school house
3	2	Jas. Maxwell	Roadway, waterway	James. A. Maxwell	Roadway, waterway
3	1	Nelson Gates	Waterway	Nelson Gates	Waterway
2	3	Wm Stotts Ed Huxtable	None None	Wm W Stotts E. Huxtable	None
2	2	Chas Sanders	Waterway	Chas Sanders	Waterway

The 1860 map depicts the Rouge River and the "Small Rouge River" intersecting the Study Area at five points. Old Finch Avenue traverses east-west and Sewells Road traverses north-south, both following a straight line which may reflect concession boundaries rather than operational roadways. Meadowvale Road is also shown traversing north-south. Sheppard Avenue is shown on both sides of the Rouge River, while Twyn Rivers Road was not illustrated. One sawmill is shown west of the Study Area on Lot 8, Concession 4 with a mill pond, and a second sawmill is shown west of the Study Area on Lot 5, Concession 4 with a mill pond.

By 1878, the Study Area on Lots 7-8, Concession 4 is shown to be forested, and a road is shown to curve north intersecting the Study Area approximately where the Milne Bailey Bridge exists. A schoolhouse (now known as Hillside Outdoor Education Centre) is illustrated at the southeast corner of Meadowvale Road and Old Finch Avenue. The sawmill on Lot 5, Concession 4 is no longer depicted by 1878.

1.2.4 Twentieth-Century Mapping Review

The 1914 National Topographic Series Markham sheet (Department of Militia and Defence 1914), the 1954 aerial photography (Hunting Survey Corporation Limited 1954), and the 1992 aerial photography (City of Toronto Archives) were examined to determine the extent and nature of development and land uses within the Study Area (Figures 4-5).

The 1914 map depicts Meadowvale Road and Twin Rivers Drive in their current alignments. Sewells Road and Old Finch Avenue are largely in their current alignments, however there is a fork in Old Finch Avenue at its junction to Sewells Road. Sewells Road Bridge, Hillside Bridge, Stott's Bridge, and Maxwell's Bridge are depicted. The Canadian Northern Ontario Railway intersects through Sewells Road and Meadowvale Road in the northern part of the Study Area.

By 1954 the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway is labelled "Abandoned Railway" and a second line marked Canadian Pacific Railway runs parallel to the north. The Study Area is in a largely rural setting. The section of Old Finch Avenue at Sewells Road is no longer forked. South of Old Finch Avenue east of Sewells Road is an orchard. Agricultural fields are east, west, and southwest of Meadowvale Road, with wooded areas following along the Little Rouge riverbed. Along Twyn Rivers Road wooded areas following along the riverbeds, and agricultural fields are found southwest and northeast of the area.



The 1992 aerial photography shows the roads in their present alignment and indicates residential development to the west of Sewells Road, east of Meadowvale Road near the south, and to the southwest of Twyn Rivers Drive.

1.3 Archaeological Context

This section provides background research pertaining to previous archaeological fieldwork conducted within and in the vicinity of the Study Area, its environmental characteristics (including drainage, soils or surficial geology and topography, etc.), and current land use and field conditions. Three sources of information were consulted to provide information about previous archaeological research: the site record forms for registered sites available online from the MHSTCI through "Ontario's Past Portal"; published and unpublished documentary sources; and the files of ASI.

1.3.1 Current Land Use and Field Conditions

A review of available Google satellite imagery since 2002 shows that the Study Areas remain largely unchanged.

A Stage 1 property inspection was conducted on October 5, 2020 that noted the Study Area is located along parts of Sewells Road and Old Finch Avenue around Sewells Bridge and Milne Bailey Bridge; along Meadowvale Road around Hillside Bridge; and along Twyn Rivers Road around Stott's Bridge and Maxwell's Bridge.

Sewells Road and Old Finch Avenue are both two-lane roads surrounded by a rural landscape crossing the main channel of the Rouge River. The roads intersect on a plateau within an oxbow of the river. Sewells Road between Old Finch Avenue and the CPR line is largely wooded on both the east and west sides. The approaches to the Sewell's Bridge are on a winding stretch of road. Old Finch Avenue east of Sewells Road is also a winding stretch of road with dense woods on both sides of road. Hiking trails meander through the woods, with access immediately south of the Milne Bailey Bridge.

The stretch of Meadowvale Road from the CPR in the north to approximately 175 metres south of the intersection with Old Finch Avenue is a two-lane road (though reduced to one lane on the Hillside Bridge) with trees lining both east and west sides, crossing the Little Rouge Creek. The road travels over and alongside the steeply sloping banks of the creek.

Twyn Rivers Drive is a two-lane road with dense forest on both sides crossing the main Rouge River channel at Stott's Bridge and the Little Rouge Creek at Maxwell's Bridge. The road travels east from the top of the west riverbank into the floodplain and over a linear plateau which divides the creek from the river, and descends into the creek floodplain. Forested areas, with hiking trails running through them, border the road near the eastern terminus of this zone.

1.3.2 Geography

In addition to the known archaeological sites, the state of the natural environment is a helpful indicator of archaeological potential. Accordingly, a description of the physiography and soils are briefly discussed for the Study Area.



The S & G stipulates that primary water sources (lakes, rivers, streams, creeks, etc.), secondary water sources (intermittent streams and creeks, springs, marshes, swamps, etc.), ancient water sources (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, etc.), as well as accessible or inaccessible shorelines (high bluffs, swamp or marsh fields by the edge of a lake, sandbars stretching into marsh, etc.) are characteristics that indicate archaeological potential.

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. Since water sources have remained relatively stable in Ontario since 5,000 BP (Karrow and Warner 1990:Figure 2.16), proximity to water can be regarded as a useful index for the evaluation of archaeological site potential. Indeed, distance from water has been one of the most commonly used variables for predictive modeling of site location.

Other geographic characteristics that can indicate archaeological potential include: elevated topography (eskers, drumlins, large knolls, and plateaux), pockets of well-drained sandy soil, especially near areas of heavy soil or rocky ground, distinctive land formations 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 (migratory routes, spawning areas) are also considered characteristics that indicate archaeological potential (S & G, Section 1.3.1).

The Study Area is located within the drumlinized till plains and the sand plains of the South Slope Physiographic Region, as well as the Sand Plains of the Iroquois Plain Physiographic Region of southern Ontario (Chapman and Putnam 1984).

The South Slope physiographic region (Chapman and Putnam 1984:172-174) is the southern slope of the Oak Ridges Moraine. The South Slope meets the Moraine at heights of approximately 300 metres above sea level, and descends southward toward Lake Ontario, ending, in some areas, at elevations below 150 metres above sea level. Numerous streams descend the South Slope, having cut deep valleys in the till.

The Iroquois Plain physiographic region of southern Ontario is a lowland region bordering Lake Ontario. This region is characteristically flat, and formed by lacustrine deposits laid down by the inundation of Lake Iroquois, a body of water that existed during the late Pleistocene. This region extends from the Trent River, around the western part of Lake Ontario, to the Niagara River, spanning a distance of 300 km (Chapman and Putnam 1984:190). The old shorelines of Lake Iroquois include cliffs, bars, beaches and boulder pavements. The old sandbars in this region are good aquifers that supply water to farms and villages. The gravel bars are quarried for road and building material, while the clays of the old lake bed have been used for the manufacture of bricks (Chapman and Putnam 1984:196).

In the vicinity of the Study Area, the South Slope is ground moraine of limited relief. A shorecliff intersects the Study Area south of Mine Bailey Bridge and Hillside Bridge.

Figure 8 depicts surficial geology for the Study Area. The surficial geology mapping demonstrates that the Study Area is underlain by stone-poor, sandy silt to silty sand-textured till on Paleozoic Terrain and modern alluvial deposits consisting of clay, silt, sand, and gravel that may contain organic materials (Ontario Geological Survey 2010).



Soils in the Study Area consist of Woburn loam and Brighton sandy loam, grey-brown podzolics with good drainage; Milliken loam and Berrien sandy loam, grey-brown podzolics with imperfect drainage; and Bottom Land, an alluvial with variable drainage (Figure 9).

The Study Area crosses the Rouge River and Little Rouge River within the Rouge River watershed. The Rouge River watershed drains an area of over 335 square kilometres in the Regions of York and Durham, the Cities of Toronto and Pickering, and the Towns of Markham, Richmond Hill, and Whitchurch-Stouffville. South of the Peel Plain, the Rouge trail corridor traverses another swath of the South Slope before encountering the Iroquois Lake Plain, an area of gently rolling till plain and low drumlins. As a result of Euro-Canadian forest clearance and agriculture, it is likely that the Rouge River and its tributaries have been substantially altered since the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Deforestation has likely resulted in larger volumes of water flowing into the streams as surface run-off, increasing both the temperature of the watercourses and their sediment content. In addition, the removal of the forest cover has permitted solar radiation to further warm the waters. These and other modern alterations are also likely to have resulted in increased rates of waterflow, which, concomitantly, have exacerbated erosion and degradation of the water table. Therefore, it is probable that stream levels in the area of the subject property were both higher and slower prior to land clearance. The watershed contains protected areas such as the Greenbelt and Rouge National Urban Park.

1.3.3 Previous Archaeological Research

In Ontario, information concerning archaeological sites is stored in the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database (OASD) maintained by the MHSTCI. This database contains archaeological sites registered within the Borden system. Under the Borden system, Canada has been divided into grid blocks based on latitude and longitude. A Borden block is approximately 13 km east to west, and approximately 18.5 km north to south. Each Borden block is referenced by a four-letter designator, and sites within a block are numbered sequentially as they are found. The Study Area under review is located in Borden block *AkGs*, *AkGt*, and *AlGt*.

According to the OASD, 42 previously registered archaeological sites are located within one kilometre of the Study Area, none of which are within the Study Area and one of which is within 50 metres (MHSTCI 2020). A summary of the sites is provided below.

Table 2: List of previously registered sites within one kilometre of the Study Area					
Borden #	Site Name	Cultural Affiliation	Site type	Researcher	
AkGs-11	William Brown	Euro-Canadian	Mill	MPPA 1987	
AkGt-38	Nash	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Camp/campsite	MPPA 1987	
AkGt-39	David Milne 1	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Findspot	MPPA 1987	
AkGt-40	David Milne 2	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Camp/campsite	MPPA 1987	
AkGt-41	Milne	Ancestral Huron-Wendat	Village	MPPA 1987	
AkGt-42	J. Beare	Archaic	Unknown	MPPA 1987	
AkGt-43	David Milne 3	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Unknown	MPPA 1987	
AkGt-44	David Milne 4	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Unknown	MPPA 1987	
AkGt-46	Milne's Forest	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Unknown	MPPA 1987	



Borden #	Site Name	Cultural Affiliation	Site type	Researcher
AkGt-63	n/a	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Camp/campsite	TRCA 2006
AkGt-64	n/a	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Scatter	Unknown 2006
AkGt-65	n/a	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Findspot	Unknown 2006
AkGt-74	n/a	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Findspot	TRCA 2009
AkGt-75	n/a	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Findspot	TRCA 2009
AkGt-76	n/a	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Findspot	TRCA 2009
AkGt-77	n/a	Euro-Canadian	Unknown	TRCA 2009
AlGt-47	Sewell 2	Euro-Canadian; Woodland, Late	Camp/campsite; fishing; hunting	TRCA 1973, 2006; MPPA 1987; Janice Teichroeb 2006
AlGt-57	Unwin	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Findspot	MPPA 1973; N/A 1973
AlGt-58	J. Rittenhouse	Other	Unknown	MPPA 1987; N/A 1973
AlGt-63	D. Reesor	Ancestral Huron-Wendat	Village	MPPA 1987
AlGt-164	Plug Hat	Archaic, Middle	Camp/campsite	MPPA 1987
AlGt-165	John Sewell 1	Archaic, Middle	Unknown	MPPA 1987
AlGt-177	Hope Site	Other	Cemetery	MPPA 1987
AlGt-178	Muirson I	Archaic	Unknown	MPPA 1987
AlGt-180	Mercer	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Camp/campsite	MPPA 1987
AlGt-181	Udell	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Findspot	MPPA 1987
AlGt-182	Robinson	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Camp/campsite	MPPA 1987
AlGt-184	Pratt	Archaic, Middle	Camp / campsite	MPPA 1987; TRCA 2004
AlGt-186	Speer	Archaic	Findspot	MPPA 1987
AlGt-501	Robinson 2	Euro-Canadian	Homestead	TRCA 2005
AlGt-513	n/a	Euro-Canadian	Unknown	TRCA 2007
AlGt-514	n/a	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Unknown	TRCA 2007
AlGt-535	n/a	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Findspot	TRCA 2007
AlGt-541	n/a	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Findspot	TRCA 2008
AlGt-542	n/a	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Findspot	TRCA 2008
AlGt-543	n/a	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Findspot	TRCA 2008
AlGt-544	George Pearse	Euro-Canadian	Scatter	TRCA 2008
AlGt-545	n/a	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Findspot	TRCA 2008
AlGt-546	n/a	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Findspot	TRCA 2008
AlGt-594	n/a	Euro-Canadian	Farmstead	TRCA 2009
AlGt-637	Site C	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Unknown	TRCA 2004



Borden #	Site Name	Cultural Affiliation	Site type	Researcher
AlGt-655	n/a	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Findspot	TRCA 2018
Sites with	in the Study Area	in Bold		
Sitor with	in 50 m in <i>Italics</i>			

MPPA – Mayer, Pihl, Poulton & Associates TRCA – Toronto and Region Conservation Authority

Two sites are located within 50 m of the Study Area and exhibit further CHVI (see *Supplementary Documentation*). AlGt-542 is not considered to extend into the area of proposed impacts for the Rouge Park Bridges project. The Milne Site (AkGt-41) is an ancestral Huron-Wendat village site circa AD 1300-1400 located within the Study Area (see *Supplementary Documentation*). It was encountered during pedestrian survey which was conducted at two metre intervals during the *Archaeological Facility Master Plan Study of the Northeast Scarborough Study Area* by Mayer, Pihl, Poulton & Associates in 1987 (Mayer, Pihl, Poulton and Associates Inc. 1988). Milne is considered to be highly significant and exhibits further CHVI. An affiliated ossuary has not yet been identified for the village.

D. Reesor (AlGt-63) is an ancestral Huron-Wendat village site located within 150 metres of the Study Area. It was encountered during test pit survey during the *Archaeological Facility Master Plan Study of the Northeast Scarborough Study Area* by Mayer, Pihl, Poulton & Associates in 1987 (MPP 1987) (see *Supplementary Documentation*). The OASD notes that the site has further CHVI. An affiliated ossuary has not yet been identified for the village.

According to the background research, five previous reports detail fieldwork within 50 m of the Study Area.

ASI (2007) conducted a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (AA) of the Southeast Trunk Collector, bound by Ninth Line to the west to east of Brock Street, to 16th Avenue and Highway 7 to the north, and Old Finch Avenue and Finch avenue to the south. It overlaps the current Study Area at Sewells Road and Old Finch Avenue, and at Meadowvale Road. Background research determined the project area held archaeological potential and would require Stage 2 archaeological assessment. [P057-322-2006]

ASI (2014) conducted a Stage 1-2 AA of Sewells Road improvements, overlapping the current Study Area along Sewell's Road from the north of the CP railwayto Old Finch Avenue. The study corridor was limited to the public right-of-way (ROW) lands. All areas determined to exhibit archaeological potential were subject to test pit survey at five metre intervals. Within the overlapping area, no positive test pits were encountered. The Milne site (AkGt-41) was noted as a significant ancestral Huron-Wendat village in proximity to the project area, and it was recommended that a licensed archaeologist be present to monitor the removal of topsoil for all areas within 1000 metres of the Milne site. Given the proximity of the Milne site to the ROW lands, it was also recommended that a Stage 3 archaeological assessment be conducted in the ROW lands adjacent to the site to determine if any site deposits have survived road construction activities, in accordance with S & G Section 2.2, Guideline 4. [P392-0035-2013]

ASI (2015) conducted a Stage 3 construction and ossuary monitoring for the Milne site (AkGt-41), overlapping the current Study Area within Sewell's Road from the rail line to Old Finch Avenue. To avoid any impacts to these sites the City of Toronto reduced the project scope to: ditch cleaning to improve drainage around existing culverts; and "like for like" replacement of the asphalt to above the existing granular layer. As best practice, the City of Toronto Heritage Planning Services department



requested that a licensed archaeologist be on-site to monitor the re-paving and ditch cleaning activities due to the significance and sensitive nature of the Hamlin and Milne site deposits. Construction activities undertaken during the Sewells Road improvements were observed and did not impact any archaeological resources associated with the Milne site. The report recommended that any future work in the Sewells Road ROW should be preceded by Stage 3 site-specific assessment in accordance with the S & G in order to clarify the nature and extent of the site deposits. [P094-0192-2014, P094-0193-2014]

TRCA (2002) conducted an AA of Glen Eagles Trail, within 50 metres of the current Study Area southeast of Twyn Rivers Drive and Sheppard Avenue. A pedestrian survey was conducted at 1.5 metre intervals, which did not locate cultural material. The project area was recommended to be cleared of further archaeological concerns. [2001-056-007]

TRCA (2010) conducted an 1-2 AA of the Rouge Park Restoration projects. Part of the project area was within the current Study Area west of Meadowvale Road. The area was subject to pedestrian survey, and survey transects were decreased over a ten-metre radius when artifacts were encountered. One lithic findspot (AlGt-542) with an assemblage consisting of one piece of Onondaga shatter and one calcined bone was encountered. Additional artifacts through intensification were not recovered. It was noted that the project area had been subject to low impact cultivation activities and therefore the spatial veracity of the recovered artifacts had been minimally compromised. It was recommended that the findspot be subject to Stage 3 archaeological assessment if the property were to be impacted in future. [P019-151-2008]. Therefore, the AlGt-542 site is unlikely to extend into the current Study Area and the project will not trigger Stage 3.

2.0 FIELD METHODS: PROPERTY INSPECTION

A Stage 1 property inspection must adhere to the S & G, Section 1.2, Standards 1-6, which are discussed below. The entire property and its periphery must be inspected. The inspection may be either systematic or random. Coverage must be sufficient to identify the presence or absence of any features of archaeological potential. The inspection must be conducted when weather conditions permit good visibility of land features. Natural landforms and watercourses are to be confirmed if previously identified. Additional features such as elevated topography, relic water channels, glacial shorelines, well-drained soils within heavy soils and slightly elevated areas within low and wet areas should be identified and documented such as woodlots, bogs or other permanently wet areas, areas of steeper grade than indicated on topographic mapping, areas of overgrown vegetation, areas of heavy soil, and recent land disturbance such as grading, fill deposits and vegetation clearing. The inspection should also identify and document structures and built features that will affect assessment strategies, such as heritage structures or landscapes, cairns, monuments or plaques, and cemeteries.

The Stage 1 archaeological assessment property inspection was conducted under the field direction of John Sleath of ASI, on October 5, 2020, in order to gain first-hand knowledge of the geography, topography, and current conditions and to evaluate and map archaeological potential of the Study Area. It was a visual inspection from publicly accessible lands/public right-of-ways only and did not include excavation or collection of archaeological resources. Fieldwork was conducted when weather conditions were deemed clear with good visibility, per S & G Section 1.2., Standard 2. Field observations are compiled onto the existing conditions of the Study Area in Section 7.0 (Figures 10-16) and associated photographic plates are presented in Section 8.0 (Plates 1-20).



3.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

The historical and archaeological contexts have been analyzed to help determine the archaeological potential of the Study Area. Results of the analysis of the Study Area property inspection and background research are presented in Section 3.1.

3.1 Analysis of Archaeological Potential

The S & G, Section 1.3.1, lists criteria that are indicative of archaeological potential. The Study Area meets the following criteria indicative of archaeological potential:

- Previously identified archaeological sites (See Table #2; ancestral Huron-Wendat villages);
- Water sources: primary, secondary, or past water source (Rouge River, Little Rouge Creek);
- Early historic transportation routes (Sewells Rd, Meadowvale Rd, Twyn River Dr, Old Finch Ave, CPR);
- Proximity to early settlements (sawmills, school, farmsteads); and
- Well-drained soils (Woburn, Brighton)

According to the S & G, Section 1.4 Standard 1e, no areas within a property containing locations listed or designated by a municipality can be recommended for exemption from further assessment unless the area can be documented as disturbed. The Municipal Heritage Register was consulted and two properties within the Study Area are Listed or Designated under the Ontario Heritage Act:

- Hillside School, 2259 Meadowvale Road, Designated Part IV under OHA, By Law 037-1999
- Diller-Pearse House, 2271 Meadowvale Road, Listed

The *Master Plan of Archaeological Resources for the City of Toronto (Interim Report)* (ASI et al. 2004) indicates the Study Area exhibits archaeological potential. A number of Late Woodland and contact period sites have been defined as Archaeologically Sensitive Areas (ASAs) in Toronto. In general, ASAs represent concentrations of interrelated features of considerable scale and complexity, some of which are related to single particularly significant occupations or a long-term continuity of use, while others are the product of a variety of changes in use or association through time and therefore constitute an array of overlapping but potentially discrete deposits. The Study Area is within approximately 100 metres of the AlGt-63 ASA and is within the AkGt-41 ASA.

These criteria are indicative of potential for the identification of Indigenous and Euro-Canadian archaeological resources, depending on soil conditions and the degree to which soils have been subject to deep disturbance.

The property inspection determined that the Study Area exhibits archaeological potential. These areas will require Stage 2 archaeological assessment prior to any construction activities. According to the S & G Section 2.1.2, test pit survey is required on terrain where ploughing is not viable, such as wooded areas, properties where existing landscaping or infrastructure would be damaged, overgrown farmland with heavy brush or rocky pasture, and narrow linear corridors up to 10 metres wide (Plates 6, 11, 13-14, 18-19; Figures 11-16: areas highlighted in green).

The Milne Site (AkGt-41) is an ancestral Huron-Wendat village within the Study Area along Sewell's Road. Original Stage 2 pedestrian survey (Mayer, Pihl, Poulton and Associates Inc. 1988) located the site



and suggested it may cross under Sewell's Road, therefore additional survey was recommended in the ROW. ASI (2014) subsequently conducted Stage 2 test pit survey in 2014 of the Sewell's Road ROW and did not identify any material associated with the Milne Site. Archaeological construction monitoring of the Sewell's Road resurfacing (with impacts only above the existing road granular layer) was also conducted in 2015 by ASI (2015) and did not identify any disturbance beyond the road bed or locate any archaeological materials in the ROW.

The location of the Milne Site (AkGt-41) as defined by the original 1988 survey (Mayer, Pihl, Poulton and Associates Inc. 1988) should be noted when conducting Stage 2 survey (see *Supplementary Documentation* Appendix A). These areas require reassessment by Stage 2 survey, prior to any construction activities, due to the passage of time since the site was first located and has been subject to further plough disturbance. According to the S & G Section 2.1.1, pedestrian survey is required in actively or recently cultivated fields (Figure 11: areas highlighted in orange).

Despite being visually assessed as disturbed by ASI (2014), test pit survey is recommended within the Sewell's Road ROW to confirm the presence of any intact soils (Plate 21; Figure 11: areas highlighted in teal). It is possible that the results of this Stage 2 survey will lead to a recommendation for Stage 3 site-specific assessment. This previous ASI report (2014) also recommended that Stage 3 site-specific assessment should be conducted within the ROW due to the significance of the Milne Site, with the assumption that the site will also require Stage 4 mitigation depending on the level of disturbance within the Sewell's Road ROW lands (Figure 11: areas highlighted in teal).

The Milne Site (AkGt-41) and the D. Reesor site (AlGt-63) are both ancestral Huron-Wendat villages for which an associated ossuary has not yet been identified. In order to mitigate this concern, it is recommended that predevelopment topsoil removal (grading) within those development area lands that are located within 1000 metres of documented village sites *and* within 300 metres of any current or former water source should be subject to an archaeological monitoring program (see *Supplementary Documentation*). Part of Sewell's Road has been previously subject to a program of archaeological monitoring by ASI in 2015 during construction impacts which occurred above the existing granular surface. Additional construction monitoring is required in these areas for any construction impacts below the existing granular surface (Figure 11-12: areas hatched in black).

A combination of property inspection and assessment of topographic mapping (ESRI 2020) determined that some of lands within the Study Area are sloped in excess of 20 degrees, and according to the S & G Section 2.1 do not retain potential (Plates 3, 10, 12, 16; Figures 11-16: areas highlighted in pink). A part of the Study Area is located in low and wet conditions, and according to the S & G Section 2.1 does not retain potential (Plate 9; Figures 11-16: areas highlighted in blue). The remainder of the Study Area has been subjected to deep soil disturbance events and according to the S & G Section 1.3.2 do not retain archaeological potential (Plates 1-2, 4-5, 7-8, 10-17, 20; Figures 11-16: areas highlighted in yellow). These areas do not require further survey.

3.2 Conclusions

The Stage 1 background study determined that 42 previously registered archaeological sites are located within one kilometre of the Study Area, of which one is within 50 metres and one is an ancestral Huron-Wendat village site located within the Study Area (AkGt-41). One additional ancestral Huron-Wendat village site is located within one kilometre of the Study Area. The property inspection determined that parts of the Study Area exhibit archaeological potential and will require Stage 2 assessment. Part of the



Study Area is within an area considered to have ossuary potential and will require a program of archaeological monitoring. In addition, according to recommendations from previous assessments in the Study Area, Stage 3 will be required within the Sewell's Road right-of-way near the Milne Site (AkGt-41).

4.0 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

In light of these results, the following recommendations are made:

- 1. Parts of the Study Area exhibit archaeological potential. These lands require Stage 2 archaeological assessment by test pit survey and pedestrian survey, both at five metre intervals, prior to any proposed construction activities (Figures 11-16: areas highlighted in green and orange);
- 2. AlGt-542 is a Pre-Contact Indigenous findspot with Cultural Heritage Value or Interest located within 50 metres of the Study Area. The location of the site should be noted while any Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment is undertaken in this area however it is not anticipated to extend into the Study Area;
- 3. Part of the Study Area was previously assessed by ASI (P392-0035-2013, P094-0192-2014, P094-0193-2014). In keeping with these previous recommendations, the Sewell's Road ROW in proximity to the Milne site (AkGt-41) requires Stage 3 site-specific assessment (Figure 11: areas highlighted in teal). Stage 2 test pit survey at a minimum of 5 m intervals should be conducted prior to the Stage 3 assessment in these lands to confirm the presence of any intact soils. The Stage 3 should be conducted in accordance with Table 3.1 Standards 10-12 for Stage 3 excavation of Woodland Period village sites:
 - The Stage 3 archaeological assessment should commence with the creation of a recording grid on a fixed datum, the position of which has been recorded using a GPS.
 - Following the S & G Table 3.1 Standards 10-12 for Stage 3 excavation of Woodland Period village sites, a series of one metre by one metre units will be excavated at five metre intervals across all areas of artifact concentrations. An equal number of additional test units will be excavated across the remainder of the project area, either in a systematic grid or in focused areas to recover a sample of topsoil deposits. The test units should be excavated five centimetres into the sterile subsoil and soil fills screened through six-millimetre wire mesh to facilitate artifact recovery. The sterile subsoil should be troweled and all soil profiles examined for undisturbed cultural deposits.
 - During the Stage 3 assessment, meaningful engagement with Indigenous communities, should be conducted, as outlined in the S & G Section 3.5, and in the Engaging Aboriginal Communities in Archaeology Technical Bulletin (Ministry of Tourism and Culture 2011a);



- 4. Part of Sewell's Road has been previously subject to a program of archaeological monitoring by ASI in 2015 during construction impacts which occurred above the existing granular surface. Additional construction monitoring is required in these areas for any construction impacts below the existing granular surface (Figure 11-12: areas hatched in black);
- 5. The Milne Site (AkGt-41) and the D. Reesor (AlGt-63) are ancestral Huron-Wendat villages adjacent to the Study Area. An associated ossuary has not yet been identified for either site. To minimize the risk of impacting an ossuary within the project limits, a licensed archaeologist should be engaged to conduct a program of archaeological monitoring during the removal of topsoil for all parts of the Study Area that are within both 1000 metres of the sites and 300 metres of water (see Supplementary Documentation);
- 6. The remainder of the Study Area does not retain archaeological potential on account of deep and extensive land disturbance, low and wet conditions, slopes in excess of 20 degrees, or being previously assessed. These lands do not require further archaeological assessment; and,
- 7. Should the proposed work extend beyond the current Study Area, further Stage 1 archaeological assessment should be conducted to determine the archaeological potential of the surrounding lands.

NOTWITHSTANDING the results and recommendations presented in this study, ASI notes that no archaeological assessment, no matter how thorough or carefully completed, can necessarily predict, account for, or identify every form of isolated or deeply buried archaeological deposit. In the event that archaeological remains are found during subsequent construction activities, the consultant archaeologist, approval authority, and the Cultural Programs Unit of the MHSTCI should be immediately notified.



5.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION

ASI also advises compliance with the following legislation:

- This report is submitted to the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, RSO 1990, c 0.18. The report is reviewed to ensure that it complies with the standards and guidelines that are issued by the Minister, and that the archaeological field work and report recommendations ensure the conservation, preservation and protection of the cultural heritage of Ontario. When all matters relating to archaeological sites within the project area of a development proposal have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries, 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.
- 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 time as a licensed archaeologist has completed archaeological field work 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 Archaeology Reports referred to in Section 65.1 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.
- 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 sec. 48 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.
- The *Cemeteries Act*, R.S.O. 1990 c. C.4 and the *Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act*, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33 (when proclaimed in force) require that any person discovering human remains must notify the police or coroner and the Registrar of Cemeteries at the Ministry of Consumer Services.
- 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, nor may artifacts be removed from them, except by a person holding an archaeological license.



6.0 **REFERENCES CITED**

Andreae, C.

1997 *Lines of Country: An Atlas of Railway and Waterway History in Canada*. Boston Mills Press, Erin, Ontario.

ASI, (Archaeological Services Inc.)

2006 *Historical Overview and Assessment of Archaeological Potential Don River Watershed, City of Toronto.* Report on file with the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries, Toronto.

2007 Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Southeast Collector Trunk Sewer Individual EA Regions of York and Durham, Ontario. Report on file with the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries, Toronto.

2013 Archaeological Management Plan for the Region of York. Long Range Planning, York Region.

2014 Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment (Background Study and Property Assessment) Sewells Road Improvements Old Finch Avenue to Little Rouge Creek, Former Township of Scarborough, County of York, City of Toronto.

2015 Stage 3 Construction and Ossuary Monitoring Hamlin and Milne Sites Sewells Road, South of Rouge River to Little Rouge Creek Former Township of Scarborough, County of York City of Toronto, Ontario.

ASI, (Archaeological Services Inc.), Cuesta Systems Inc., Commonwealth Historic Resources Management Limited, Golder Associates, and Historica Research Limited. 2004 *A Master Plan of Archaeological Resources for the City of Toronto (Interim Report)*. https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/97cc-city-planning-a-master-plan-ofarchaeological-resources.pdf.

Assikinack, F.

1858 Legends and Traditions of the Odawa Indians. *The Canadian Journal, Second Series* III:115–125.

Birch, J., and R.F. Williamson

2013 *The Mantle Site: An Archaeological History of an Ancestral Wendat Community.* Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., Latham.

Bonis, R.R.

1968 A History of Scarborough. Scarborough Public Library Board, Scarborough, Ontario.

Bowman, I.

1975 History of the Peninsula Portage and Canoe Route: Colpoy's Bay to Lake Huron - with



an Overview of Indian Occupation of the Bruce Peninsula. Toronto.

Brown, J.

1995 On Mortuary Analysis – with Special Reference to the Saxe-Binford Research Program. In *Regional Approaches to Mortuary Analysis*, L. A. Beck, ed, pp. 3–23. Plenum Press, New York.

Brown, R.

1997 Toronto's Lost Villages. Polar Bear Press, Toronto.

Canadian Pacific

2020 Our History. Canadian Pacific. https://cpconnectingcanada.ca/our-history/.

Chapman, L.J., and F. Putnam

1984 *The Physiography of Southern Ontario*. Vol. 2. Ontario Geologic Survey, Special Volume. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Toronto.

Churcher, C.

2013 Significant Dates in Canadian Railway History. http://www.railways.incanada.net/candate.htm.

City of Toronto Archives

Aerial Photographs, 1947-1992. *City of Toronto*. https://www.toronto.ca/city-government/accountability-operations-customer-service/access-city-information-or-records/city-of-toronto-archives/whats-online/maps/aerial-photographs/.

Copway, G.

1850 *The Traditional History and Characteristic Sketches of the Ojibway Nation*. Charles Gilpin, London.

1851 *The Traditional History and Characteristic Sketches of the Ojibway Nation.* Benjamin B. Mussey & Co., Boston.

1858 Indian Life and Indian History. Albert Colby and Company, Boston.

Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs

2013 Upper Canada Land Surrenders and the Williams Treaties (1781-1862/1923). https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1360941656761/1360941689121.

Department of Militia and Defence

1914 Markham Sheet 30M/14. National Topographic System.

Dodd, C.F., D.R. Poulton, P.A. Lennox, D.G. Smith, and G.A. Warrick

1990 The Middle Ontario Iroquoian Stage. In *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D.* 1650, C. J. Ellis and N. Ferris, eds, pp. 321–360. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter OAS Number 5. Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., London, ON.



Edwards, T.W.D., and P. Fritz

1988 Stable-Isotope Palaeoclimate Records from Southern Ontario, Canada: Comparison of Results from Marl and Wood. *Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences* 25:1397–1406.

Ellis, C.J., and D.B. Deller

1990 Paleo-Indians. In *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*, C. J. Ellis and N. Ferris, eds, pp. 37–64. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter OAS Number 5. Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., London, ON.

Ellis, C.J., I.T. Kenyon, and M.W. Spence

1990 The Archaic. In *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*, C. J. Ellis and N. Ferris, eds, pp. 65–124. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter OAS Number 5. Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., London, ON.

Ellis, C.J., P.A. Timmins, and H. Martelle

2009 At the Crossroads and Periphery: The Archaic Archaeological Record of Southern Ontario. In *Archaic Societies: Diversity and Complexity across the Midcontinent.*, T. D. Emerson, D. L. McElrath, and A. C. Fortier, eds, pp. 787–837. State University of New York Press, Albany, New York.

Esri, DeLorme, HERE, TomTom, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, and the GIS User Community 2020 World Topographic Map. http://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=30e5fe3149c34df1ba922e6f5bbf808f.

Ferris, N.

2013 Place, Space, and Dwelling in the Late Woodland. In *Before Ontario: The Archaeology of a Province*, pp. 99–111. McGill-Queen's University Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt32b7n5.15.

Fullerton, K.A., and Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation

2015 The Rouge River Valley Tract Unsurrendered Traditional Lands, Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation (Formerly Known As Mississaugas of the New Credit Indian Band). Statement of Claim. Submitted to the Government of Canada and the Government of Ontario.

Hunting Survey Corporation Limited

1954 Digital Aerial Photographs. https://mdl.library.utoronto.ca/collections/air-photos/1954-air-photos-southern-ontario/index.

Johnson, I.V.B.

1986 The Early Mississauga Treaty Process, 1781-1819 in Historical Perspective. PhD Dissertation, University of Toronto.

Johnston, D.

2004 *Connecting People to Place: Great Lakes Aboriginal in Cultural Context.* Unpublished paper prepared for the Ipperwash Commission of Inquiry. http://www.attorneygeneral.jus.gov.on.ca/inquiries/ipperwash/transcripts.pdf.



Jones, P.

1861 *History of the Ojebway Indians : With Especial Reference to Their Conversion to Christianity.* A. W. Bennett, London. https://archive.org/details/historyofojebway00jonerich.

Karrow, P.F., and B.G. Warner

1990 The Geological and Biological Environment for Human Occupation in Southern Ontario. In *The Archaeology of Ontario to A.D. 1650*, pp. 5–36. Occasional Publications 5. London Chapter, Ontario Archaeological Society, London.

Konrad, V.A.

1974 Iroquois Villages on the North Shore of Lake Ontario, 1665-1687. presented at the Fall Meeting of the Ontario Historical Geographers, November 9, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.

1981 An Iroquois Frontier: The North Shore of Lake Ontario during the Late Seventeenth Century. *Journal of Historical Geography* 7(2):129–144.

MacLeod, P.

1992 The Anishinabeg Point of View: The History of the Great Lakes Region to 1800 in Nineteenth-Century Mississauga, Odawa, and Ojibwa Historiography. *Canadian Historical Review* 73(2):194–210.

Mayer, Pihl, Poulton and Associates Inc.

1988 *The Archaeological Facility Master Plan Study of the Northeast Scarborough Study Area. Volume III. Site Descriptions. Part I: AlGt Sites.* Report on file with the City of Toronto, Toronto.

- MHSTCI, (Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries) 1990 Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. c. 0.18.
 - 2020 Ontario's Past Portal. PastPortal. https://www.pastport.mtc.gov.on.ca.

Migizi, G.

2018 Michi Saagiig Nishnaabeg: This Is Our Territory. ARP Books, Winnipeg.

Migizi, G., and J. Kapyrka

2015 Before, During, and After: Mississauga Presence in the Kawarthas., edD. Verhulst. *Peterborough Archaeology*:127–136.

Mika, N., and H. Mika

1977 *Places In Ontario: Their Name Origins and History, Part I, A-E.* Vol. I. Encyclopedia of Ontario. Mika Publishing Company, Belleville.

Miles & Co.

1878 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of York. Toronto.



Ministry of the Environment

1990 Environmental Assessment Act, R.S.O. Province of Ontario.

Ministry of Tourism and Culture

2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. Cultural Programs Branch, Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture, Toronto.

MPP, (Mayer, Pihl, Poulton &. Associates Inc.).

1987 *The Archaeological Facility Master Plan Study of the Northeast Scarborough Study Area* (*7 Reports*). Report on file, Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, Toronto.

Municipal Engineers Association

2000 Municipal Class Environmental Assessment.

Ontario Geological Survey

2010 Surficial Geology of Southern Ontario. Miscellaneous Release — Data 128 – Revised. http://www.geologyontario.mndm.gov.on.ca/mndmaccess/mndm_dir.asp?type=pub&id=MRD12 8-REV.

Parks Canada

2019 Rouge National Urban Park. July 9. https://www.pc.gc.ca/en/pn-np/on/rouge/culture.

Paudash, R.

1905 The Coming of the Mississagas. Ontario Historical Society Papers and Records 6(190).

Schmalz, P.S.

- 1977 The History of the Saugeen Indians. Ontario Historical Society, Ottawa.
- 1991 The Ojibwa of Southern Ontario. University of Toronto Press.

Smith, D.B.

1975 Who Are the Mississauga? *Ontario History* 67(4):311–222.

2000 Kahgegagahbowh. *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online*. http://www.biographi.ca/009004-119.01-e.php?&id_nbr=4517.

Spence, M.W., R.H. Pihl, and C. Murphy

1990 Cultural Complexes of the Early and Middle Woodland Periods. In *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*, C. J. Ellis and N. Ferris, eds. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter OAS Number 5. Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., London.

Surtees, R.

1984 *Indian Land Surrenders in Ontario 1763-1867.* Research Branch, Corporate Policy, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.

1985 A Cartographic Analysis of Indian Settlements and Reserves in Southern Ontario and



Southern Quebec, 1763-1867. Research Branch, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, Ottawa.

Tanner, H. H., ed,

1987 Atlas of the Great Lakes Indian History. Oklahoma University Press, Norman.

Town of Newmarket

2018 The First Railroad in Upper Canada. http://www.newmarket.ca/ThingsToDo/Documents/History%20-%20Terry%20Carter%20Compilation.pdf.

TRCA, (Toronto and Region Conservation Authority)

2002 Archaeological Assessment of TRCA Property in the City of Toronto Glen Eagles Trail Part of Lot 3, Concession 2 Former City of Scarborough, City of Toronto.

2010 Archaeological Inventory of TRCA Property in the City of Toronto (Stage 1 and 2) Rouge Park Restoration Projects, Toronto Lots 4 and 5, Concession IV Former Town of Scarborough, City of Toronto.

Tremaine, G.C.

1860 Tremaine's Map of the County of York, Canada West. George C. Tremaine, Toronto.

Von Gernet, A.

2002 'Within the Prick'd Line': The Historical Context of the 1701 Deed from the Iroquois to the King of England of a Vast Tract of Land. Report Prepared for the Province of Ontario.

Williams Treaties First Nations

2017 About Williams Treaties First Nations. http://www.williamstreatiesfirstnations.ca/about/.

Williamson, R.F.

1990 The Early Iroquoian Period of Southern Ontario. In *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*, C. J. Ellis and N. Ferris, eds, pp. 291–320. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter OAS Number 5. Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., London.

Williamson, R.F., D.A. Robertson, M.S. Cooper, R.I. MacDonald, S.J. Austin, and R.H. Pihl 2008 Life and Death at the Quarry: The Early Woodland Archaeology of the Peace Bridge Site. *Ontario Archaeology* 85–88:39–68.



7.0 MAPS





Figure 1: XX





STUDY AREA	Sources:	C	0 Kilome	1 tres
ÂŚİ	Projection: NAD 1 Scale: 1:30,000 Page Size: 8.5 x 1	1983 UTM Zone 17N ASI F Date: 11	Project No.: 19EA-117 e: 4/15/2021 10:09 AM	Drawn By: RL File: Fig2-3

X:\2019 Projects\EA\19EA-117 Rouge Park Bridges\ArcPro_Workspace\ArcPro_Workspace.aprx



Figure 4: Study Area (Approximate Location) Overlaid on the 1914 NTS Sheet



Figure 5: Study Area (Approximate Location) Overlaid on the 1954 Aerial Photography

	Sou Sou	ources:	0	1
			Kilome	etres
ÂŜÎ	Proj Sca Pag	rojection: NAD 1983 UTM Zone 17N cale: 1:30,000 age Size: 8.5 x 11	ASI Project No.: 19EA-117 Date: 4/15/2021 10:11 AM	Drawn By: RL File: Fig4-5



Sewell's Road Bridge



Hillside Bridge



Stott's Bridge



Figure 6: Study Area (Approximate Location) Overlaid on the 1992 Aerial Photography







Figure 9: Study Area - Soil Drainage

X:\2019 Projects\FA\19FA-117 Rouge Park Bridges\ArcPro_Workspace\ArcPro_Workspace aprx_





Figure 11: Rouge Park Bridges Study Area - Results of Stage 1 (Sheet 1)



Figure 12: Rouge Park Bridges Study Area - Results of Stage 1 (Sheet 2)



Figure 13: Rouge Park Bridges Study Area - Results of Stage 1 (Sheet 3)



Figure 14: Rouge Park Bridges Study Area - Results of Stage 1 (Sheet 4)



Figure 15: Rouge Park Bridges Study Area - Results of Stage 1 (Sheet 5)



Figure 16: Rouge Park Bridges Study Area - Results of Stage 1 (Sheet 6)

8.0 IMAGES



Plate 1: View of Sewells Road towards rail line; Area is disturbed, no potential

Plate 2: View of Sewells Road towards Sewells Road Bridge; Lands beyond disturbed road require Stage 2 survey



Plate 3: View from Sewells Road; Area is sloped, no potential

Plate 4: View of Sewells Road towards river; Beyond disturbed road and right-of-way is sloped, no potential



Plate 5: View of Old Finch Avenue towards Milne Bailey Bridge; Area is disturbed, no potential

Plate 6: View from Old Finch Avenue; Area requires Stage 2



Plate 7: View of Old Finch Avenue; Road and right-of-way are disturbed, no potential

Plate 8: View of Meadowvale Road towards rail line; Road and right-ofway are disturbed, no potential



Plate 9: View of Hillside Bridge; Area is low and wet, no potential



Plate 10: View from Meadowvale Road; Area is sloped and disturbed, no potential



Plate 11: View from Meadowvale Road; Area beyond disturbed road and right-of-way requires Stage 2

Plate 12: View of Twyn Rivers Drive; Areas beyond disturbed road and right-of-way is sloped, no potential



Plate 13: View of Twyn Rivers Drive towards Stott's Bridge; Area beyond disturbed road and right-of-way requires Stage 2



Plate 14: View from Twyn Rivers Drive; Area beyond disturbed road and right-of-way requires Stage 2



Plate 15: View of Twyn Rivers Drive; Road and right-of-way are disturbed, no potential

Plate 16: View of Twyn Rivers Drive; Areas beyond disturbed road and right-of-way is sloped, no potential



Plate 17: View of Twyn Rivers Drive towards Maxwell's Bridge; Road and right-of-way are disturbed, no potential

Plate 18: View from Twyn Rivers Drive towards Orchard Trail; Area requires Stage 2



Plate 19: View from Twyn Rivers Drive; Area requires Stage 2

Plate 20: View of Twyn Rivers Drive towards Maxwell's Bridge; Road and right-of-way are disturbed, no potential



Plate 21: Photo taken during ASI 2014 survey (P392-0035-2013): Sewell's Road ROW north of CP rail crossing was recommended for Stage 3 assessment. This should be preceded by Stage 2 test pit survey.

STAGE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT ROUGE PARK BRIDGES LOT 4,5, 8, CONCESSION 4 LOT 2, CONCESSION 3 (FORMER TOWNSHIP OF SCARBOROUGH, COUNTY OF YORK) CITY OF TORONTO, ONTARIO

SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION

Prepared for:

Dillon Consulting 235 Yorkland Boulevard Suite 800 Toronto, ON M2J 4Y8

Archaeological Licence #P1066 (Lytle) Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries PIF# P1066-0163-2020 ASI File: 19EA-117

20 April 2021



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	MAPS	.1
2.0	DETAILED SITE LOCATION	.6
2.1	AlGt-542	6
2.2	AkGt-41	6
2.3	AlGt-63	.7
3.0	REFERENCES CITED	.8
4.0	APPENDIX A	.9

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Rouge Park Bridges – Location of Previously Registered Archaeological Sites within 1km.	2
Figure 2: Rouge Park Bridges - AlGt-542 Site Location	3
Figure 3: Rouge Park Bridges - Ossuary Potential (AkGt-41)	4
Figure 4: Rouge Park Bridges - Ossuary Potential (AlGt-63)	5

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: (AlGt-542) Detailed Location Information	6
Table 2: Milne Site (AkGt-41) Detailed Location Information	7
Table 3: D. Reesor Site (AlGt-63) Detailed Location Information	7



1.0 MAPS

According to Section 7.6 of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (S & G) administered by the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism, and Culture Industries (MHSTCI 2011), any information that pinpoints the location of an archaeological site (e.g., detailed assessment results mapping, tables of Global Positioning System (GPS) coordinates for site locations) must not be included in the project report and should only be provided in the Supplementary Documentation. This allows the MHSTCI to exclude it from the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports, if necessary. Archaeological site location information is considered by the MHSTCI to be confidential and/or sensitive information that cannot be made public.

The following maps show the approximate location of sites within one kilometers of the Study Area; the detailed location of AlGt-542 within 50 metres of the Study Area considered to have further Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI); and the ossuary potential mapping for D. Reesor (AlGt-63) and Milne (AkGt-41). Appendix A includes the original survey results of the Milne Site (MPP 1988). Site descriptions and other relevant information relating to all archaeological work conducted for the project are contained in our accompanying Stage 1 assessment report (ASI 2020).



E:\19EA-117 Rouge Park Bridges\ArcPro_Workspace\ArcPro_Workspace.aprx



Figure 1: Rouge Park Bridges - Previously Registered Sites within 1km

Martin Contraction of			
N			
the ref		STUDY AREA	
-	•	PREVIOUSLY REGI	STERED VILLAGE SITES
	\diamond	PREVIOUSLY REGI	STSERED SITES WITHIN 50M
N.S.S.M	•	PREVIOUSLY REGI	STERED SITES WITHIN 1KM
ERSIDR	City of Tor	onto, Maxar	Projection: NAD 1983 UTM Zone 17N Scale: 1:15,000 Page Size: 11 x 17
and the state		0	500
		Me	ters
Statistics O	ASI Project N Date: 4/23/2	No.: 19EA-117 1021 2:18 PM	Drawn By: PB/RL File: SD
	80.50		



Figure 2: Rouge Park Bridges - AlGt-542 Site Location

	City of
535-200 2	SI Desi
Notes -	Date: 4/

2.5

	STUDY	AREA			
\diamond	LOCATI	ON OF	ALGT-54	12	
y of Toron	to, Maxar		Projection: 17N	NAD 1983 UTI	4 Zone
			Scale: 1:5,0 Page Size: 1	00 L1 x 17	
10					
()			200	
Desig + N	1054 117	Met	ers	/DI	
t Project No. te: 4/15/202	: 19EA-117 1 3:02 PM		Urawn By: PB, File: SD 2	rkL	



Figure 3: Rouge Park Bridges - Ossuary Potential (AkGt-41)

<image/>	STUDY AREA NOCATION OF AKGT 41 OSSUARY POTENTIAL
	Lity or foronito, maxar Projection: NAD 1983 UTM Zone 17N Scale: 1-5 000
	Scale: 1:5,000 Page Size: 11 x 17
Street 1 Bis	0 200
A PART	
	ASI Project No.: 19EA-117 Drawn BV: PB/RI
R. A.	Date: 4/23/2021 2:48 PM File: SD 3



Puertore
Image: Display the im
Cocation of Algt 63 OSSUARY POTENTIAL City of Toronto, Maxar Projection: MAD 1983 UTM 200 74
Thy of Toronto, Maxar Projection: NAD 1983 UTM 201714
Tity of Toronto, Maxar Projection: NAD 1983 UTM Zor UN
Lity of foronto, Maxar Projection: NAD 1983 01M 200
Scale: 1:5,000
Page Size: 11 x 17
0 200
Meters
ASI Project No.: 19EA-117 Drawn By: PB/RL Date: 4/15/2021 3:27 PM File: SD 4

2.0 **DETAILED SITE LOCATION**

2.1 AlGt-542

AlGt-542 is a pre-contact Indigenous findspot consisting of one Onondaga shatter and one piece of calcined bone. It is located approximately 240 metres northwest of the intersection of Meadowvale Road and Old Finch Avenue and 130 metres south of a branch of the Rouge River. The site is located within 50 metres of the Study Area west of an access road, both sides of which were subject to intensified pedestrian survey by TRCA (2010) which did not located any additional artifacts.

Table 1: (AlGt-542) Detailed Location Information				
MTCS PIF:	P019-151-2008			
Source:	(MHSTCI 2020; TRCA 2010)			
UTM Grid Zone:				
Site	UTM Co-ordinates	Error (I <i>x</i> m)	Site Datum (Grid Co-ordinate) and/or	
			Location information	
(AlGt-542)	646267, 4854515		Centre point	

2.2 AkGt-41

The Milne Site (AkGt-41) is an ancestral Huron Wendat village site circa 1300-1400 CE located on the west side of Sewells Road between the Canadian Pacific Railroad and the hydroelectric corridor (MPP 1988). The majority of the site is located in a plough-disturbed context in a cultivated field north of a farm lane upon a drumlin and it extends southward across the laneway into another smaller cultivated field which lies just north of the railway. The site is situated upon tableland just north of the Rouge River valley and occupies an area of 0.98 hectares. Surface distributions indicated that the site was aligned along the top of the drumlin in an area approximately 180 north-south and 80 metres east-west. Site deposits have been located right up to the edge of Sewells Road. Original road construction may have disturbed the eastern margin of the site, and the possibility exists that Milne once extended beyond Sewells Road (MPP 1988).

Appendix A contains original site mapping from the Mayer, Pihl, Poulton and Associates Inc. Stage 2 survey for the Scarborough Northeast Master Plan (MPP 1988). The entire field north of the laneway (Area 65 in the MPP report) was subject to pedestrian survey at five metre intervals, within intensification at two metre intervals around the site finds in the area north of the laneway. The field south of the laneway (Area 97 in the MPP report) was subject to pedestrian survey at two metre intervals. the grass and treeline laneway itself was not tested (MPP 1988).

The Rouge Park Bridges Study Area extends into Area 97. The MPP report describes that relatively little material was recovered from the southern end of the site in this field, and notes that it is presume the village did not extend as far as the railway (MPP 1988).



Table 2: Milne Site (AkGt-41) Detailed Location Information					
MTCS PIF:	1987-60-002-1987				
Source:	(MHSTCI 2020)				
UTM Grid Zone:					
Site	UTM Co-ordinates	Error (I <i>x</i> m)	Site Datum (Grid Co-ordinate) and/or Location information		
	644412.0035,		Centre point		
Milne Site (AkGt-41)	4854772.8543				

2.3 AlGt-63

The D. Reesor Site (AlGt-63) is a Late Woodland Village site located within 150 metres of the Study Area at Meadowvale Road, south of the junction of the Canadian Pacific Railroad and on the west bank of the Little Rouge River. The OASD notes that part of the site was considered to have been destroyed from construction of the railway bridge, however areas north of the railway corridor were identified to have CHVI.

Table 3: D. Reesor Site (AlGt-63) Detailed Location Information					
MTCS PIF:	1987-60-002-1987				
Source:	(MHSTCI 2020)				
UTM Grid Zone:					
Site	UTM Co-ordinates	Error (I x m)	Site Datum (Grid Co-ordinate) and/or Location information		
	645912.008, 4855022.8947		Centre point		
D. Reesor Site (AlGt-63	3)		-		



3.0 REFERENCES CITED

ASI, (Archaeological Services Inc.)

2020 Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Rouge Park Bridges Lot 4,5, 8, Concession 4 Lot 2, Concession 3 (Former Township of Scarborough, County of York) City of Toronto, Ontario.

Mayer, Pihl, Poulton and Associates Inc.

1988 The Archaeological Facility Master Plan Study of the Northeast Scarborough Study Area. Volumes I-III. Report on file with the City of Toronto, Toronto.

MHSTCI, (Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries) 2020 Ontario's Past Portal. PastPortal. https://www.pastport.mtc.gov.on.ca.

Ministry of Tourism and Culture

2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists. Cultural Programs Branch, Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture, Toronto.

TRCA, (Toronto and Region Conservation Authority)

2010 Archaeological Inventory of TRCA Property in the City of Toronto (Stage 1 and 2) Rouge Park Restoration Projects, Toronto Lots 4 and 5, Concession IV Former Town of Scarborough, City of Toronto.



4.0 APPENDIX A





Figure 33 The Milne Site (AkGt-41)



Figure 34 Detail of the Milne Site