APPENDIX C Characterization and Development of Alternatives (Phase 2)

APPENDIX C1 Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment





STAGE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT

German Mills Creek Geomorphic Systems Master Plan EA

ORIGINAL REPORT March 4, 2024 DR21-17 | PIF P1016-0203-2021 Licensee: Alistair Jolly (P303)

Lots 23 to 25, Concession II E, and Lot 25, Concession III E, Geographic Township of York, Historic York County in the City of Toronto

Executive Summary

The City of Toronto ("the City") has initiated a Geomorphic Systems Master Plan (GSMP) Environmental Assessment (EA) study for German Mills Creek – Extending from Steeles Avenue to its confluence with the East Don River. The purpose of this study is to provide the City with a comprehensive investigation of German Mills within the Study Area to derive a long-term approach for the mitigation of erosion that could potentially damage or create risk for Toronto Water infrastructure. Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) was retained by the City to conduct a Stage 1 archaeological assessment in support of the GSMP EA study under the Environmental Assessment Act.

The GSMP EA study area is situated within Lots 23 to 25, Concession II East of Yonge Street (E) and Lot 25, Concession III E in the Geographical Township of York, historic York County in the City of Toronto. Permission for this assessment was granted to TRCA Archaeology by TRCA. No property inspection was completed during this assessment, thus no permission-to-enter was required. Areas requiring further Stage 2 archaeological assessment will be determined based on the results of the Stage 1 archaeological assessment documented herein.

The review of historic land use, geographic and cultural features, with careful consideration of available aerial photography, has indicated that the GSMP EA study area has the potential for buried cultural resources.

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

- A Stage 2 archaeological assessment is required in all areas identified as holding potential prior to any ground disturbing activities within the boundaries of the study area. Areas determined to hold potential must be subject to archaeological test pit survey at five-metre intervals prior to any ground disturbing activities, in accordance with the 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists.
- Areas that have been previously subjected to a Stage 2 archaeological assessment within the study area require no further archaeological assessment.
- Portions of the study area identified as disturbed and holding no potential due to deep and extensive disturbances (e.g. grading below topsoil, quarrying, building footprints, or sewage and infrastructure development) must be subject to an on-site visual survey to confirm and document their nature and extent. Only then can these areas be exempt from Stage 2 test pit survey.
- Portions of the study area classified as having low or no archaeological potential due to physiographic features (e.g., permanently wet areas; steep slope) must be subjected to an on-site visual survey to confirm and document their nature and extent. Only then can these areas be exempt from Stage 2 test pit survey.
- Future areas determined for construction that are not covered by this Stage 1 archaeological assessment such as staging areas, temporary access roads, etc., must also be subject to a Stage 1 archaeological assessment, and if recommended, a Stage 2 archaeological assessment.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary i
Table of Contents ii
Project Personnelv
1.0 Project Context
1.1 Objective
1.2 Development Context
1.3 Traditional Territories and Treaties
2.0 Background Study
2.1 Local Environmental Context9
2.2 Historical Context11
2.3 Archaeological Context20
2.4 Built Features and Existing Cultural Heritage Resources22
3.0 Evaluation of Archaeological Potential26
3.1 Potential for Encountering Pre-Contact Sites26
3.2 Potential for Encountering Euro-Canadian Sites26
3.3 Proximity to Known Archaeological Sites26
3.4 Proximity to Known Built and Cultural Heritage Resources26
3.5 Twenty and Twenty-First Century Alterations to the Land26
3.6 Summary27
4.0 Recommendations
Advice on Compliance and Legislation 28
Bibliography and Sources
Appendix A: Maps
Appendix B: Images

Tables

Table 1. Summary of 19 th Century Historical Features	. 18
Table 2. Registered Archaeological Sites within One Kilometre of the Study area	. 21
<i>Table 3</i> . Bridges within the Study Area	. 23

Maps

Map 1. General Study area	32
Map 2. Development Plan	33
<i>Мар 3</i> . Detail of 1851 Browne Map – York County	34
Map 4. Detail of 1860 Tremaine Map – York County	35
Map 5. Detail of 1878 Miles & Co. Illustrated Atlas – York County	36
<i>Мар 6</i> . 1914 Topographic Map	37
<i>Мар 7</i> . 1933 Topographic Map	38
<i>Мар 8</i> . Local Topography – Study area	39
Map 9. TRCA Archaeological Potential Model	40
Map 17. City of Toronto Archaeological Potential Model	41
Map 11. Built Features	42
Map 12. Built Heritage	43
Map 13. Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Recommendations	44

Images

Image 1. 1947 aerial photograph of the study area	. 46
Image 2. 1954 aerial photograph of the study area	. 47
Image 3. 1967 aerial photograph of the study area	. 48
Image 4. 1971 aerial photograph of the study area	. 49
Image 5. 1989 aerial photograph of the study area	. 50

<i>Image 6</i> . Cummer Avenue over Don River Bridge – October 31, 2017 (City of Toronto 2021)	51
Image 7. East Don Parkland, Structure ID 308405 – March 30, 2016 (City of Toronto 2021)	51
Image 8. East Don Parkland, Structure ID 308410 – March 30, 2016 (City of Toronto 2021)	52
<i>Image 9</i> . Pineway Boulevard pedestrian bridge over German Mills Creek- October 31, 2017 (City of Toronto 2021)	52
Image 10. CNR rail over Don River - date unknown (City of Toronto 2021)	53
<i>Image 11</i> . East Don Parkland, Structure ID 308408 – December 14, 2017 (City of Toronto 2021)	53
Image 12. Leslie Street over German Mills Creek – date unknown (City of Toronto Archives 2021)	54
<i>Image 13</i> . Leslie Street over German Mills Creek – October 31, 2017 (City of Toronto 2021)	54
Image 14. Duncan Creek Trail Bridge – date unknown (Google Earth 2021)	55

Project Personnel

Project Direction:

Alvina Tam (P1016))

Report Preparation: Alvina Tam (P1016)

Archival Research:

Loren Scott (R1094)

Graphics:

Kathryn Brown

Edited By:

Loren Scott

1.0 Project Context

1.1 Objective

The objectives of a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, as outlined by the *2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (2011 Standards and Guidelines) published by the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) (2011), are as follows:

- To provide information about the property's geography, history, previous archaeological fieldwork and current land condition;
- To evaluate in detail the property's archaeological potential, which will support recommendations for Stage 2 survey for all parts of the property; and
- To recommend appropriate strategies for Stage 2 survey.

1.2 Development Context

The City of Toronto ("the City") has initiated a Geomorphic Systems Master Plan (GSMP) Environmental Assessment (EA) study for German Mills Creek – Extending from Steeles Avenue to its confluence with the East Don River. The purpose of this study is to provide the City with a comprehensive investigation of German Mills within the Study Area to derive a long-term approach for the mitigation of erosion that could potentially damage or create risk for Toronto Water infrastructure. Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) was retained by the City to conduct a Stage 1 archaeological assessment in support of the GSMP EA study under the Environmental Assessment Act.

The GSMP EA study area is situated within Lots 23 to 25, Concession II East of Yonge Street (E) and Lot 25, Concession III E in the Geographical Township of York, historic York County in the City of Toronto (**Maps 1 and 2**). Permission for this assessment was granted to TRCA Archaeology by TRCA. No property inspection was completed during this assessment, thus no permission-to-enter was required. Areas requiring further Stage 2 archaeological assessment will be determined based on the results of the Stage 1 archaeological assessment documented herein.

1.3 Traditional Territories and Treaties

TRCA's jurisdiction encompasses the overlapping Traditional territories and Treaty areas relating to the Anishinaabe, Haudenosaunee, Huron-Wendat, and Métis nations. TRCA lands contain hundreds of known ancestral archaeological sites, as well as the high potential to discover more.

The treaty making process began during the 1700s in Ontario and continued through to the twentieth century. The treaties most relevant to the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) include the Treaties of 1701, the Toronto Purchase (1805), the Head of the Lake Treaty (1806), the Ajetance Treaty (1818), and the Williams Treaties (1923), which are briefly discussed below.

During the late seventeenth century, Britain and France were locked in a struggle to establish trade dominance in the Great Lakes Region. The French had allied with the Huron-Wendat and Anishinaabe, while the British were aided by the Haudenosaunee or Five Nations Iroquois (Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga and Seneca Nations). Both the Huron and Iroquois claimed the lands north of Lake Ontario as part of their traditional hunting territory. The 1701 Albany deed, also known as the Nanfan Treaty of 1701, between the Five Nations Iroquois and the British Crown identified beaver hunting grounds in the environs of Lakes Ontario, Erie, Huron and Michigan and included southwestern Ontario. The map accompanying the ceded area was made by Samuel Clowes, protracted by John Nanfan who was the Lieutenant Governor of New York at the time. Clowes Map of 1701 is currently accepted by the courts as the geographic extent of the Nanfan Treaty. However, the Iroquois had been pushed out of these territories before the end of the seventeenth century, and a large portion of the beaver hunting grounds described in the deed were also claimed and in use by the French and their First Nation allies, the Huron-Wendat and Anishinaabe Nations, at the time of this surrender.

Following the Seven Years' War, Britain became the dominant colonial power in North America. By the late eighteenth century, it was the Anishinaabeg Mississauga who resided along the north shore of Lake Ontario and in the Trent River valley, and the Chippewas resided around Lake Simcoe, the Bruce Peninsula, and the Thames River valley. The Five Nations Iroquois at the time were not residing within the region. A number of land surrenders (the Upper Canada Land Surrenders of 1763-1830) occurred between the Crown and the Chippewas, the Mississauga, and the now Six Nations of the Iroquois Confederacy, that potentially affect lands within the GTA.

The Johnson-Butler Purchase was arranged in 1787 with the Mississauga and involved the surrender of a large tract of land along the north shore of Lake Ontario between the Trent River to the east and the Etobicoke River to the west, north to Lake Simcoe. However, due to irregularities in the document, particularly the lack of a detailed description of the land surrendered, the Crown determined the treaty to be invalid but did not rectify the issue until 1805, where the land was formally purchased from the Mississauga under the Toronto Purchase in 1805. Under the new agreement, the Mississauga reserved exclusive fishing rights on Etobicoke Creek. A day after, the Crown sought to purchase the lands immediately west of the Toronto Purchase Treaty (Treaty 13). In return for the lands, the Mississaugas received £1000 and the sole right to fish at the Credit River, as well as a one-mile strip of land on each of its banks. These terms were signed in 1806 under the Head of Lake Treaty (Treaty 14).

Following the Chippewas cession of land to the Crown in 1818 under the Lake Simcoe-Nottawasaga Treaty, the Crown wished to purchase adjacent lands from the Mississauga. This area includes part of the present day cities of Mississauga, Brampton and Caledon. The Ajetance Treaty (Treaty 19) was negotiated in 1818, where 648,000 acres of lands were exchanged for an annual amount of goods.

The Williams Treaties negotiated the surrender of a large tract of land in central and southern Ontario, which involved the Rama, Beausoleil, Georgina Island, Scugog Island, Alderville, Hiawatha, and Curve Lake First Nations and the Crown in 1923. These treaties were to account for the absence of documentation tied to the Gunshot Treaty of 1788, the northern boundary of which was to be established as far back as one could hear a gun shot from Lake Ontario. Part of the lands included in the Williams Treaties encompasses the southern part of the Rouge River Valley and in territory claimed by The Mississaugas of the Credit. Given that the Mississaugas were not a signatory of the Williams Treaty and did not surrender their interest in the lands, they claim unextinguished aboriginal title to the Rouge River Valley tract.

Differing interpretations of these historic treaties have been the subject of several land claims brought to federal and provincial courts over Aboriginal rights, rights to land, and traditional uses of that land. Descendants of Indigenous peoples who occupied Ontario prior to European settlement are actively involved in

consultations with the provincial and federal governments relating to ancestral sites (particularly burial grounds and other sacred spaces) and proposed projects that have the potential to impact ancestral territories and Indigenous rights under the Canadian constitution. These descendant communities reside on reserve lands and in urban areas throughout Ontario, in the Province of Quebec, and in the States of Kansas and New York.

TRCA has formulated Engagement Guidelines to provide guidance on stewardship and management decisions within the archaeological assessment process and other TRCA land management processes. These guidelines outline our commitment to growing our relationships with Anishinaabe, Huron-Wendat, Haudenosaunee and Métis communities, whether that be relatively informal partnerships in various initiatives or in formal engagement for large-scale projects.

We acknowledge that the archaeological assessment reported here was undertaken within Traditional Territories and Treaty Lands, in particular those of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, Huron-Wendat, the Anishinaabeg of the Williams Treaty First Nations, and the Haudenosaunee. As stewards of land and water resources within the greater Toronto region TRCA appreciates and respects the history and diversity of the land, recognizes our shared values and interests, and is grateful to have the opportunity to work in this territory.

2.0 Background Study

Following the 2011 Standards and Guidelines, a desktop background study was conducted to provide detailed documentary research of the property's archaeological and land use history and present condition. This background study includes the following research information and sources:

- The most current list of archaeological sites from the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database (OASD) and TRCA records for the presence of sites in and within one-kilometre of the study area;
- Previous archaeological field work within a radius of 50 metres around the study area;
- Topographic maps at 1:10,000 (recent and historical) or the most detailed scale available;
- Historic settlement maps and atlases;
- Known archaeological management plans or other archaeological potential mapping;
- Aerial photography (both recent and historical);
- Title deeds and other land registry documents;
- Historical land use and ownership records including assessment rolls, census records and commercial directories;
- Organizations with oral or written information about the land use of the study area and area;
- Secondary historical document sources such as local and regional histories and academic research; and,
- Known built heritage resources within 50 metres of the study area.

The background study encompasses the historical and cultural contexts of the people who lived both within and adjacent to the study area boundaries. Archival research of historic and modern heritage documents was conducted using available resources through the Ontario Archives, Collections Canada and various internet genealogical resources to provide a detailed synopsis of Euro-Canadian/Settlement period families on these properties. Relevant heritage documents accessed for this study included nineteenth-century surveyor's maps and land abstracts for each property. Secondary sources that document the settlement of York Township, villages, and the surrounding areas were also reviewed.

In addition to archival research, a review of documented nineteenth- and twentieth-century property alterations within the study area provides the means to evaluate the potential for cultural heritage resources and landscapes to remain intact within undisturbed pockets of these properties. Despite the level of archaeological potential evaluated through the modelling process, the potential for encountering intact resources is often mitigated by the degree of modern development and construction activities, largely in urban and near urban settings.

Detailed archival research into historic and modern heritage documents was conducted as a component of this study and is presented in **Section 2.2**.

2.1 Local Environmental Context

Prehistoric Environment

Ten thousand years ago, Early Lake Ontario was considerably smaller than the earlier Lake Iroquois. This low water phase began around 11,400 BP when the St. Lawrence River outlet became established. Climatic changes during the Holocene were the result of "interplay of movements of continental cyclonic weather systems, fluctuating Great Lakes levels and associated climatic influences, and site-specific microclimate regimes"

(Karrow and Warner 1990:35). Changes in forest composition reflect these climatic changes. During the Early Holocene ameliorating winters and warm, dry summers that were longer and warmer than present resulted in changes in the landscape in southern Ontario from treeless tundra to spruce forest by *ca.* 10,000 BP (Karrow and Warner 1990:33-35).

After 10,000 BP a gradual increase in atmospheric humidity in conjunction with warm summers led to the replacement of spruce forests by jack pine which were dominant between 9800 and 8500 BP but were replaced by white pine by 8000 BP, suggesting a gradual increase in humidity and a continuation of hot summers. These forests would have been similar to, although not directly analogous with a modern boreal forest, insofar as a variety of hardwood and mast trees such as oak were present. In this relatively open boreal forest, subsistence resources were probably woodland caribou and/or elk, moose, beaver, hare and fish (Dibb 2004:126; Lennox 2002:8). With the exception of a mid-Holocene warm/dry period between 6,000 and 3,000 years ago (Yu and McAndrews 1994:151), after ca. 7,500 years ago the southern Ontario climate shifted from deglacial to postglacial (Yu 2003:387), and experienced an essentially modern but slightly drier climate. Mixed coniferousdeciduous forest dominated the region. Subsistence resources at this time likely included a wide variety of aquatic animals, as well as waterfowl attracted to the riverine and marsh environment. Deer, fish, beaver, hare, duck and turtle as well as seasonal plants such as berries, sedges and nut trees were all possible food items established at this time (Ellis et al. 1990:111-114; Jamieson 2002:31; Ritchie 1994:34). Sand plains were rich in nut bearing trees such as oak, hickory, chestnut, walnut and beech. The well drained soils in this area were highly suited for growing Native horticultural crops and along with the rich food sources in the environment would have provided an ideal locale for more sedentary agriculturalists that populated southern Ontario after AD 900 (Karrow and Warner 1990:14).

Historic Environment

The study area falls within the Don River watershed, which covers an area measuring 360 square kilometres in size. The river itself measures 38 kilometres in length and is comprised of two main branches, the East Don River and the West Don River. A number of tributaries branch off from each arm of the Don River, providing a network of watercourses throughout the watershed. The two main branches of the Don River converge at what has become known as the Forks of the Don, located approximately eight kilometers north of Lake Ontario. At the time of European arrival to the Toronto area, there existed a path connecting the Don River to the Humber River. This path linked the Don River to the Toronto Carrying Place Trail, a travel and trade route utilized by First Nations that connected the Toronto area north to the Holland River and beyond to the upper lakes. As a result, the Don River was utilized by First Nations as both a major corridor for travel and as an excellent resource for food.

The river was originally known by various Indigenous names including *Necheng Qua Kekonk* and *Wonscoteonoch*. The latter may be interpreted as "black burnt lands" which may refer to fire damage. The river received its English name in 1793 when Simcoe realized the similarities between the Ontario River and the River Don in Yorkshire. During the nineteenth century, a number of industries sprang up along the Lower Don and pollution soon contaminated the mouth of the river. During the late nineteenth century, the river was straightened with a channel to create harbor space and divert pollution. The river became increasingly polluted during the twentieth century as over 30 sewage treatment facilities were constructed and industrial refuse was dumped along the river. By the 1960s the river was polluted nearly beyond repair. However, in recent years, successful efforts have been made to restore the Don.

The Don River valley lands were known for its steep, picturesque banks overlooking lush flood plains and marsh land made of dark, nutrient-rich soil. The valley lands were filled with a wide variety of trees and fruit-bearing bushes, a diverse collection of wildlife, and a river teeming with many species of fish. As a result, the Don River Valley was well-known for its hunting and fishing, was a perfect location for agricultural and manufacturing purposes, and was a preferred camping and picnicking locale. It is not surprising that First Nations, as well as the Europeans who immigrated to Upper Canada, regarded the Don River Valley as a place of great beauty and natural wealth.

European settlement along the Don did not begin to grow with any regularity until the 1820's and even then, remained sparse, with large areas of rural forest interspersed with homesteads until the 1900's. This was due in part to the lands west of the Don River being held as a government reserve (for military purposes, and then for a hospital endowment), while lands east of the Don were separated from the urban center of York by the river itself. The lands west of the Don remained as government reserves from the late eighteenth century until the late 1820's when the land was surveyed and offered for sale to prospective buyers.

The ecology of the Don Valley prior to the 1820's is described as dense forests thick with numerous species of trees and shrubs. The earliest account of a population estimate for European settlers in the Don is from 1797 when 35 men and 34 women were accounted for. Clearing the forest along the Don was a slow process that was still ongoing well into the 1900's. During the mid-1800's, sufficient land had been cleared to pasture cattle in some parts of the valley. The numerous mills meant that mill races and mill ponds were a constant along the Don River from the 1790's onward. The multitude and variety of trees throughout the Don River valley offered ample material for homesteads, barns and cottages for those earliest settlers, and supplied sufficient lumber for the large industrial mill complex that became synonymous with the Don.

The Don River was known to have regular flooding episodes. Large areas of land surrounding the river were prone to seasonal flooding, varying in severity from only a few acres to large swaths of land equaling hundreds of acres. This was witnessed in the floods of 1850, 1878, and most recently in 1954 with Hurricane Hazel, which cost 81 people in Ontario their lives. Broad marshland extended out from the mouth of the Don where it empties into Lake Ontario.

These flooding events caused the course of the Don River and its tributaries to change. Slight errors are not unusual for the nineteenth century maps, but it is reasonable to expect that the course of the river has changed due to the effects of nineteenth century milling activities along the Don, storm events and erosion during the past 300 years, and urban development during the last 75 years. These changes can be observed through historical maps dating between 1851 and 1878 (**Maps 3 to 5**), historic topographical maps dating between 1914 and 1933 (**Maps 6 and 7**) and aerial photographs dating between 1947 and 1989 (**Images 1 to 5**).

2.2 Historical Context

The following historic background was written to document the chronological land use history of the lands within the study area. The subsequent Pre-Contact chronology is constructed from research contained within *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to AD 1650*, edited by C.J. Ellis and N. Ferris (1990). The Euro-Canadian period is presented from its broadest scale and refined down to individual properties. That is, the discussion reviews the history of York County, York Township, as well as the communities, industries, and relevant structural improvements located within the vicinity of the study area. The German Mills GSMP EA study area bears the name of an early settlement known as German Mills. This settlement was originally associated with

Markham Township, on the north side of Steeles. Given that the former settlers of the current study area were closely linked to this community, a brief history of this association has been included in this report.

Pre-Contact History

Paleo Period – 12,000 to 10,000 BP

Twelve thousand years ago, as the glaciers retreated from southern Ontario, nomadic peoples gradually moved into areas recently vacated by the massive ice-sheets. These people lived in small family groups and it is presumed that they hunted caribou and other fauna associated with the cooler environment of this time period. As the glaciers melted at the end of the last ice age, the landscape of southern Ontario was very much like the tundra of the present day eastern sub-arctic. Traditionally, the occupation of southern Ontario during the Paleo Period has been associated with glacial lake shorelines, however recent investigations in the Toronto vicinity indicate that these peoples also exploited interior locations situated inland from the glacial lakes.

Intense Diversification Period – 10,000 to 2,800 BP

As the climate in southern Ontario warmed, Indigenous populations adapted to these new environments and associated fauna. Thus, many new technologies and subsistence strategies were introduced and developed by the Indigenous peoples of this time period. Woodworking implements such as groundstone axes, adzes, and gouges began to appear, as did net-sinkers (for fishing), numerous types of spear points and items made from native copper, which was mined from the Lake Superior region. The presence of native copper on archaeological sites in southern Ontario and adjacent areas suggests that people were involved in long range exchange and interaction. The trade networks established at this time were to persist between Indigenous groups until European contact. To harvest the new riches of the warming climate, the bands residing in southern Ontario followed an annual cycle, which exploited seasonably available resources in differing geographic locales within watersheds. As the seasons changed, these bands split into smaller groups and moved inland to exploit other resources that were available during the fall and winter such as deer, rabbit, squirrel, and bear, which thrived in the forested margins of these areas.

Initial Woodland Period – 2,800 BP to AD 700

Early in the Initial Woodland period, band size and subsistence activities were generally consistent with the groups of the preceding Intense Diversification Period. Associated with the earliest components of this cultural period is the introduction of clay pots. Additionally, around two thousand years ago a revolutionary new technology, the bow and arrow, was brought into southern Ontario and radically changed approaches to hunting and warfare. These two technological innovations allowed for major changes in subsistence and settlement patterns. As populations became larger, camps and villages with more permanent structures were occupied longer and more consistently. Generally, these larger sites are associated with the gathering of macrobands. Often these larger groups would reside in favourable locations to cooperatively take advantage of readily exploitable resources. It was also during this period that elaborate burial rituals and the interment of numerous exotic grave goods with the deceased began to take place. Increased trade and interaction between southern Ontario populations and groups as far away as the Atlantic coast and the Ohio Valley was also taking place.

Late Woodland Period – AD 700 to 1650

Around AD 700, maize was introduced into southern Ontario from the south. With the development of horticulture as the predominant subsistence base, the Late Woodland Period gave rise to a tremendous

population increase and the establishment of permanent villages. These villages consisted of longhouses measuring six metres wide and high and extending anywhere from three to 15 metres in length. Quite often these villages, some of which are one to four hectares in size, were surrounded by multiple rows of palisades suggesting that defence was a community concern. Aside from villages, Late Woodland peoples also inhabited hamlets and special purpose cabins and campsites that are thought to have been associated with larger settlements. Social changes were also taking place, as reflected in the fluorescence of smoking pipes; certain burial rituals; increased settlement size; and distinct clustering of both longhouses within villages (clan development) and villages within a region (tribal development). One interesting socio-cultural phenomenon that occurred during this period as a result of the shift in emphasis from hunting to horticulture was a movement away from the traditional patrilineal and patrilocal societies of the preceding band-oriented groups to a matrilineal orientation. Warfare was also on the rise.

The movement of villages northward within individual watersheds in the Toronto region is clearly documented over time. This movement is generally attributed to the decline of resource availability over the lifetime of the village. After which, communities continued a northward trend eventually settling in Huronia (in the Penetanguishene Peninsula) and it was these communities that eventually interacted with and were described by French missionaries and explorers during the early seventeenth century.

According to oral traditions, *Anishinaabe* peoples migrated from the Eastern coast into the Great Lakes region around AD 1400. The Anishinaabe include people identified as Ojibway, Chippewa, or Mississauga and until the seventeenth century lived primarily a nomadic lifestyle north of Lake Ontario on the Canadian Shield. The *Wendat,* who are recognized as the cultural group that inhabited the Toronto area during the Late Woodland Period, eventually moved their villages northward toward Georgian Bay. The Huron-Wendat Nation was decimated by warfare with the Iroquois from south of the lake that was exacerbated by illnesses brought to the New World by Europeans. They fled Huronia around 1650, and now have established communities in Wendake, Quebec and in the American States of Kansas and New York. The Haudenosaunee, or people of the longhouse, comprise the six Iroquois Nations of Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga, Seneca, and Tuscarora. As allies of the British during the American Revolution under Captain Joseph Brant the Haudenosaunee were granted a tract of land along the Grand River where many relocated from the Finger Lakes region of New York State. It was these and other nations in southwestern Ontario that interacted with and were described by French missionaries and explorers during the early seventeenth century.

Post Contact History

Post Contact Period – AD 1650 to 1778

Also called the Early Historic Period, these years are characterized by the arrival of a small number of Europeans interested in exploration, trade, and establishing missions, coupled with a gradual adoption of European materials by First Nations peoples.

Anishinaabe peoples who traditionally lived further north on the Canadian Shield remained largely nomadic well into the Historic Period. Exploration and fur trade activities between Lake Ontario and the upper Great Lakes were carried out along well-established trails linking Lake Ontario to the Holland River, Lake Simcoe and Lake Huron. It was during this period of trade and exploration that male fur traders established families with Indigenous women during their travels. A blending of cultural traditions eventually resulted in distinct Métis communities along the lakes and waterways of Ontario. The French explorers and fur traders began to travel along the Lake Ontario shoreline and explore parts of the north shore inland. They followed the centuries-old route of the well-established west branch of the Toronto Carrying Place Trail along the Humber River and the east branch along the Rouge River north to the Holland River and beyond, to the upper lakes.

By AD 1650 the lands along the north shore of Lake Ontario were largely uninhabited and small groups of Seneca subsequently moved into the area *ca*.1660. The Seneca established the villages of Teiaiagon and Ganatsekwyagon at strategic trading locations at the mouths of the Humber and Rouge Rivers, effectively controlling access to the west and east branches of the Toronto Carrying Place Trail. Teiaiagon and Ganatsekwyagon were also connected east-west by an overland route along the lakeshore.

In terms of material culture, it is often difficult to distinguish between *Haudenosaunee*, *Anishinaabe*, *Métis* and colonial settler campsites during these early years. This is due to the interaction and adoption of each other's material goods and subsistence strategies which blur cultural boundaries. Such interaction was essential to early explorers and missionaries who relied on local people for survival strategies and knowledge of the local landscape.

These permeable boundaries continued until the Crown established segregated reserves in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries for the *Haudenosaunee* and *Anishinaabe* communities who remained here while granting properties to European settlers.

Due to the trade disputes between the French and English, these disruptions to trade resulted in the Seneca abandoning their villages after 1695, leaving the region without a permanent First Nations settlement. The Mississauga people began moving south in the seventeenth century, traversing southern Ontario on their seasonal rounds and establishing villages along the north shore of Lake Ontario, even re-occupying those formerly abandoned by the Seneca. The Mississauga were largely fishers and hunters, and participated in more casual maize horticulture. By the late eighteenth century, the Mississauga resided along the north shore of Lake Ontario and in the Trent River valley, and the Chippewa resided near Lake Simcoe, the Bruce Peninsula, and the Thames River valley. The Five Nations Iroquois were not residing within the region at the time nor were the Huron.

Following the signing of the Treaty of Paris, which passed New France into British hands, King George III issued the Royal Proclamation, a document attributed to the first formal recognition of Indigenous rights. The Royal Proclamation asserted the British Crown's sovereignty of the region, while also declaring the land to be in possession of the Indigenous peoples who lived there. It forbade non-Indigenous people from entering the land and denied individual land purchasing rights. Only the Crown could purchase land from the Indigenous peoples living there, and this land could then subsequently be bought from the Crown. As described in **Section 1.3**, a number of key land surrenders were negotiated between the Crown and the Chippewa, the Mississauga, and the Five Nations Iroquois, that potentially impact lands within the Greater Toronto Area.

Euro-Canadian Period – AD 1778 to Present

York County

Since 1788, the land north of Lake Ontario formed part of the District of Nassau in the Province of Quebec. Following the creation of the Province of Upper Canada in 1791 Colonel John Graves Simcoe, the first lieutenant-governor, in 1792 renamed it the Home District and formed York County along with 18 other counties. York County originally included modern day York Region, Peel Region, Halton Region, Toronto, parts of Durham Region and the City of Hamilton. It was divided into two ridings, East and West York.

York County included the townships of East Gwillimbury, East York, Etobicoke, Georgina, King, North Gwillimbury, North York, Scarborough, Vaughan, Whitchurch and York (Reaman 20:1971). "Simcoe made every effort to give English names to countries, towns, townships and rivers, in order to impress on the Loyalists that there was a continuing British presence north of the lost American Colonies" (Rayburn 1996). Early land patents were rewards to soldiers in the British fight against the American Colonies. Townships that were further inland, were not a desirable location by the Loyalists and were therefore of secondary importance to the settlement policies of Simcoe. As a result, the prime waterfront townships were quickly occupied by the Loyalists, while other townships were left for the children of Loyalists, "late-Loyalists" and settlers from Europe and the United States to clear.

York Township

Lieutenant-Governor Simcoe originally established the Town of York in 1793 as the military headquarters of Upper Canada. He also renamed the township from Dublin Township to York Township. The former title had been bestowed by the surveyor Augustus Jones the previous year and the new name was in honour the Duke of York for his recent victory in Flanders (Rayburn 1996). Jones was instrumental in the surveying of York Township. Appointed crown surveyor in 1787, he was adept at completing surveys of townships and town sites. His claim to fame was the surveying of Dundas Street in York and Yonge Street, which was the dividing line between East and West York.

Yonge Street was completed in 1796 and stretched from York through dense bush and forest to Holland Landing. This forty-three day endeavor required extensive clearing before it could be properly surveyed (Stamp 1991). Unfortunately, no survey diaries are available for York Township earlier than 1821 and accordingly, there is no record of this area or the terrain as it existed when it was initially surveyed. However, early accounts provide insight into the conditions of the area during the late eighteenth century from Lady Simcoe's descriptions and drawings from her diary dating between 1791 and 1796. Additionally, a drawing of the Town of York dating to 1818 by Lieutenant Phillpotts of the Royal Engineers indicates the town boundaries at that time. Fort Rouillé is shown to the west, where the present day Canadian National Exhibition is located, to the east is the Don River and the Toronto Islands are indicated to the south.

The town of York was laid out as a ten-block town site with 100 acre (40.5 hectare) park lots north of the town, running from Queen Street (originally Lot Street) north to Bloor Street. These were intended for government officials as compensation for having to move to a wilderness outpost (Alexander 2005). Later, 200 acre (81 hectares) land grants were given outside of the town core as a reward to soldiers in who fought for the British in the fight against the American colonies. Land patents were also issued to attract settlers from the British Isles as well as United Empire Loyalists from the United States. These land patents were granted under conditions written in the Settlement Duty Agreement that required patent holders to clear and fence five acres (two hectares) of land, and build a house 18 feet by 20 feet (5.5 metres by 6.1 metres) and open the road fronting the lot within the first 18 months of settlement.

Settlers arrived in York as early as 1794 and in some cases were squatters who obtained squatters rights at the time of the first survey. Townships were quickly settled by Scottish, Irish and English immigrants and French émigré families from the French Revolution. Many were also from Pennsylvania. These included the

Pennsylvania Dutch (more correctly Pennsylvania Deutsch or German), Quakers, Mennonites and Brethren in Christ – known as "Dunkards" or "Tunkers."

Nearby Settlements

German Mills

In 1792, William Berczy left Hamburg, Germany for New York State, leading a group of colonists to assist in the development of a large track of land in Western New York. In order to do so, Berczy borrowed money to acquire supplies needed for the journey. Upon discovering that in New York they would be renters rather than owners, the caravan of settlers decided to move again, this time looking north to Canada. An estimated 300 settlers arrived in York County in the spring of 1794. Berczy was offered a considerable amount of land from Lieutenant Governor Simcoe if he could persuade the German peoples to move to lands east of York County and assist in the development of Yonge Street up to Lake Simcoe. Berczy once again borrowed money to aid the settlers in these undertakings.

The Berczy settlers established a settlement that would become known as German Mills located on Lot 4 Concession III (Bruce and Gohn 1950) in Markham Township, however land grants were issued surrounding this Lot, including south into York Township. It is in York Township where the well-known Cummer family settled south of where the Don River forks to the East Branch and German Mills Creek. In Markham, a number of buildings were constructed in the late eighteenth century, including a sawmill, a flour mill, a distillery, a brewery, a malt house, a blacksmith shop and a cooper chop (Bruce and Gohn 1950:13). Unfortunately, land clearing resulted in a decreased water supply along the creek, which provided insufficient power to operate the village industries and subsequently there was a decline in population. Further, by 1805, Berczy was in financial disgrace, having lost \$150,000 in his ventures into colonization. It appears that in 1804 or 1805, Captain Babington Nolan purchased the saw and grist mills that had been listed for sale by Berczy.

According to the Gazette of 1818, the German Mills and Distillery were still in operation. By 1828, it is noted that German Mills was a ghost town, with all remaining buildings boarded up. The United Empire Loyalist advertised the same year the sale of lease of the property called Nolanville or German Mills, with 50 acres under fencing and improvement, with a dwelling house, barn stables, sawmill, grist mill distillery, brew house, malt house and several other outbuildings (Weaver 1974:2).

All that remains of this settlement is the old German Mills Road between Don Mills Road and John Street, and the German Mills School House. It is unknown exactly when the original Markham School House No. 2 was constructed for the German Mills community, but several references discuss the school. Folklore suggests the first children in the area were taught in the home of Melchoir Quantz, a known Markham Township schoolmaster. Additionally, folklore alluded to an early log school that once stood on the east side of German Mills Road on Lot 4 where the Cummer Family lived (Weaver 1974:3).

A further look at the census return for the area revealed a frame school house was standing on David Cummer's property on Lot 4 Concession III in 1851. Furthermore, the 1871 census return indicated "School House No. 2" was built on Samuel Cummer's (son of David) property on Lot 4 at that time. In 1874, William Cherry was recorded as selling land to the school trustees for School House No. 2 in the land abstracts. One account by a local resident indicated that an earlier schoolhouse in the same location caught fire, hence the building of a new school. Without doubt, there seems to be some confusion on which lot the school was built upon. Modern day imagery indicates the schoolhouse property is located on both Lots 3 and 4, which may account for the confusion between the map cartographers and census enumerators. Markham School House No.2 continued to teach local children until 1962 when it was deemed too small for the community. Afterwards, the building operated as a community centre and presently operates as a day care. The Town of Markham designated the German Mills School House under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act in 1980.

In the 1940's, a sand quarry was opened on Lots 3 and 4 by John Sabiston Ltd. This quarry operated until about the 1960's when the excavated quarry was used as a landfill. The landfill was in active use until it was closed in 1975.

Lot Summaries

A review of the land abstract indices for Lots 23 to 25, Concession II E and Lot 25, Concession III E, York Township, historic County of York was conducted to identify early settler histories for the properties.

Lot 23, Concession II E

This lot was patented to Kings College in 1828 which sold 60 aces of the west half to John Cummer in 1836. According to a directory for the City of Toronto from 1837, James Mitchell, Samuel Sanderson and John D. Staples were residing on this Lot at the time. By 1851, the census return for this area indicated Jacob Cummer, son of John, was residing on this lot with his family in a one-storey frame house. His occupation was listed as a miller and the census noted a flour mill which employed three individuals. The 1851 map (**Map 3**) illustrated the Cummer grist mill, as well as two additional structures.

By 1860 (**Map 4**), the eastern hundred acres was owned by Richard Wilson with one structure central to the lot. In the southwestern corner of the east half of the property, the Cummer grist mill was depicted. West of the mill on the west half of the property, approximately 25 acres was illustrated as owned by "J.C.", Jacob Cummer. The north half of this parcel is predominately covered by a mill pond. West of the Cummer's are two additional parcels owned by Owen Davidson and George Davis.

In 1878 (**Map 5**), the grist mill was now owned by J. Cooper who acquired the property and business from the Cummer's in 1868. East of the mill, Jonathan Lindsay who was illustrated a house and an orchard. West of Cooper's mill was owned by Owen Davidson.

Lot 24, Concession II E

James Macauley was granted this lot by the Crown in 1808. The Macauley family "trusted" the property to the Honourable George Crookshanks in 1829 who sold to John Cummer in 1833. Cummer sold the western hundred acres to William Sedgeworth in 1850 who was listed as living on the lot in the 1837 and in the 1851 census return. The 1851 Browne Map (**Map 3**) illustrates a sawmill on this lot and the 1851 census indicates a William Deveraux as a saw miller next to Jacob Cummer's name. In 1855, Sedgeworth sold to David Mulholland who is illustrated on the western half of this property in 1860 (**Map 4**). The eastern half of this lot depicts Thomas Davidson, shown with a sawmill and associated mill pond on the eastern half of the property, as well as R.W. Wilson. By 1878 (**Map 5**), the eastern hundred acres was owned by Mrs. M. Burns, shown with a long laneway leading to a house, and Jonathan Lindsay. The western hundred acres was owned by Joseph Shepard, depicted with a laneway, house, orchard and mill pond.

Lot 25, Concession II E

Patented to Elizabeth Macauley in 1799, the Macauley family sold the south half to William Dickson in 1832 and the north half to Joseph Abraham in 1833. A John Dixon (a possible iteration of Dickson) was recorded as

residing on this lot in the 1837 directory, however the 1851 census indicates the property was occupied by William Dickson and the Abraham family. Both families are illustrated on the 1860 map (**Map 4**). The land abstracts indicate the Abraham family retained the north property until 1880, when it was sold to John Coats (Coates), and the Dickson family retained the south property until 1883, when it sold to Benjamin Madill. The 1878 map (**Map 5**) illustrates Coates and Dickson with homes on the western margins of their properties.

Lot 25 Concession III E

This lot was granted to William Baldwin in 1803 who sold it to John Duncan in 1830. William Duncan was listed as residing on this lot in the 1837 Directory and the Duncan family was illustrated on the 1860 Tremaine Map (**Map 4**), with John on the south half and William on the north half. By 1878 (**Map 5**), the south half was occupied by George Duncan, illustrated with a house and orchard, and the north half was occupied by Jonathan Cox, illustrated with a houses are central to the lot and not within the study area.

Review of Maps and Aerial Photography

Nineteenth-Century Maps

Three nineteenth-century maps were reviewed for depiction of features of archaeological potential within the study area: the 1851 Browne Map of York Township (**Map 3**), the 1860 Tremaine Map of York County (**Map 4**) and the 1878 Miles & Co. Illustrated Atlas of York County (**Map 5**). **Table 1** summarizes the historical features illustrated on these maps and are located within the German Mills GSMP EA study area. Note that the Don River is illustrated significantly further east in the 1851 Map and may have been a mapping error. Subsequently, the review of this map assumed reasonable continuity for historical features, including the grist and sawmills, within the study area based on later historical mapping.

While the maps show several historical features within the study area, it should be stressed that not every aspect of potential interest today would have been illustrated on the historic maps and unknown features could be located within the study area. Consequently, the possibility remains that farm middens or outbuildings, outbuildings relating to the estates, parks, and other features associated with homesteads and early villages, exists within the project limits. Given the proximity of depicted structures to the study area it is possible that previously undocumented structures could be encountered relating to nineteenth-century residential, agricultural, and commercial areas.

Map & Township	Lot - Concession	Name	Historical Features within Study area
1851 Browne	23 – 2 EYS		Grist mill
	24 – 2 EYS		Sawmill
	25 – 2 EYS		Woodlot
	25 – 3 EYS		Woodlot
1860 Tremaine	23 – 2 EYS	E ½ - Richard Wilson W ½ - Owen Davidson, Geo. Davis, J.C.	Grist mill and mill pond; 3 structures

Table 1. Summary of 19th Century Historical Features

Map & Township	Lot - Concession	Name	Historical Features within Study area
	24 – 2 EYS	E ½ - Thomas Davidson, R.W. Wilson W ½ - David Mulholland	Sawmill and mill pond
	25 – 2 EYS	N ½ - Benj. Abrahams Est. S ½ - Wm Dickson	
	25 – 3 EYS	N ½ - Wm Duncan Sr. S ½ - John Duncan	
1878 Miles & Co.	23 – 2 EYS	E ½ - Jno Lindsay W ½ - Owen Davidson, J. Cooper	Grist mill; mill pond
	24 – 2 EYS	E ½ - Mrs. M. Burns, Jno Lindsay W ½ - Joseph E. Shepard	Mill pond
	25 – 2 EYS	N ½ - Jno Coates S ½ - Jno Dickson	
	25 – 3 EYS	N ½ - Jno Cox S ½ - George Duncan	

Twentieth-Century Topographic Maps and Aerial Photographs

Topographic maps from 1914 to 1933 (**Maps 6 and 7**) and aerial photographs from 1947 to 1989 (**Images 1 to 5**) were reviewed to evaluate the growth and development of the study area and are on file at TRCA. Aerial photographs are important sources to review as they can display past disturbances within a study area. Aerial photographs are also valued for their ability to track changes in watercourse alignments and natural greenspace cover, though greenspaces depicted on aerial photographs often hide potential structures within a study area. It should be noted that due to the size of the study area, not every topographic map and aerial photograph has been included in this report.

Topographic maps illustrate no structures within the study area from 1914 and 1933 (**Maps 6 and 7**). Aerial photograph reveals an evolving and growing surrounding community, with a handful of visible structures within the study area. The study area over time has remained largely wooded and naturalized.

Some observable changes over time include the dam associated with the Cummer grist mill and the Jacob Cummer House (see **Section 2.4**), both are located just outside of the western study area limits on aerial images dating between 1947 and 1989 (**Images 1 to 5**). The 1947 aerial (**Image 1**) depicts two structures within the study area. One structure can be seen where Cummer Avenue bends south of the Don River in the southern study area limits. The second structure is shown in the northwestern portion of the study area, amongst trees at a roundabout. It is unknown when these structures were constructed, and both appear to have been demolished by 1967 (**Image 3**). Between 1967 and 1989 (**Images 3 to 5**) residential subdivision development was well underway surrounding the study area.

Present Land Use

The study area is presently designated as part Natural Areas, Parks and Hydro Corridors according to the City of Toronto's Official Plan – Land Use Plan (City of Toronto 2019).

2.3 Archaeological Context

The general geography and geology, previous archaeological sites registered in the vicinity, site predictive models and previous archaeological assessments within 50 metres of the current study area were reviewed to provide archaeological context for the current study area.

General Geography and Geology

The study area is located in the Peel Plain physiographic region of southern Ontario. The Peel Plain is a landform that spreads over 780 square kilometres, gradually slopes toward Lake Ontario, and ranges in elevation from 150 to 230 metres above sea level (Chapman and Putnam 1984:174). The Credit, Humber, Don and Rouge Rivers provide drainage and wetlands. However, water supply on the plain can be inconsistent due to shallow overburden, dense till and lack of natural aquifers. The plain also experiences a high degree of evaporation (Chapman and Putnam 1984:175). Although the Peel Plain is now almost completely deforested, in the past it supported high quality hardwood forests. Fertile soils have resulted in extensive agricultural use of the plain and it was once a noted wheat-growing area (Chapman and Putnam 1984:176). Century farms can still be found dotting the plain.

Current Land Use and Conditions

The study area currently encompasses ravine and greenspace areas behind residential subdivisions in the City of Toronto and is used as recreational parkland with several pedestrian trails (**Map 8**). Three native soil types were identified within the study area including Cashel clay, Bottom land, and Peel clay. Cashel clay is a grey-brown podzolic that is stonefree with good drainage. Peel clay is a grey-brown podzolic with imperfect drainage and is stonefree. Bottom Land is an alluvial soil with variable drainage. Due to the extensive urban expansion of the Greater Toronto Area since 1954, the native soil information is unavailable for built up portions of the study area (OMAFRA 2009).

Reports Documenting Archaeological Assessments within 50 metres

Three previous archaeological assessments were identified within the study area based on TRCA project records.

CIF 1996-034

Archaeological Resource Assessment of lands owned by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority: Pedestrian Trail Survey Along the German Mills Creek Between Leslie Street and Cummer Avenue. Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (MTRCA) conducted an archaeological assessment along German Mills Creek prior to the extension of a pedestrian trail running from Leslie Street and Steels Avenue through to Olean Court. Ploughed areas were subject to pedestrian survey at one-metre intervals. Nonploughed components were subject to test pit survey at five-metre intervals. No cultural resources were encountered, and no further archaeological assessment was recommended (MTRCA 1996).

PIF P019-123-2008

Archaeological Assessment of TRCA Property in the City of Toronto (Stage 1 and 2) Erosion Control Projects: East Don River, Lots 13, 20 and 25, Concession II, Lot 25, Concession III, Lots 2 and 10, Convession IV, Former Borough of North York, City of Toronto

TRCA conducted a Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment ahead of proposed erosion control measures. This study encompasses a large portion of the southern half of the current study area. The project area was subject to test pit survey at five-metre intervals. A small collection of undiagnostic Euro-Canadian architectural material was encountered and not considered to have significant cultural heritage value or interest. No further archaeological assessment was recommended (TRCA 2009).

PIF P338-041-2012

Archaeological Assessment (Stage 1-2) in the City of Toronto, Duncan Creek Erosion Control and Creek Restoration

TRCA conducted a Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment ahead of the proposed erosion control and creek restoration. The project area was subject to test pit survey at five-metre intervals. No artifactual material or cultural features were located within the project area and no further archaeological assessment was recommended (TRCA 2013).

Previously Identified Archaeological Sites

Consultation with the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database (OASD) maintained by the MHSTCI, and TRCA project records indicates that four archaeological sites have been previously located within one kilometre of the study area (**Table 2**). No sites are located within 50 metres of the study area.

Borden Number	Site Name	Time Period	Affinity	Site Type	Current Development Review Status
AkGu-8	Zion Heights				
AkGu-17	Doncaster 2	Woodland, Late		Village	Further CHVI
AkGu-64	Zion Primitive Methodist Church	Post-Contact, Woodland, Late	Aboriginal, Euro- Canadian	Church/chapel	
AkGu-88		Woodland	Aboriginal	Unknown	Further CHVI

Table 2. Registered Archaeological Sites within One Kilometre of the Study Area

Archaeological Potential Models

Archaeological Site Predictive Models (ASPM) are tools used to assist in determining the probability of encountering archaeological sites. Probability models are created under careful consideration of several variables including: distance to water, stream order, soil type, drainage, physiographic region, degree of slope, proximity to registered archaeological sites, and degree of disturbance.

In 1990, TRCA's Archaeological Master Plan was designed to assess the potential for cultural resources within a particular property. The model employs High, Medium and Low probability categories based on the several

variables noted above. The three most significant factors that determine settlement location of past peoples are close proximity to water, well drained soils, and flat to gently sloping terrain. While the model does not forecast exact site locations, it does present a generalized prediction based on the known settlement patterns of Indigenous populations. The accuracy of such models has not been thoroughly studied and compared with archaeological finds in the last two decades; however, it is quite clear that most sites are located in high probability areas. A scenario where archaeological potential is nil occurs when there is reliable, convincing data to determine that a location has been thoroughly disturbed and that no potential remains for intact archaeological resources to survive. Nevertheless, even in areas of disturbance, there is still the possibility to encounter deeply buried deposits containing cultural resources. Low potential is often found in low lying wetlands and scenarios like this greatly reduce the potential for encountering archaeological sites, except in small pockets of undisturbed land at higher elevated locations within the study area.

It should be stressed that accessible water is one of the most fundamental influences on human settlement and is therefore a major indicator of archaeological potential. In the 2011 Standards and Guidelines, the MHSTCI notes that archaeological sites are likely to be discovered in project and study areas that are within 300 metres of primary water source (lakes, rivers, streams and creeks), secondary water sources (intermittent streams and creeks, springs, marshes and swamps) and features that indicate past or ancient water sources (glacial lake shorelines). Thus, areas with high probability to contain Pre-Contact cultural resources are approximately within 300 metres of a water source with good soil drainage and level to gently undulating topography.

Euro-Canadian settlers faced the same environmental constraints as Indigenous peoples including good access to water and arable soil. Primary and permanent water resources were crucial for establishing mills and well drained soils were important for gardens, crops and livestock. Roads established at this time were vital for access to settlements and transportation of goods. As a result, areas with high probability to contain Euro-Canadian sites are typically located within 100 metres of historic roads. In many cases modern roads follow these original alignments.

The application of TRCA's ASPM indicated that the study area has medium to high potential for encountering archaeological resources (TRCA 2003) (**Map 8**). This potential model is based on distance to water, drainage and slope, and does not take into consideration disturbance to the land. Within the Greater Toronto Area's watersheds, most indigenous archaeological sites have been located in high and medium potential areas. Accordingly, there is a possibility that additional archaeological sites, or remnants of Roselands or Frimette sites, may be identified within the study area, including the slope.

The City of Toronto archaeological potential model takes into consideration impacts from previous development which may result in the removal of archaeological potential. According to the City of Toronto archaeological potential model (**Map 9**), the majority of the study area has archaeological potential (City of Toronto 2011).

2.4 Built Features and Existing Cultural Heritage Resources

The study area was assessed for the identification of built features and existing cultural heritage resources. Built features, such as parks, bridges, trails and rail lines, are included in this section as their construction often has an impact on the landscape (**Map 10**). Heritage resources include the identification of municipally designated and listed structures, bridges, cemeteries, plaques and cultural heritage landscapes (**Map 11**). Occasionally a built feature may also be identified as a heritage resource. Common examples include bridges, rail lines, and cemeteries.

Built features and heritage resources may act as a gateway for historical interpretation to the public. Identification of these features and resources also provides an opportunity for future interpretation, such as commemorative plaques and informative signage.

Identified Built Features

Transportation: Roads and Railways

The major intersection of the study area is present-day Steeles Avenue and Leslie Street. Cummer Avenue is also located along the southern limits of the study area and historically was a laneway leading to the mills from Bayview Avenue (**Map 4**).

In 1906, the Canadian Northern Railway (former James Bay Railway Company) laid tracks through the study area, including a rail bridge where the rail line crosses the Don River. Due to financial troubles, the Canadian Northern Railway merged with the Canadian National Railway in 1918.

Nineteenth century maps depict continuous roadways through the study area (i.e. present-day Steeles Avenue and Leslie Street), suggesting that bridge connections were available across the East Don River. Early twentieth century topographic mapping illustrates a bridge connecting Leslie Street and Steeles Avenue over the East Don River, as well as a rail bridge on Lot 24, Concession II E (**Maps 6 and 7**). Early bridges were historically constructed out of wood. The 1913 topographic map (**Map 6**) indicates the Steeles Avenue bridge just north of the study area was once wooden; the map does not detail how the Leslie Street bridge was constructed. An archival photograph from 1964 reveals that the Leslie Street bridge was concrete at the time (**Image 12**). It is possible footings from these older bridges exist within the study area.

Bridges

Several bridges are situated within the study area and are summarized within **Table 3**. None are considered built heritage features.

Structure ID	Location	Structure Use	Year Built	Image Reference
	Cummer Avenue over			
755	Don River	Road Bridge	1968	6
308405	East Don Parkland	Vehicular Bridge	1994	7
308410	East Don Parkland	Vehicular Bridge	1980	8
	Pineway Boulevard			
	pedestrian bridge over			
768	German Mills Creek	Pedestrian Bridge	1973	9
	CNR rail over Don			
D-15-08	River	Rail Bridge	-	10
308408	East Don Parkland	Pedestrian Bridge	1985	11

Table 3. Bridges within the Study Area

Structure ID	Location	Structure Use	Year Built	Image Reference
332	Leslie Street over German Mills Creek	Road Bridge	1964	12, 13
-	Duncan Creek Trail Bridge	Pedestrian Trail	ca. 2017-2018	14

"-" denotes information not available

Parks

Bestview Park

Bestview Park is a 3.6-hectare park near Steeles Avenue and Leslie Street. The park contains amenities such as a baseball diamond, outdoor tennis courts and children's playground. The park is connected to the East Don Parklands and Don River. Additionally, there are also approximately two kilometres of natural surface (dirt) trails.

Duncan Creek Park

Duncan Creek Park is a 24 hectare park near Leslie Street and Steeles Avenue. The park features a children's playground.

East Don Parkland

The East Don Parkland is a 10-kilometre stretch along the Don River that features the natural greenspace from Steeles Avenue to Sheppard Avenue. It is a popular trail route that hosts numerous native species of flora and fauna in the City of Toronto.

The Parkland also holds the Lady's Stairs, a wooden and stone staircase built to help traverse the steep ravine areas.

Sewers

Sewers are present throughout the study area, generally following the alignments of the East Don River, German Mills Creek and Duncan Creek (**Map 11**).

Existing Cultural Heritage Resources

Heritage Register

The Ontario Heritage Act (OHA) gives municipal heritage advisory committees the responsibility of researching and recommending to municipal council properties of cultural value or interest. The properties are recorded and monitored through a heritage register as *designated* (under the OHA) or *listed* (non-designated properties with cultural heritage interest or value that may become candidates for designation). One listed heritage property was identified adjacent to (i.e., within 50 metres of) the study area:

Jacob Cummer House

Located at municipal addresses 42 and 44 Beardmore Crescent, the Jacob Cummer House was built circa 1850 by Jacob Cummer II while he was manager of the mill on the north side of Cummer Avenue at the Don River. The original farmhouse forms the central part of the present day structure, and is a mixture of Georgian and neo-classical styles. Several additions were made to the home in 1910 and the early 1930s. Due to the extensive alterations to the home over the years, it is considered to have lost its architectural authenticity. As a

result, the home was not designated as a heritage property, however due to the home's connection to the Cummer family, it became a listed heritage property by the City of Toronto in 2006.

Commemorative Plaques

During desktop review, no commemorative plaques were identified within or in close proximity (300 metres) of the study area.

Cultural Heritage Landscapes

No registered cultural heritage landscapes are located within or in close proximity (300 metres) of the study area.

Cemeteries

No cemeteries are located within or in close proximity (300 metres) of the study area.

3.0 Evaluation of Archaeological Potential

A desktop background study was completed to provide an inclusive review of the geographic and cultural features of both the study area and its surroundings in order to evaluate the potential for encountering cultural resources, and conversely, identify if and where the study area has been subjected to extensive modifications that have damaged or removed any archaeological potential. Archaeological potential as determined by the various avenues of research contained within this study are summarized below.

3.1 Potential for Encountering Pre-Contact Sites

The study area encompasses the East Don River, German Mills Creek and Duncan Creek, which would have offered rich resources such as fish, waterfowl and game that would have been exploited as part of a people's seasonal round prior to the occupation of villages. As a result, there is very high potential for encountering Indigenous sites within the study area.

3.2 Potential for Encountering Euro-Canadian Sites

Based on the proximity to water, historic roadways and a railway, and historic residential and commercial structures, the study area would be expected to demonstrate high potential for encountering Euro-Canadian sites.

The review of historic maps indicates there is potential to encounter nineteenth-century structures within the study area with additional potential to locate unillustrated features such as middens and outbuildings associated with the residences and mills. Although twentieth-century topographic maps and aerial photographs reveal some twentieth century disturbances from residential development, there remains the potential to locate cultural heritage resources within undisturbed portions of the study area.

3.3 Proximity to Known Archaeological Sites

A review of the MHSTCI's Ontario OASD revealed that four archaeological sites have been registered within one-kilometre of the study area.

3.4 Proximity to Known Built and Cultural Heritage Resources

Several inventories were reviewed in order to determine if the local study area contained any identified built heritage resources, features, or landscapes. Presently, one listed heritage property, the James Cummer House, is located within 50 metres of the study area.

3.5 Twenty and Twenty-First Century Alterations to the Land

The suburbanization of the study area and its surroundings are illustrated through through topographic maps dating between 1914 and 1933 (**Maps 6 and 7**), and aerial photography dating between 1942 and 1978 (**Images 1 to 6**).

Disturbances in the area are largely known due to hundreds of years of flooding and erosion events in the floodplains but also the urban development of associated with the surrounding residential subdivisions, and infrastructure development including the railway and bridge works. These impacts may have impacted the archaeological potential of *in situ* sites in the study area.

3.6 Summary

Based on the information summarized above, the study area has demonstrated the potential for intact cultural heritage resources, in the form of archaeological sites, to be present. Areas assessed as having archaeological potential based on the analysis outlined above are illustrated on **Maps 13 and 14**.

The features which may be encountered in the German Mills GSMP EA study area include remnants of the Cummer grist mill, Jacob Cummer house, the saw mill and remnants of early wooden bridges over the East Don River and German Mills Creek. Although modern imagery illustrate the dam and Jacob Cummer House outside of the study area, it is possible remnants of mill races, tail races and features associated with these structures are located with the study area.

4.0 Recommendations

The review of geographic and cultural features, with careful consideration of available aerial photography, has indicated that the German Mills GSMP EA study area has the potential for buried cultural resources (**Maps 13** and **14**).

It is therefore recommended that:

- A Stage 2 archaeological assessment is required in all of the areas identified as holding potential prior to any ground disturbing activities within the boundaries of the study area. Areas determined to hold potential must be subject to archaeological test pit survey at five-metre intervals prior to any ground disturbing activities, in accordance with the 2011 Standards and Guidelines.
- Areas that have been previously subjected to a Stage 2 archaeological assessment within the study area require no further archaeological assessment.
- Portions of the study area identified as disturbed and holding no potential due to deep and extensive disturbances (e.g. grading below topsoil, quarrying, building footprints, or sewage and infrastructure development) must be subject to an on-site visual survey to confirm and document their nature and extent. Only then can these areas be exempt from Stage 2 test pit survey.
- Portions of the study area classified as having low or no archaeological potential due to physiographic features (e.g., permanently wet areas; steep slope) must be subjected to an on-site visual survey to confirm and document their nature and extent. Only then can these areas be exempt from Stage 2 test pit survey.
- Future areas determined for construction that are not covered by this Stage 1 archaeological assessment such as staging areas, temporary access roads, etc., must also be subject to a Stage 1 archaeological assessment, and if recommended, a Stage 2 archaeological assessment.

Advice on Compliance and Legislation

- a. This report is submitted to the Minister of Tourism and Culture as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 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 fieldwork and report recommendations ensure the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario. When all matters relating to archaeological sites within the study 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.
- b. 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 fieldwork 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*.
- c. 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 Section 48 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.
- d. The *Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act*, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33 require that any person discovering human remains must notify the police or coroner and the Registrar of Cemeteries at the Ministry of Government and Consumer Services.

Bibliography and Sources

Alexander, S.

2005 History of Toronto and County of York. www.historyoftoronto.ca, accessed Feb. 19, 2008.

Bruce, A.D and W.C. Gohn

1950 *Historical Sketch of Markham Township 1793-1950*. Centennial Celebration of Municipal Government 1850-1950. Economist and Sun, Markham.

Chapman, L.J. and D.F. Putnam

1984 *The Physiography of Southern Ontario*. Ontario Geological Survey, Special Volume 2, 3rd Edition, Government of Ontario.

Cruickshank F.D.

1937 *History of Weston*. The Times and Guide. Weston, Ontario.

Dibb, G.

2004 The Madina Phase: Late Pleistocene-Early Holocene Occupation Along the Margins of the Simcoe Lowlands in South-Central Ontario. In *The Late Paleo-Indian Great Lakes: Geological and Archaeological Investigations of Late Pleistocene and Early Holocene Environments,* L. J. Jackson and A. Hinshelwood eds., pp. 117-126. Mercury Series, Archaeological Survey of Canada Paper 159, Canadian Museum of Civilization, Hull.

Ellis, Chris J. and Ferris, Neal

1990 *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario To AD 1650.* Occasional Publications of the London Chapter, Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., Publication Number 5, London Ontario.

Fisher S.T.

1985 *The Merchant Millers of the Humber Valley*. New Publications Canada, NC Press Limited, Toronto.

Google Earth

2021 *Google Street View*. accessed on July 31, 2021.

Hulley, R. B.

2009 The Long Forgotten Proposal to Build a "Ship Canal" Through King Township. Tapestry: A Magazine of Quality Living in King Township, Fall 2009.

Jamieson, S. M.

2002 Limited Activity and Low Visibility Remains in the Middle Trent Valley: Wishin' and Hopin' at the West Burleigh Bay Site. *Ontario Archaeology 73:29-37.*

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

1990 The Geological and Biological Environment for Occupation in Southern Ontario. In *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to AD 1650,* C. J. Ellis and N. Ferris, eds., pp. 5-36. London Chapter of the Ontario Archaeological Society Occasional Publication No.5, London, Ontario. Lennox, P. A.

2002 The McKean Site: A Late Paleo-Indian/Early Archaic Site in Simcoe County, Ontario. Available at <Adamsheritage.com/articles/lennox/mckean site>.

Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority

1996 Archaeological Resource Assessment of lands owned by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority: Pedestrian Trail Survey Along the German Mills Creek Between Leslie Street and Cummer Avenue. CIF 1996-034. On file with Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.

Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries

2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists. Queen's Printer for Ontario, Toronto.

Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA)

2009 Soil Survey Complex (Southern Ontario Soil Survey) (Version 1.0). ESRI Shapefile.

Rayburn, A.

1996 *Yorkshire Names In Canada*. www.bifhsgo.ca/classics/classics_arayburn.htm, accessed Feb. 19, 2008.

Reaman, G. E.

1971 *Vaughan Township, Two Centuries of Life in the Township*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Ritchie, W. A.

1994 *The Archaeology of New York State.* Reprinted. Purple Mountain Press, Fleischmanns, New York. Originally published 1965, Doubleday & Company, New York.

Stamp, R.M.

1991 *Early Days in Richmond Hill: A History of the Community to 1930, the Road Through Richmond Hill, Augustus Jones Finishes the Road.* http://edrh.rhpl.richmondhill.oln.ca/default.asp?ID=s1.6, accessed Feb. 19, 2008

Toronto, City of

- 2011 Interim Archaeological Potential. toronto.ca/open accessed on June 17, 2011.
- 2019 *Toronto Official Plan Land Use Plan*. https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/97f2-cp-official-plan-Map-19_LandUse_AODA.pdf, accessed on August 17, 2021
- 2021 Bridge and Structure Condition. https://www.toronto.ca/city-government/data-researchmaps/maps/bridge-and-structure-condition/, accessed on July 31, 2021

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority

- 2009 Archaeological Assessment of TRCA Property in the City of Toronto (Stage 1 and 2) Erosion Control Projects: East Don River, Lots 13, 20 and 25, Concession II, Lot 25, Concession III, Lots 2 and 10, Convession IV, Former Borough of North York, City of Toronto. PIF P019-123-2008. On file with Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.
- 2013 Archaeological Assessment (Stage 1-2) in the City of Toronto, Duncan Creek Erosion Control and Creek Restoration. PIF P338-041-2012. On file with Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.

Weaver, L.

1974 German Mills School Centennial, 1874-1974. No Publisher. Willowdale, Ontario.

Yu, Z.

- 2003 Late Quaternary Dynamics of Tundra and Forest Vegetation in the Southern Niagara Escarpment, Canada. *New Phytologist 157:365-390.*
- Yu, Z. and J. H. McAndrews
- 1994 Holocene Water Levels at Rice Lake, Ontario, Canada: sediment, pollen and plant macrofossil evidence. *The Holocene* 4(2): 141-152.

Maps and Aerial Photographs

- 1851 *Plan of the Township of York*, B.O. Browne.
- 1860 Tremaine's Map of the County of York, Canada West. G.C. Tremaine, Toronto.
- 1878 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of York. Miles and Company, Toronto.
- 1914 *Topographic Map.* Department of Militia & Defence. Markham Sheet.
- 1933 Topographic Map. Department of National Defence. Brampton Sheet.
- 1947 Aerial Photograph. Ministry of Natural Resources.
- 1954 Aerial Photograph. Ministry of Natural Resources.
- 1967 Aerial Photograph. Spartan Air Service.
- 1971 Aerial Photograph. Ministry of Natural Resources.
- 1989 Aerial Photograph. Aquarius Flight Inc.

Archival Materials

Land Abstracts

Lots 23 to 25 Concession II East of Yonge Street Lot 25 Concession III East of Yonge Street, York Township, City of Toronto. Accessed online at OnLand.ca.

Appendix A: Maps



Map 1. General Study area



Map 2. Development Plan



Map 3. Detail of 1851 Browne Map – York County



Map 4. Detail of 1860 Tremaine Map – York County



Map 5. Detail of 1878 Miles & Co. Illustrated Atlas – York County



Map 6. 1914 Topographic Map



Map 7. 1933 Topographic Map



Map 8. Local Topography – Study area



Map 9. TRCA Archaeological Potential Model

Map 10. City of Toronto Archaeological Potential Model

Map 11. Built Features

Map 12. Built Heritage

Map 13. Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Recommendations (west half)

Map 14. Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Recommendations (east half)

Appendix B: Images

Image 1. 1947 aerial photograph of the study area

Image 2. 1954 aerial photograph of the study area

Image 3. 1967 aerial photograph of the study area

Image 4. 1971 aerial photograph of the study area

Image 5. 1989 aerial photograph of the study area

Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment: German Mills Creek Geomorphic Systems Master Plan EA

Image 6. Cummer Avenue over Don River Bridge – October 31, 2017 (City of Toronto 2021)

Image 7. East Don Parkland, Structure ID 308405 - March 30, 2016 (City of Toronto 2021)

Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment: German Mills Creek Geomorphic Systems Master Plan EA

Image 8. East Don Parkland, Structure ID 308410 - March 30, 2016 (City of Toronto 2021)

Image 9. Pineway Boulevard pedestrian bridge over German Mills Creek- October 31, 2017 (City of Toronto 2021)

Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment: German Mills Creek Geomorphic Systems Master Plan EA

Image 10. CNR rail over Don River - date unknown (City of Toronto 2021)

Image 11. East Don Parkland, Structure ID 308408 – December 14, 2017 (City of Toronto 2021)

Image 12. Leslie Street over German Mills Creek – date unknown (City of Toronto Archives 2021)

Image 13. Leslie Street over German Mills Creek – October 31, 2017 (City of Toronto 2021)

Image 14. Duncan Creek Trail Bridge – date unknown (Google Earth 2021)

www.trca.ca

A HISTORY OF THE CHIPPEWAS OF RAMA FIRST NATION

A HISTORY OF THE CHIPPEWAS OF RAMA FIRST NATION

The following text describes the history of the Chippewas of Rama First Nation and was requested to be included with the Stage 1 Archaeology Report for German Mills Creek. Sent to <u>germanmills@toronto.ca</u> from <u>consultation@ramafirstnation.ca</u> on December 4, 2023:

The Chippewas of Rama First Nation are an Anishinaabe (Ojibway) community located at Rama First Nation, ON. Our history began with a great migration from the East Coast of Canada into the Great Lakes region. Throughout a period of several hundred years, our direct ancestors again migrated to the north and eastern shores of Lake Huron and Georgian Bay. Our Elders say that we made room in our territory for our allies, the Huron-Wendat Nation, during their times of war with the Haudenosaunee. Following the dispersal of the Huron-Wendat Nation from the region in the mid-1600s, our stories say that we again migrated to our territories in what today is known as Muskoka and Simcoe County. Several major battles with the Haundenosaunee culminated in peace being agreed between the Anishinaabe and the Haudenosaunee, after which the Haudenosaunee agreed to leave the region and remain in southern Ontario. Thus, since the early 18th century, much of central Ontario into the lower parts of northern Ontario has been Anishinaabe territory.

The more recent history of Rama First Nation begins with the creation of the "Coldwater Narrows" reserve, one of the first reserves in Canada. The Crown intended to relocate our ancestors to the Coldwater reserve and ultimately assimilate our ancestors into Euro-Canadian culture. Underlying the attempts to assimilate our ancestors were the plans to take possession of our vast hunting and harvesting territories. Feeling the impacts of increasingly widespread settlement, many of our ancestors moved to the Coldwater reserve in the early 1830s. Our ancestors built homes, mills, and farmsteads along the old portage route which ran through the reserve, connecting Lake Simcoe to Georgian Bay (this route is now called "Highway 12"). After a short period of approximately six years, the Crown had a change of plans. Frustrated at our ancestors continued exploiting of hunting territories (spanning roughly from Newmarket to the south, Kawartha Lakes to the east, Meaford to the west, and Lake Nipissing to the north), as well as unsuccessful assimilation attempts, the Crown reneged on the promise of reserve land. Three of our Chiefs, including Chief Yellowhead, went to York under the impression they were signing documents affirming their ownership of land and buildings. The Chiefs were misled, and inadvertently allegedly surrendered the Coldwater reserve back to the Crown.

Our ancestors, then known as the Chippewas of Lakes Simcoe and Huron, were left landless. Earlier treaties, such as Treaty 16 and Treaty 18, had already resulted in nearly 2,000,000 acres being allegedly surrendered to the Crown. The Chippewas made the decision to split into three groups. The first followed Chief Snake to Snake Island and Georgina Island (today known as the Chippewas of Georgina Island). The second group followed Chief Aissance to Beausoleil Island, and later to Christian Island (Beausoleil First Nation). The third group, led by Chief Yellowhead, moved to the Narrows between Lakes Simcoe and Couchiching and eventually, Rama (Chippewas of Rama First Nation).

A series of purchases, using Rama's own funds, resulted in Yellowhead purchasing approximately 1,600 acres of abandoned farmland in Rama Township. This land makes up the core of the Rama Reserve today, and we have called it home since the early 1840's. Our ancestors began developing our community, clearing fields for farming and building homes. They continued to hunt and harvest in their traditional territories, especially within the Muskoka region, up until the early 1920's. In 1923, the Williams Treaties were signed, surrendering 12,000,000 acres of previously unceded land to the Crown.

Once again, our ancestors were misled, and they were informed that in surrendering the land, they gave up their right to access their seasonal traditional hunting and harvesting territories.

With accessing territories difficult, our ancestors turned to other ways to survive. Many men guided tourists around their former family hunting territories in Muskoka, showing them places to fish and hunt. Others worked in lumber camps and mills. Our grandmothers made crafts such as porcupine quill baskets and black ash baskets, and sold them to tourists visiting Simcoe and Muskoka. The children were forced into Indian Day School, and some were taken away to Residential Schools. Church on the reserve began to indoctrinate our ancestors. Our community, along with every other First Nation in Canada, entered a dark period of attempted genocide at the hands of Canada and the Crown. Somehow, our ancestors persevered, and they kept our culture, language, and community alive.

Today, our community has grown into a bustling place, and is home to approximately 1,100 people. We are a proud and progressive First Nations community.

APPENDIX C2 Overview of Historic Channel Traces

- Channel Planform 1954
- Channel Planform 1965
- Channel Planform 1978
- Channel Planform 2005 Channel Planform – 2018
- Reach Break
- ---- Watercourse
- ----- Highway
- ----- Road
- → Railway
- Sanitary Sewer Constructed in 1969
- ----- Storm Sewer
- ----- Watermain
- ▲ Stormwater Outfall
- Sanitary Sewer Maintenance Hole
- Storm Sewer Maintenance Hole

Disclaimer: Sewers have been clipped to the Focused Study Area.

Reference: Contains information licensed under the Open Government Licence – Ontario. Imagery (2018) obtained from Canada Map Sales. used under license. Imagene provided hy City of Toronte Licent under license.

City of Toronto German Mills Creek GSMP EA

Overview of Historical Channel Traces

)ate:	December 2021	Project 32227	Submitter: N. Cyples	Reviewer: J. McDonald
Disclaimer:	The information contained her	rein may be compiled from numerous third	party materials that are subject to periodic	change Figure
without prio	r notification. While every effor	t has been made by Matrix Solutions Inc. to	o ensure the accuracy of the information pro-	asented
at the time o	of publication, Matrix Solutions	Inc. assumes no liability for any errors, om	issions, or inaccuracies in the third party m	aterial. C2a

0070

4851600

300		
4851600		 Channel Planform – 1954 Channel Planform – 1965 Channel Planform – 1978 Channel Planform – 2005 Channel Planform – 2018 Reach Break Watercourse Highway Road Railway Sanitary Sewer Constructed in 1969 Storm Sewer Watermain Stormwater Outfall Sanitary Sewer Maintenance Hole
4851500		 Storm Sewer Maintenance Hole
4851400	001	
4851300		Disclaimer: Sewers have been clipped to the Focused Study Area. <u>1.2,000</u> metres
		Reference: Contains Information Icensed under the Open Government Licence – 20 0 20 40 Ontairo. Imagery (2018) obtained from Canada Map Sales. used under license. NAD27 MTM zone 10
		Matrix Solutions Inc. ENVIRONMENT & ENGINEERING
851200	007100	City of Toronto German Mills Creek GSMP EA
	r	Overview of Historical Channel Traces
		Date: December 2021 Project: 32227 Submitter: N Cyroles Reviewer: J McDonald
300		Disclaimer: The information contained herein may be compiled from numerous third party materials that are subject to previotic change whou tryic notification. While every effort has been made by Matrix Solutions inc. to ensure the accuracy of the information cresented
		at the time of publication, Matrix Solutions Inc. assumes no fability for any errors, omissions, or inaccuracies in the third party material.

