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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY  

Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) was contracted by HDR | iTRANS, Toronto, on behalf of the County of Northumberland, to conduct a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (background research and property inspection) as part of the Reconstruction of County Road 2 Class Environmental Assessment Study. The project extends from Hamilton Road in Port Hope to William Street in Cobourg, Northumberland County. The overall project will consider existing and future transportation issues, surface water drainage requirements, property needs and traffic management options for the County Road 2 corridor.

The Stage 1 background research determined that a single archaeological site has been registered within 1 km the study corridor. A review of the geography and local nineteenth century land use of the study corridor suggested that it has potential for the identification of Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian archaeological sites.

The property inspection confirmed that the entire right-of-way (ROW) has been previously and thoroughly disturbed. Although some lands adjacent to the ROW have been previously disturbed by commercial development or can be characterized as low and wet, there are several areas adjacent to the ROW that remain undisturbed and contain archaeological potential.

In light of these results, ASI makes the following recommendations:

1. The existing County Road 2 ROW does not retain archaeological site potential due to previous ground disturbances. Additional archaeological assessment is therefore not required along this portion of the study corridor; and

2. If construction extends beyond the disturbed ROW, a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment is required on any lands within the study corridor where there is potential for archaeological sites, in accordance with Draft Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) was contracted by HDR | iTRANS, Toronto, on behalf of the County of Northumberland, to conduct a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (background research and property inspection) as part of the Reconstruction of County Road 2 Class Environmental Assessment Study (Figure 1). The project extends from Hamilton Road in Port Hope to William Street in Cobourg, Northumberland County. The overall project will consider existing and future transportation issues, surface water drainage requirements, property needs and traffic management options for the County Road 2 corridor.

Authorization to carry out the activities necessary for the completion of the Stage 1 assessment was granted to ASI by HDR | iTRANS on May 25, 2010.

The objectives of this report are:

- To provide information about the geography, history, previous archaeological fieldwork and current land condition of the study corridor;
- To evaluate in detail the archaeological potential of the study corridor which can be used, if necessary, to support recommendations for a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment for all or parts of the study corridor; and
- To recommend appropriate strategies for a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, if necessary.

2.0 BACKGROUND RESEARCH

The Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of the study corridor was conducted in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act (2005) and the Draft Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MCL 2009). A Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment involves a background study to provide detailed documentary research on the archaeological and land use history and present conditions of the study corridor. Specifically, the background study provides information about previous archaeological fieldwork within and around the study corridor, its geography and history, and current land conditions.

2.1 Previous Archaeological Research

In order for an inventory of archaeological resources to be compiled for the study corridor, three sources of information were consulted: the site record forms for registered sites housed at the Ministry of Tourism and Culture (MTC) 1; published and unpublished documentary sources; and the files of ASI.

In Ontario, information concerning archaeological sites is stored in the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database (OASD) maintained by the MTC. This database contains archaeological sites registered within the Borden system. Under the Borden system, Canada has been divided into grid blocks based on latitude and longitude. A Borden block is approximately 13 km east to west, and approximately 18.5 km north to.

---

1 In January 2010, the Government of the Province of Ontario re-organized several of its ministries, and the new Ministry of Tourism and Culture was formed from the former Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Tourism.
Figure 1: Location of the study corridor.

Base Map: NTS Sheet 30 M/16 (Port Hope)
Each Borden block is referenced by a four-letter designator, and sites within a block are numbered sequentially as they are found. The study corridor under review is located in Borden block AlGn.

According to the OASD (email communication, Robert von Bitter, MTC Data Coordinator, July 20, 2010), a single archaeological site has been registered within 1 km of the study corridor. The Moore Site, AlGn-1, was registered in 1978 by Arthur C. B. Roberts after a local resident reported finding a single artifact unknown Aboriginal cultural affiliation. Another local resident reported that local children had found multiple artifacts (i.e. Aboriginal projectile points) at this location in 1962.

### 2.2 Geography

The study corridor is situated within the Iroquois Plain physiographic region of southern Ontario, which is a lowland region bordering Lake Ontario. This region is characteristically flat formed by lacustrine deposits laid down by the inundation of Lake Iroquois, a body of water that existed during the late Pleistocene. This region extends from the Trent River, around the western part of Lake Ontario, to the Niagara River, spanning a distance of 190 miles (Chapman and Putnam 1984:190). The old shorelines of Lake Iroquois include cliffs, bars, beaches and boulder pavements. The old sandbars in this region are good aquifers that supply water to farms and villages. To the north of Port Hope and Cobourg, the old shoreline is very much indented. It is a region of many large drumlins, some of which stood out as islands in the old lake while others formed jutting promontories (Chapman and Putnam, 1984:194).

Potable water is the single most important resource necessary for any extended human occupation or settlement. Since water sources have remained relatively stable in south central Ontario since the Pleistocene era, proximity to water can be regarded as a useful index for the evaluation of archaeological site potential. Indeed, distance from water has been one of the most commonly used variables for predictive modeling of site location.

The Draft Standards and Guidelines stipulates that primary water sources (lakes, rivers, streams, creeks, etc.), secondary water sources (intermittent streams and creeks, springs, marshes, swamps, etc.), ancient water sources (glacial lake shorelines indicated by the presence of raised sand or gravel beach ridges, relic river or stream channels indicated by clear dip or swale in the topography, shorelines of drained lakes or marshes, cobble beaches, etc.), as well as accessible or inaccessible shorelines (high bluffs, swamp or marsh fields by the edge of a lake, sandbars stretching into marsh, etc.) are characteristics that indicate archaeological potential (MCL 2009:5). Gage Creek bisects County Road 2 just east of Hamilton Road and Cobourg Creek is located just east of William Street. Other unnamed tributaries also bisect the central portion of the study corridor.

Other geographic characteristics that can indicate archaeological potential include: elevated topography (eskers, drumlins, large knolls, plateaux), pockets of well-drained sandy soil, especially near areas of heavy soil or rocky ground, distinctive land formations that might have been special or spiritual places, such as waterfalls, rock outcrops, caverns, mounds, and promontories and their bases. There may be physical indicators of their use, such as burials, structures, offerings, rock paintings or carvings. Resource areas, including; food or medicinal plants (migratory routes, spawning areas, prairie) and scarce raw materials (quartz, copper, ochre, or outcrops of chert) are also considered characteristics that indicate archaeological potential (MCL 2009:5-6). The present study corridor does not exhibit any of these characteristics.
Therefore, due to the proximity of numerous water sources, it may be concluded that there is potential for the recovery of Aboriginal cultural material within the study corridor.

2.3 Land-Use History

2.3.1 Township Survey, Settlement, and Transportation

The former Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland, was first settled by United Empire Loyalists and immigrants from England and Scotland. It is bound by Rice Lake in the north, Lake Ontario in the South, Hope Township in the west and Haldimand Township in the east. Eluid Nickerson is credited to have been the first settler, in 1798, on the site of present-day Cobourg. Cobourg soon became the main centre in the township, and expanded even more rapidly when a harbour was built at the foot of Division Street in 1832. Lumber was the chief export commodity shipped from Cobourg’s harbour. Cobourg was also a regular port of call for Durham boats and early steamers on Lake Ontario. It was located on the York to Kingston Road, and was a stop over for stages and Cobourg’s inns and hotels prospered. The township had a rural charm and it is still evident today (Mika 1981:220).

2.3.2 Historic Map Review

The 1878 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the Counties of Northumberland and Durham, Ontario was reviewed to determine the potential for the presence of historical archaeological remains within the study corridor during the nineteenth century (Figure 2).

![Figure 2: The study corridor overlaid on the map of Hamilton Township.](image)
Historically, the study corridor was located on Lots 21 to 35, between the road allowance for Concession A and Concession I, in the former Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland. County Road 2 is a historically surveyed thoroughfare travelling east-west across the township. The available data gathered from the historic atlas is summarized in Table 1. It should be noted, however, that not all features of interest were mapped systematically in the Ontario series of historical atlases, given that they were financed by subscription, and subscribers were given preference with regard to the level of detail provided on the maps. Moreover, not every feature of interest would have been within the scope of the atlases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conc.</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Property Owner</th>
<th>Historic Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M. Burnham</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M. Burnham</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Walter Underwood</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>M. Nicholls,</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James Cunningham</td>
<td>Homestead, Toll Gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mathias Carr</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. G. Hagerman</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>L. Rowe</td>
<td>2 homesteads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mathias Carr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mary L. Jones</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>R. Higet</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Carr</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>J. Carr</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G. Ruddock</td>
<td>School House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>G. Ruddock</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>W. Clemence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>W. Clemence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>J. Wade</td>
<td>Toll Gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Henry Toms,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Molsom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M. Burnham</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M. Burnham</td>
<td>2 homesteads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>J.B. Dundas</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel Nicholls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>M. Carr</td>
<td>Homestead, Toll Gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>R. Foster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W.L. Burnham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>W.L. Burnham</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E. Philips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>E. Philips</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. Gifford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>S. Purser</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>M. Purser</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>A. Haig</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>W. Roddock</td>
<td>2 homesteads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G. Ruddock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>R. Morton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>J. Wade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>J. Wade</td>
<td>Toll Gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Henry Toms</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the Euro-Canadian period, the majority of early nineteenth century farmsteads (i.e., those which are arguably the most potentially significant resources and whose locations are rarely recorded on nineteenth century maps) are likely to be captured by the basic proximity to the water model outlined in Section 2.2, since these occupations were subject to similar environmental constraints. An added factor, however, is the development of the network of concession roads and railroads through the course of the nineteenth century. These transportation routes frequently influenced the siting of farmsteads and businesses. Accordingly, undisturbed lands within 100 m of an early settlement road, such as County Road 2, are also considered to have potential for the presence of Euro-Canadian archaeological sites.

The Draft Standards and Guidelines stipulates that that areas of early Euro-Canadian settlement (pioneer homesteads, isolated cabins, farmstead complexes), early wharf or dock complexes, pioneer churches and early cemeteries, are considered to have archaeological potential. There may be commemorative markers of their history such as local, provincial, or federal monuments or heritage parks. Early historical transportation routes (trails, passes, roads, railways, portage routes), properties listed on a municipal register or designated under the Ontario Heritage Act or a federal, provincial, or municipal historic landmark or site, and properties that local histories or informants have identified with possible archaeological sites, historical events, activities, or occupations are also considered to have archaeological potential (MCL 2009: 6).

Therefore, based on the proximity to early Euro-Canadian settlements and early settlement roads, it may be concluded that there is potential for the recovery of historic cultural material within the study corridor.

3.0 ANALYSIS: ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL EVALUATION

The Draft Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists list characteristics that indicate where archaeological resources are most likely to be found (MCL 2009: 7). Archaeological potential is confirmed when one or more feature of archaeological potential is present.

Per Section 1.3.1 of the standards and guidelines, the study corridor meets the following criteria used for determining archaeological potential:

- Water sources: primary, secondary, or ancient water sources (i.e. Gage Creek, Cobourg Creek)
- Areas of early Euro-Canadian settlement (i.e. pioneer homesteads); and
- Early historical transportation route (i.e. County Road 2).

These criteria characterize the study corridor as having potential for the identification of Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian archaeological sites.

4.0 PROPERTY INSPECTION

A property inspection of the study corridor was conducted by Peter Carruthers (P163), ASI, on August 26, 2010, in order to gain first-hand knowledge of its geography, topography, and current conditions, and to evaluate and map its archaeological potential. The property inspection was a visual inspection only and does not include excavation or collection of archaeological resources. Weather conditions during the property inspection were sunny, clear, and 26°C.

Typically, rights-of-way (ROW) can be divided into two areas: the disturbed ROW, and ROW lands
beyond the disturbed ROW. The typically disturbed ROW extends outwards from either side of the
centerline of the traveled lanes, and it includes the traveled lanes and shoulders and extends to the toe of
the fill slope, the top of the cut slope, or the outside edge of the drainage ditch, whichever is furthest from
the centerline. Subsurface disturbance within these lands may be considered extreme and pervasive,
thereby negating any archaeological potential for such lands.

ROW construction disturbance may be found to extend beyond the typical disturbed ROW area, and this
generally includes additional grading, cutting and filling, additional drainage ditching, watercourse
alteration or channelization, servicing, removals, intensive landscaping, and heavy construction traffic.
Areas beyond the typically disturbed ROW generally require archaeological assessment in order to
determine archaeological potential relative to the type or scale of disturbances that may have occurred in
these zones.

The study corridor is primarily situated in a rural area between Port Hope and Cobourg. The property
inspection focused on the County Road 2 ROW and the immediately adjacent lands (Figures 3 to 7).

County Road 2 is an east-west arterial road and consists of a two lane rural cross-section, with wide paved
shoulders. The County Road 2 ROW has been subject to extensive and deep land alterations, such as
ditching and utility installation, that have severely damaged the integrity of any archaeological resources
(Plates 1, 3, 9-11, 13, 16-19, 24-26, 30-32, 35). The grade separation at the railway crossing has also
cause disturbance to the study corridor (Plates 6-8). Despite the rural setting, some commercial
development has also disturbed lands adjacent to the ROW (Plates 4, 14, 21, 27, 34, 37-38). Due to the
extent of previous disturbance, these areas do not exhibit archaeological site potential. No further
archaeological assessment is required at these locations (Figures 4-7: areas marked in yellow).

As mentioned in Section 2.2, the study corridor is bisected by numerous water sources, including, Gage
Creek and Cobourg Creek. For the most part, the land around these areas can be characterized as being
low and wet (Plates 1, 2, 15, 28-29).

However, beyond the disturbed ROW, the surrounding countryside traverses fairly level to gently
undulating agricultural fields (Plates 3-5, 9-10, 13, 16, 18-19, 24, 26, 30, 35). These areas have remained
relatively undisturbed, and they exhibit archaeological site potential due to their proximity to numerous
primary water sources and a historic transportation corridor. Historic structures are also of archaeological
interest, and land surrounding them exhibit archaeological site potential (Plates 12, 20, 22-23, 33, 36).
Should road improvements encroach upon undisturbed land with archaeological potential beyond the
disturbed ROW, a Stage 2 assessment should be conducted (Figures 4-7: areas marked in green).

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMPLIANCE ADVICE

The Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment was completed to assist with the Reconstruction County Road 2
Class Environmental Assessment Study. The background research determined that a single archaeological
site has been registered within 1 km the study corridor. A review of the geography and local nineteenth
century land use of the study corridor suggested that it has potential for the identification of Aboriginal
and Euro-Canadian archaeological sites.

The property inspection confirmed that the entire ROW has been previously and thoroughly disturbed.
Although some lands adjacent to the ROW have been previously disturbed by commercial development
or can be characterized as low and wet, there are several areas adjacent to the ROW that remain undisturbed and contain archaeological potential.

In light of these results, ASI makes the following recommendations:

1. The existing County Road 2 ROW does not retain archaeological site potential due to previous ground disturbances. Additional archaeological assessment is therefore not required along this portion of the study corridor; and

2. If construction extends beyond the disturbed ROW, a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment is required on any lands within the study corridor where there is potential for archaeological sites (Figures 4-7: areas marked in green), in accordance with *Draft Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (MCL 2009).

ASI advises compliance with the following legislation:

- 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*, RSO 1990, c 0.18. The report is reviewed to ensure that the licensed consultant archaeologist has met the terms and conditions of their archaeological licence, and that the archaeological fieldwork and report recommendations ensure the conservation, preservation and protection of the cultural heritage of Ontario;

- Should previously undocumented archaeological resources be discovered, they may be a new archaeological site and therefore subject to Section 48 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The proponent or person discovering the archaeological resources must cease alteration of the site immediately and engage a licensed consultant archaeologist to carry out archaeological fieldwork, in compliance with sec. 48 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*;

- The *Cemeteries Act* requires that any person discovering human remains must immediately notify the police or coroner and the Registrar of Cemeteries, Ministry of Small Business and Consumer Services; and

The documentation related to this archaeological assessment will be curated by Archaeological Services Inc. until such a time that arrangements for their ultimate transfer to Her Majesty the Queen in right of Ontario, or other public institution, can be made to the satisfaction of the project owner(s), the Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture, and any other legitimate interest groups.
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8.0 PHOTOGRAPHY

Plate 1: View east toward Hamilton Rd intersection. Note culvert on left for drainage.

Plate 2: View west along south side of bridge over Gage Creek.

Plate 3: View east along County Rd 2 ROW. Roadbed has been raised, graded, and ditched. Potential exists beyond fence line.

Plate 4: View east along County Rd 2 ROW. Note commercial development in distance. Potential exists beyond fence line.

Plate 5: View west toward open agricultural field.

Plate 6: View east along former highway ROW parallel to grade separation.
Plate 7: View west along former Road 2 ROW. Note raised roadbed on right. Area has been entirely disturbed.

Plate 8: View east with railway in distance.

Plate 9: View east along disturbed County Road 2 ROW. Potential exists in distance in agricultural field.

Plate 10: View northeast toward building cluster. Undisturbed land exists beyond disturbed ROW.

Plate 11: View east below existing highway grade. ROW disturbed by ditch and utilities. Potential exists in distance in agricultural field.

Plate 12: View south-southwest toward historic farmstead.
Plate 13: View west-northwest across County Road 2. Potential exists beyond fence line.

Plate 14: View east-southeast toward commercial development.

Plate 15: View west across creek toward residential development.

Plate 16: View west along disturbed ROW. Undisturbed land is present beyond hydro poles.

Plate 17: View north-northeast across Theatre Rd. and access road on right.

Plate 18: View west toward Theatre Rd. Potential exists beyond hydro poles.
Plate 19: View west-northwest across County Rd 2. Potential exists beyond hydro poles.

Plate 20: View south-southeast toward historic farmstead.

Plate 21: View northeast toward commercial development.

Plate 22: View north toward historic farmstead.

Plate 23: View northeast toward historic farmstead.

Plate 24: View west along disturbed County Road ROW. Potential exists in agricultural field.
Plate 25: View north-northeast across County Rd 2 with Apple Orchard Rd in distance.

Plate 26: View east along disturbed County Rd 2 ROW. Potential exists beyond hydro poles in field and front yards.

Plate 27: View northeast toward commercial development.

Plate 28: View east across low/wet area.

Plate 29: View northeast across County Rd 2 toward low/wet area adjacent to ROW.

Plate 30: View west-northwest from County Rd 2. Land beyond hydro poles remains undisturbed.
Plate 31: View east toward Lovshin Rd.

Plate 32: View east along disturbed County Rd 2 ROW.

Plate 33: View north toward historic homestead.

Plate 34: View east along disturbed ROW with commercial development in distance. Note hydrant on right denoting further disturbance beyond ROW.

Plate 35: View southeast from County Rd 2 across disturbed ROW with undisturbed land in far distance (beyond hydrant).

Plate 36: View north toward historic farmhouse.
Plate 37: View southeast toward commercial development.

Plate 38: View northeast toward commercial development.