

# ATTACHMENT TSD#1-F-2

## Archaeological Assessment, Boundary Road Site



February 6, 2013

## REPORT ON

# Archaeological Assessment Capital Region Resource Recovery Centre Boundary Road Site Part Lots 23-25, Concession 11 Cumberland Township City of Ottawa

PIF Number: P366-026-2013

**Submitted to:**  
Taggart Miller Environmental Services  
P.O. Box 4080  
Markham, Ontario

REPORT



Report Number: 12-1125-0045/4500/0160-2





## **Executive Summary**

*The Executive Summary highlights key points from the report only; for complete information and findings, as well as the limitations, the reader should examine the complete report.*

Golder Associates Ltd. (Golder) completed a preliminary archaeological assessment of the lands located on Lots 23 - 25, Concession 11, Cumberland Township, Ontario. The archaeological assessment is part of an overall assessment of lands located between Boundary Road and Frontier Road and south of Highway 417. This study area, known as the Boundary Road Site (BR), is being assessed as a possible location for the Capital Region Resource Recovery Centre (CRRRC). The objective of the archaeological investigation was to identify known heritage and archaeological sites within and in the vicinity of the study area and to assess its archaeological potential.

The study area consisted of 3 part lots totalling 175 hectares. The study area was composed primarily of overgrown agricultural fields with a smaller component of actively cultivated fields. The study area is bounded to the north by Highway 417, to the west by the Boundary Road Industrial Park and Boundary Road, to the east by Frontier Road and to the south by a Devine Road and a mix of wood lots and agricultural fields.

There is evidence of human occupation in Eastern Ontario dating at least 9,000 Before Present (B.P.) following the retreat of the Champlain Sea. Although open at this time, Cumberland Township would have been very sparsely populated through the Palaeo-Indian period but would have experienced a gradual increase in population during the subsequent Archaic and Woodland periods. Even with this increase, the highly mobile and seasonal nature of habitation ensured that the region would remain sparsely populated until European colonization and agricultural intensification during the early nineteenth century.

Settlement on Lots 23 – 25 did not occur until the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century. Crown patents for Lots 23 & 24 were granted in 1865, while patents for Lot 25 were granted in 1874. According to the available historic maps, no structures were located within the study area in 1825, 1840, 1861 or 1881. Furthermore, the first roads to border the study area do not appear until 1923, and at the time it was only a small section of Frontier Road, south of Devine Road that was in use (Prescott and Russell Counties Map, 1923).

There are no registered archaeological sites in the study area or within a three kilometre radius. Due to the flat topography, poorly drained soils, and relatively late settlement date, the study area contains low archaeological potential for both pre-contact and historic resources.

This investigation has provided the basis for the following recommendations:

- 1) That the CRRRC Boundary Road study area does not require further archaeological assessment.



## Project Personnel

Client Contact	Jeff Parkes; Taggart Miller Environmental Services
Project Director	Paul Smolkin P.Eng.
Senior Report Review	Hugh Daechsel M.A. (P051)
Licensed Archaeologist	Erin Wilson M.A. (P366)
Project Manager	Trish Edmond P.Eng
Report Preparation	Bradley Drouin M.A. (P311), Tim Rangecroft M.Sc. (R383)
Spatial Imaging	Bojan Radojevic, Jamie McKenzie
Administrative Support	Candice Butler

## Abbreviations

MTCS	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (Ontario)
ASDB	Archaeological Sites Database
CRRRC	Capital Region Resource Recovery Centre
NRR	North Russell Road
PIF	Project Information Form
B.P.	Before Present (Taken to be 1950)
C14	Carbon 14 dating technique



## Table of Contents

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>PROJECT PERSONNEL .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Objectives .....	1
1.2 Development Context .....	1
1.3 Historical Context.....	2
1.3.1 Pre-Contact Occupation.....	2
1.3.2 Post-Contact Occupation .....	4
1.3.3 Cumberland Township .....	5
1.3.4 Historic Maps and Air Photos.....	6
1.4 Archaeological Context.....	7
<b>2.0 FIELD METHODS.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>3.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>5.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>6.0 IMPORTANT INFORMATION AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS REPORT .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>7.0 REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>8.0 IMAGES .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>9.0 MAPS.....</b>	<b>22</b>
 <b>IMAGES</b>	
Image 1: View across area of archaeological potential, Highway 417 is located behind woods on the right, looking north west.....	19
Image 2: View along drainage channel, looking west.....	19
Image 3: Typical area of woodlot at the northern end of the study area, looking west.....	20
Image 4: Typical area of scrubland at the eastern edge of the study area, looking west.....	20
Image 5: Man-made drainage and culvert flowing through the study area, looking west.....	21
Image 6: Typical scrubland at the southern end of the study area, looking north.....	21



---

## ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT BOUNDARY ROAD SITE

---

### MAPS

Map 1: Key Plan.....	23
Map 2: Site Plan.....	24
Map 3: Historic Maps (Coffin, Census & Belden) .....	25
Map 4: Air Photos - 1945, 1964 & 1984 .....	26
Map 5: Area of Archaeological Potential .....	27

### APPENDICES

#### APPENDIX A

Photographic Catalogue



## **1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT**

### **1.1 Objectives**

This archaeological assessment was completed to identify known archaeological resources on and in the vicinity of the study area as well as assess the archaeological potential of the subject property. The assessment will determine if any additional archaeological investigations are required. The objectives of this assessment are based on principles outlined in the *Ontario Heritage Act* (Consolidated 2007), and comply with the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's *Standards and Guidelines for Consulting Archaeologists* (2011). More specifically, studies were completed with the following objectives:

- 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 further detailed surveys for all or parts of the property; and,
- To recommend appropriate strategies for further detailed surveys, if required.

### **1.2 Development Context**

Golder Associates Ltd. (Golder) was contracted by Taggart Miller Environmental Services (Taggart Miller) to undertake an Archaeological assessment of the properties located on Part Lots 23 - 25, Concession 11, Geographic Township of Cumberland, Ontario. This study area is being assessed as a possible location for the Capital Region Resource Recovery Centre (CRRRC). The objective of the study was to identify known archaeological sites within and in the vicinity of the study area and to assess its archaeological potential.

The study area consisted of 3 separate lots totalling approximately 175 hectares. The study area consists predominantly of overgrown agricultural fields with a smaller component of active fields. The study area, known as the Boundary Road Site (BR), is bounded to the north by Highway 417, to the west by the Boundary Road Industrial Park and Boundary Road, to the east by Frontier Road and to the south by Devine Road and a mix of wood lots and agricultural land. The study area is indicated by the boundaries on Maps 1 & 2; these are the physical limits of any proposed development. A wider study area of 3 km was used to investigate the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sports' (MTCS) *Archaeological Sites Database* (ASDB) in accordance with the *Standards and Guidelines for Consulting Archaeologists* (2011) and professional standards of due diligence.

This assessment was undertaken in advance of the pre-development permitting process, and for the purposes of the MTCS was triggered by the need to identify any potential impacts to archaeological resources as considered under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*. The CRRRC project has an approved Terms of Reference and the provincial Environmental Assessment activities have commenced.

Permission to access the study area for the purpose of archaeological assessment was provided by Taggart Miller in consultation with local landowners.



## **1.3 Historical Context**

Our understanding of the local sequence of human activity in the study area following the recession of the last ice sheet and the Champlain Sea is incomplete. It is possible, however, to provide a general outline of prehistoric occupation in the Ottawa region based on the archaeological investigations conducted throughout eastern Ontario.

### **1.3.1 Pre-Contact Occupation**

Human occupation of southern Ontario dates back approximately 10,000 years B.P. These first peoples, known as Palaeo-Indians to archaeologists, moved into Ontario as the last of the glaciers retreated northward. The former shores of the vast glacial lakes such as Lake Algonquin in the area that is now southern Georgian Bay, and along the north shore of present day Lake Ontario, contain remnants of some of their sites. Isolated finds of the distinctive, parallel-flaked Palaeo-Indian spear points have been recorded in the Rideau Lakes and north of Kingston (Watson 1982). Although there is limited information on the lifestyle of the Palaeo-Indians, the little evidence that is available suggests that they were highly mobile hunters and gatherers relying on caribou, small game, fish and wild plants found in the sub-arctic environment.

The Ottawa Valley remained very much on the fringe of occupation at this time. The ridges and old shorelines of the Champlain Sea and early Ottawa River channels would be the areas most likely to contain evidence of Palaeo-Indian occupation in this region. What is believed by some to be late Palaeo-Indian material has been found in several locations within the City of Ottawa including a site in Honey Gables as well as in general proximity to the study area, near Albion Road and Rideau Road, Innes Road, and north of the Mer Bleue close to the intersection of Navan Road and Page Road (Swayze 2001, 2003 & 2004).

It was not until the succeeding Archaic Period (ca. 9,000 to 3,000 B.P.), that the environment of southern Ontario approached modern conditions. While more land became available for occupation as the glacial lakes drained, Archaic populations continued as hunter-gatherers, however they appear to have focused more on local food resources, abandoning the highly mobile lifestyle of their predecessors. Although Palaeo-Indian workmanship of stone tools was also lost, the Archaic Period tool kit became more diversified, reflecting the adaptation to a temperate forest environment. Ground stone tools such as adzes and gouges first appeared and may indicate the construction of the dug-out canoes or other heavy wood working activities. Extensive trade networks had developed by the middle to late Archaic Period. Items such as copper from the north shore of Lake Superior were exchanged during this time.

The first significant evidence for occupation in the Ottawa Valley appears at this time. Archaic sites have been identified on Allumettes and Morrison Islands on the Ottawa River near Pembroke, and within the boundaries of Leamy Lake Park within the City of Gatineau (Pilon 1999: 43-53, 64). Late Archaic sites have also been identified to the west in the Rideau Lakes, and the east at Jessup Falls and Pendleton along the South Nation River (Daechsel 1980). A few other poorly documented finds of Archaic artifacts have been made within the City limits (Jamieson 1989).



The Woodland Period (ca. 3,000 to 400 B.P.) is distinguished by the introduction of ceramics. Early Woodland groups continued to live as hunters, gatherers and fishers in much the same way as earlier populations had done. They also shared an elaborate burial ceremonialism evidenced by the inclusion of exotic artifacts within graves (Spence et. al. 1990: 129). Extensive trade networks continued through the early part of this period and Early Woodland populations in Ontario appear to have been heavily influenced by groups to the south, particularly the Adena people of the Ohio Valley. By 1,700 B.P., the trade networks had reached their peak and covered much of North America.

Through the Middle Woodland Period (ca. 2,400 to 1,100 B.P.) there was an increase in the decorative styles found on ceramic pots and changes in the shapes and types of tools used. For the first time, it is possible to identify regional cultural traditions within the province, with 'Point Peninsula' being the distinctive variant found in eastern and south-central Ontario. A greater number of known sites from this period have allowed archaeologists to develop a better picture of the seasonal round followed in order to exploit a variety of resources within a home territory. Through the late fall and winter, small groups would occupy an inland 'family' hunting area. In the spring, these dispersed families would congregate at specific lakeshore sites to fish, hunt in the surrounding forest, and socialize. This gathering would last through to the late summer when large quantities of food would be stored for the approaching winter. The proliferation of sites suggests an increase in the population of Eastern Ontario, although the Ottawa area has yet to yield as many sites as other parts of south-eastern Ontario. Middle Woodland sites have been noted in the South Nation Drainage Basin and along the Ottawa River including the northwest end of Ottawa at Marshall's and Sawdust Bays (Daechsel 1980; Daechsel 1981).

Another significant development of the Woodland Period was the appearance of domesticated plants ca. 1,450 B.P. Initially only a minor addition to the diet, the cultivation of corn, beans, squash, sunflowers and tobacco gained economic importance for Late Woodland peoples. Along with this shift in subsistence, settlements located adjacent to the corn fields began to take on greater permanency as sites with easily tillable farmland became more important. Eventually, semi-permanent and permanent villages were built, many of which were surrounded by palisades, evidence of growing hostilities between neighbouring groups. By the end of the Late Woodland Period, distinct regional populations occupied specific areas of southern Ontario separated by vast stretches of largely unoccupied land, including the Huron along the north shore of Lake Ontario, and the St. Lawrence Iroquois along the St. Lawrence River.

While there is clear evidence of these latter developments in much of southern Ontario, the Ottawa Valley remained a sparsely occupied region utilized by mobile hunter-gatherers. In part, this was because the terrain was less than suitable for early agriculture. It was also a reflection of the increased pressure on hunting territories and conflict over trade routes at the end of the Woodland Period. Facing persistent hostilities with Iroquoian populations based in what is now New York State, the Huron moved from their traditional lands on the north shore of Lake Ontario to the Lake Simcoe and Georgian Bay region. Algonquin groups, who had occupied the lands north of the Huron, also appear to have retreated further northward in order to place greater distance between themselves and the Iroquois.



Woodland sites have been recorded throughout the Ottawa Valley. Two small Late Woodland sites were recently located on a property near the Village of Cumberland to the east of the study area (Ferris, 2002). A significant Woodland occupation has also been identified at the Leamy Lake site (Pilon 1999: 76-80). Finally, an ossuary burial identified near the Chaudière Falls in the 1840s dates to this period. Although ossuaries are a burial practice normally associated with Iroquoian speaking populations, especially the Huron, this internment may have been Algonquin. Once again, a number of poorly documented Woodland find spots are known for the general study area (Jamieson 1989).

At the time of initial contact, the French documented three Algonquin groups residing in the vicinity of the study area (Heidenreich & Wright 1987: Plate 18). These included the Matouweskarini along the Madawaska River to the west, the Onontcharonon in the Gananoque River basin to the southwest, and the largest of the three, the Weskarini, situated in the Petite Nation River basin north of the study area. While prolonged occupation of the region may have been avoided as a result of hostilities with Iroquoian speaking populations to the south, at least the northern reaches of the South Nation River basin were undoubtedly used as hunting territories by the Algonquin at this time.

### **1.3.2 Post-Contact Occupation**

Étienne Brûlé is reported to be the first European in the region; having travelled up the Ottawa River in 1610, three years before Samuel de Champlain. For the next two centuries, the Ottawa River served as a major route for explorers, traders and missionaries from the St. Lawrence into the interior, and throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries this route remained an important link in the French fur trade. A seigneurie was established at L'Original, east of the study area, in 1674 and granted to Nathaniel Hazard Treadwell but there was little permanent European settlement at this early date. The recovery of European trade goods (i.e., iron axes, copper kettle pieces and glass beads) from Native sites throughout the Ottawa River drainage basin has provided evidence of the extent of contact between Natives and the fur traders during this period. The English, upon assuming possession of New France, continued to use the Ottawa River as an important transportation corridor.

A French trading post was built near the mouth of Le Lievre River, near the present community of Buckingham, Quebec, sometime in the eighteenth century. This post had been abandoned by the time Alexander Henry travelled up the Ottawa River in 1761 (Voorhis 1930:62). Independent trading posts at Buckingham and in the Rockland area were reportedly operated by Gabriel Foubert in the late eighteenth century (Beaulieu n.d.). Gabriel was the father of Amable Foubert, one of the first recorded settlers in Cumberland Township.

Significant European settlement of the region did not occur until United Empire Loyalists and other immigrants began to move to lands along the Ottawa River in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The need for land on which to settle the Loyalists led the British government into hasty negotiations with their indigenous military allies, the Mississauga, who were assumed, erroneously, to be the only Native peoples inhabiting eastern Ontario. Captain William Redford Crawford, who enjoyed the trust of the Mississauga chiefs living in the Bay of Quinte region, negotiated on behalf of the British government. In the so-called 'Crawford Purchase,' the Mississauga were cajoled into giving up Native title to most of eastern Ontario, including what would become the counties of Stormont, Dundas, Glengarry, Prescott, Russell, Leeds, Grenville and Prince Edward, as well as the front Townships of Frontenac, Lennox, Addington and Hastings and much of what is now the City of Ottawa (including the Geographic Townships of Gloucester, Nepean, Osgoode, Marlborough and North Gower) (Lockwood 1996: 24). Two years after the 1791 division of the Province of Quebec into Upper and Lower



Canada, John Stegmann, the Deputy Surveyor for the Province of Upper Canada, undertook an initial survey of four Townships (Nepean, Gloucester, North Gower and Osgoode) on both sides of the Rideau River near its junction with the Ottawa River.

### **1.3.3 Cumberland Township**

The Ottawa River was an important transportation route during the early trading days of settlement in the area. Fur trading posts were erected along the Ottawa River where the Algonquin traded with the Europeans. A French trading post was situated across the river from Cumberland in modern day Buckingham in 1761. This area was controlled by France until 1763 when the British gained control of the region following the completion of the Seven Year War. The Township of Cumberland still has a large French population to this day.

The first official survey of the Township of Cumberland was conducted in 1791 (CTHS n.d.) in order to divide the land into individual lots for settlement. Although many of the lots were granted at an early date to Loyalists, very few were settled. Many of the Loyalists had already settled on properties along the St. Lawrence River and remained absentee landowners of their Cumberland lots. Another hindrance to early settlement of Cumberland was the lack of roads to the interior (Belden 1881). The first major road, Montreal Road (originally called L'Original-Bytown Rd.) was not built until 1850; this road ran directly through Concession 1 along the Ottawa River (CTHS n.d.; McGilvray 2005).

The first settlers of the Township of Cumberland were Abijah Dunning and Amable Faubert (also written Foubert), both arriving in 1801. Abijah Dunning originally obtained 800 acres of land in Cumberland from the Crown and continued to acquire land, eventually coming to own 3,000 acres throughout Cumberland, Buckingham and Onslow Townships. Amable Faubert opened up a trading post along the river in 1807. Cumberland Township was used for trading mostly fur, potash and lumber through the nineteenth century. The Foubert and Dunning families continued to have a large presence in the Township throughout the nineteenth century.

By 1858 the Village of Cumberland had a population of over 1,000 with an additional 2,000 residents in the rural parts of the Township. Cumberland became a major seasonal forwarding center along the Ottawa River in the 1870's, where two wharves were built and several forwarding companies were established, including one owned by the Faubert brothers. This helped facilitate a small ship building industry in the Township during the mid-nineteenth century (CTHS n.d.).

In 1882, the Grand Trunk Railway was built through the community of Vars which provided the first rail transportation route through the Township. Another railway, the Canadian National Railway (CNR), was built through Cumberland Township in 1899 and was extended in 1907 to run through Concession 1 along the river (CTHS n.d.). The CNR was closed during the depression and in 1952 the old line was replaced by the current Highway 417.

### **Present Land Use**

The study area is currently a mix of agricultural fields and secondary growth. Three residential buildings, one associated with a farming operation, are also present along Frontier Road at the eastern edge of the study area.



## Property History

Land registry documents were examined to provide a history of ownership and development within the study area. The documents indicated that Lots 23-24 in Concession 11 were granted by Crown Patent to Andrew F. Gault in 1865, with both Lots subsequently bought by James Boyd in 1872. The block transfer of large amounts of land is usually indicative of speculative holding rather than settlement. Both Lots are sold concurrently between O.N. Schnei, N. Smith, J. Bond, R. Scott and E. Keays during the period between 1875 and 1885 before returning to the possession of A. Gault. The Lots continued to be frequently traded well into the 1890's and early 1900's. It is highly unlikely that the Lots were settled prior to 1872, with the land registry suggesting that the area was settled possibly after 1880.

Lots 25, Concession 11 was granted by Crown Patent to William, F. Powell in 1874, and subsequently sold to John Nicholas in 1880. Ownership appears to have reverted to the Crown later in 1880, a series of entries involving the Ontario Bank occur, the net result of which is that the Lot was obtained from the Chancery by Martin O'Gara in 1885. The Lot was sold immediately by O'Gara and bought and sold with frequency over the next 10 years. The Lot appears to be split in the late 1890's. It is unlikely that the Lot was settled prior to 1880, possibly even the 1890's.

### 1.3.4 Historic Maps and Air Photos

A review of available historic maps was undertaken to identify the locations of any early historic structures within the study area. The earliest map referenced was the 1825 Coffin Map (Map 3) which showed no structures present within the 3 lots of the study area. Similarly, the 1841 census map, the 1861 Walling Map and the 1881 Belden map (Map 3) showed no structures present in any of the lots. Interestingly, the first roads in the study area do not appear until the 1923 Prescott and Russell Counties Map. At this stage a portion of what is now Frontier Road, south of Devine Road, was the only road present. The lack of roads in and around the study area was likely one reason why this area was not settled until the late nineteenth to early twentieth century; this corresponds with documentary evidence obtained from land registry records.

A review of six air photos was undertaken to determine how the study area has developed over time and to identify any previous water sources or features that might indicate archaeological potential. The air photos that were targeted were 1945 (NAPL A9611-84), 1955 (NAPL A14755-65), 1964 (NAPL A18649-23), 1975 (NAPL A31016-122), 1984 (NAPL 26469-227) and 1998 (A28361-202). These show that in 1945 the study area had been primarily used for agricultural purposes, with over 90% of the study area having been cleared and turned into agricultural fields. Slowly over time the fields were abandoned and have now become overgrown with the majority of the study area composed of secondary woodlot and bush with only a small portion at the north end remaining as agricultural land.

One building present within the 1945 air photo (Map 4) has disappeared from the landscape by 1965; it appears to have been destroyed by the re-alignment of the junction between Boundary Road and Devine Road. Due to the relatively late settlement of the area and the existence of buildings till the mid-twentieth century, this location is deemed to possess low archaeological potential.

There is no evidence of any active creeks or streams within the study area, only man made channels and ditches.



## 1.4 Archaeological Context

### Previous Environmental Conditions

The study area began to emerge from the Wisconsin Ice Cap during the onset of the Holocene, roughly 12,000 years B.P. Immediately adjacent to the retreating ice sheets, melt water lakes formed within the low lying Ottawa Valley; itself having been depressed by the great weight of the ice cap. Around 11,000 to 11,500 B.P. the ice had sufficiently melted to allow sea water from the Atlantic Ocean access to the glacially lowered lands of eastern Ontario via the St. Lawrence (Cronin et al 2008). This marine inundation formed the Champlain Sea, briefly extending as far west as parts of Renfrew County, and is represented within the sedimentary record by a change from laminated glaciolacustrine clays to marine deposited clays.

Isostatic rebound gradually raised the Ottawa Valley, resulting in the shrinkage of the Champlain Sea eastwards. Large amounts of meltwater from the retreating ice sheets to the northwest flowed down through the Ottawa Valley, resulting in the freshwater mixing with the saline Champlain Sea resulting in a brackish environment, eventually producing the smaller freshwater Lake Lampsilis by around 9,800 B.P. By this period an extensive sand delta had formed over the study area as the large amounts of sediment transported downstream entered into the less turbulent and slower waters of the Lake and subsequently dropped from suspension. This resulted in the draping of the existing deep water marine clays with a thick layer of fluvial sands and silts across the entire deltaic fan. Following the further draining of Lake Lampsilis, the Ottawa River remained as a drainage route to the Atlantic for larger glacial lakes and water bodies to the west, with occasional large release episodes. The study area would have been uncovered from the draining waters shortly after 9,800 B.P.

“The most significant alterations to the landscape following the withdrawal of the Champlain Sea are related to the shifting channels of the Ottawa River. A series of terraces and abandoned channels in the vicinity of Ottawa indicates that the Ancestral Ottawa River was much larger than present. Isostatic adjustment and the erosion of a lower channel upstream from Ottawa gradually caused the river to abandon the southern channel and shift to the north, to occupy the pre-glacial valley and what is now the Ottawa River channel. Terraces at various levels in the clay mark successive periods of downcutting by the Pre-Ottawa River. The south channel east of Ottawa has several cross channels separated by elongated islands underlain by marine clay and covered by fluvial sands” (Marshall et al 1979:14).

The study area is located in close proximity to the southern bank of this ancestral channel, with most of the channel at this location currently occupied by the Mer Bleue Bog. A carbon date obtained from the peat (GSC-681, 7650+- 120 years BP) indicates this bog to be at least 7,700 years old (ibid:15). The development of the bog indicates that the channel must have been abandoned by the Ottawa River by this time, and that potentially it existed earlier as an open lake before reverting to a peat forming marsh.

Pollen cores taken from the Mer Bleue, immediately north of the study area (Anderson 1988), and Ramsay Lake, 50 km to the northwest (Rocheleau et al 2008) provide a record of paleoflora at the time of the emergence of the study area from the Champlain Sea (9,800 B.P.). Pollen cores indicate the existence of a tundra that gave way to coniferous tree cover, likely spruce, pine and willow, later supplanted with oak and birch at the expense of the spruce. These forests increased in density and remained dominant between 10,600 and 7,500 B.P. A more mixed forest, characterised as Great Lakes Forest began to be established with the onset of a warmer and more humid environment between 7,500 and 4,700 B.P. with the predominance of pine giving way to hemlock.



A cooling of the climate and the decimation of the hemlock by disease led to a massive increase in the birch composition of the tree cover between 4,700 and 3,000 B.P. This birch, pine and hemlock tree cover remained established until 200 B.P. with lumbering and agriculture clearing the area (Ibid: 2008).

### **Study Area Characteristics**

The study area falls within the Upper St. Lawrence sub-region of the Great Lakes - St. Lawrence Forest Region (Kershaw 2001). On the acidic soils of the area, a representation of conifers is usually found, particularly the eastern hemlock, eastern white pine, white spruce and balsam fir. The more coarse textured soils commonly support stands of eastern white pine and red pine, with wetter sites supporting black spruce and eastern white cedar. After large fires, largetooth aspen and white birch, along with balsam fir and white spruce play a prominent role in the pioneer forest stands (Rowe 1977). Bogs, such as Mer Bleue, tend to be dominated by willows, poplars and alders at the fringe, with tamarack and black spruce invading the centre (Marshall et al 1979). Extensive clearance of the land through settling, farming and lumbering has greatly reduced tree cover and altered its composition, with the Great Fire of 1870 resulting in almost total devastation of Carleton County, although the study area was probably spared (Currie 2009); as a consequence no old growth tree cover is expected to remain within the study area. Recent abandonment of cleared agricultural land has resulted in the gradual re-growth of immature forest cover within the study area.

The overall geology of the study area consists of Ordovician bedrock of the Lorraine-Carlsbad formation, comprised of grey shale, sandy shale and occasional dolomitic layers, covered with Pleistocene fluvial gravels and subsequently overlain by sand and clay soils that characterize the Prescott and Russell Sand Plains physiographic region (Chapman & Putnam 1984).

The coarse sand plains of the study area have mature Podzol soils with thin ash-grey horizons, modified to Ground-Water Podzols in areas with a high or fluctuating water table, indicated by the development of iron and humus hardpans. These soils are classed as low fertility, being deficient in lime, nitrogen, potash, phosphorus and manganese (Chapman and Putnam 1984).

Specifically, the study area contains three distinct soil types. The north half of the study area consists of poorly drained fine sandy loam, either fluvial or eolian in origin. The soils in the majority of the southern half of the study area consists of poorly drained fluvial or marine fine sandy loam over clay loam, silty clay loam, silty clay or clay marine material. Portions of the southern boundary of the study area are located in the poorly drained fine sandy loam with similar underlying clay deposits (Cumberland Township Soils Map, Soils Survey Report No. 58, 1987).

Primary drainage within the study area is provided by the Simpson Municipal Drain; this traverses the centre-north of the study area parallel to, and well north of Devine Road. Minor drainage is also provided by the Regimbald Municipal Drain and an old farm ditch across the southern part of the study area. All of these outlet to Shaws Creek, which connects to Bear Brook and eventually with the South Nation River, that in turn drains into the Ottawa River.

The study area possesses a moderate limitation to the production of Ungulates, due to a lack of nutrients in the soil to facilitate optimum plant growth for deer grazing (Brassard & Bouchard 1971). It also possesses such severe limitations that almost no waterfowl are produced; however, the Mer Bleue bog, to the north and west possesses only moderate limitations (Arsenault & Johnson 1970). The majority of the study area has severe limitations to agricultural production due to low soil fertility and poor drainage.



## Property Inspection

A property inspection was conducted on November 22nd 2012. Photographs were taken of the existing conditions and a field log maintained. Visibility was excellent and conformed to the stipulations laid out in the *Standards and Guidelines for Consulting Archaeologists (2011)*.

## Registered Archaeological Sites

The primary source of information regarding known archaeological sites in the study area is the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's archaeological sites database. A current version of this database was consulted and, at present, there are no documented or registered archaeological sites either within the study area or a 3 kilometre radius (Von Bitter per comms, January 13, 2012).

## Previous research and fieldwork

There are a number of publications regarding the history and development of portions of Russell County. *From Swamp to Shanty* (Wendell 1987) discusses the historic development of the western half of neighbouring Russell Township while *Histoire d'Embrun* (Bourgie 1980) describes early settlers' lives in the eastern half of Russell Township. *The Illustrated Historical Atlas of Prescott and Russell* (Belden 1881) provides historical maps and specific information about people and places within Cumberland Township. Other historical accounts include *The History of the Ottawa Valley* (Gourlay 1896) and *Histoire de Comtes unis de Prescott et de Russell* (Brault 1965).

M. Emard (1974) and Donald Cartwright (1973) did statistical studies of settlement patterns in Eastern Ontario, including Russell County according to linguistic groups.

There has been very little archaeological assessment work done close to the study area. Some archaeological work that has been done in the area includes an overview of the archaeology and inventory of known archaeological sites, as well as an assessment of archaeological potential of the adjacent Russell Township was provided by Heritage Quest in 2004 (Daechsel & Bauer 2004; PIF P051-P051-33-2004). A Stage 1 archaeological assessment was undertaken for the expansion of Embrun and Russell Lagoons in 2006 (Daechsel 2007; PIF P051-109-2006;), a Stage 2 assessment on the same properties was undertaken in 2007 and 2008 (Golder 2009; PIF P302-038-2008). More recently, Golder undertook assessments for lands located directly north of the study area and to the northwest (Golder 2011; PIF P311-049-2011 and P311-080-2011, respectively).

The study area is covered by the Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton (ASI 1999).



## **2.0 FIELD METHODS**

A property inspection was conducted on the study area on November 22, 2012. This inspection was undertaken to determine if there were any areas of disturbance which would have affected the archaeological potential, and what assessment strategies would be appropriate for a further detailed assessment, should it be required.

The weather was clear, 7 degrees Celsius with a SW wind.

Field notes and photographs of the property were taken during the inspection. The photograph locations and directions were noted and all photographs were catalogued (see Appendix A). All photograph locations and directions referenced in this report have been shown on Map 2. No archaeological remains were noted during the course of the property inspection.

The following documents were generated in the field and will be kept with the licensee at Golder until an appropriate repository can be identified:

- Field notes (in 1 note book)
- Digital photographs
- GPS points
- Sketch maps



### **3.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS**

There are no registered archaeological sites within a significant proximity to the study area.

#### **Archaeological potential**

There are a number of criteria employed in the assessment of archaeological site potential. For pre-contact or prehistoric sites, these criteria are principally focused on the topographical features of the landscape including ridges, knolls and eskers, and the type of soils found within the area being assessed. For post-contact or historic sites, documentary evidence such as maps and census records may indicate areas of settlement and activity. These criteria were formulated in close consultation with the *Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's set guidelines* for archaeological resource potential mapping (2011).

The following assessment of archaeological potential has also been formulated in consultation with the Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton: Technical Report (Archaeological Services Inc. & Geomatics International Inc. 1999). Hereafter referred to as the Archaeological Master Plan, this report identifies areas of archaeological potential within the now amalgamated City of Ottawa and sets out guidelines for requiring testing. These guidelines also follow the *Checklist for Determining Archaeological Potential* developed by the Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture (1993) for archaeological assessments.

According to the Archaeological Master Plan modelling criteria, lands within 300 metres of 'two-line' rivers, watercourses with mapped floodplains and wetlands (as shown on 1:10 000 topographic maps) are considered to have pre-contact site potential, while lands with moderate or well drained soils within 200 metres of 'one-line' watercourses also have potential. Further, areas up to 300 metres from abandoned Ottawa and Rideau River terrace scarps have pre-contact site potential. In the case of drumlins and eskers, the entire feature has pre-contact potential. Areas near historical schools, churches, commercial buildings, industrial sites and early settlement roads are considered to have potential within 100 metres of the structure, known structure location or settlement road, the last with the object of locating early pioneer homes. Areas within 50 metres of historical railways are also considered to have site potential and, finally, any area within 100 metres of a registered or unregistered archaeological site.

The Archaeological Master Plan Does not indicate any archaeological potential within the study area.

#### **Pre-contact archaeological potential**

Pre-contact potential for the study area is low (Map 5). The site has very limited potential for pre-contact resources as it is poorly drained, low lying and a significant distance from any permanent or ancient source of water. In addition, there are no raised glacial or geological features that might be considered areas of pre-contact focus. As such, there is no direct evidence that would suggest that the study area would have been an area of focus or habitation for pre-contact populations in the Ottawa Valley.

#### **Historic archaeological potential**

The available historic information (historic maps, land records) indicate that this area of Cumberland Township was settled relatively late compared to other areas of the Township. The roads that border the study area have not been considered significant historic corridors as they do not appear on any maps until 1923. In addition, there is no evidence of historic structures present in the study area in any of the historic maps. As such, the potential for historic archaeological resources within the study area is very low.



## **4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

No registered archaeological sites and no areas of archaeological potential were identified by the Archaeological Assessment.

This investigation has provided the basis for the following recommendations:

- 1) That the CRRRC Boundary Road study area does not require further archaeological assessment.



## **5.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION**

This report is submitted to the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport 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 project area of a development proposal have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Ministry of Tourism and Culture, a letter will be issued by the Ministry stating that there are no further concerns with regard to alterations to archaeological sites by the proposed development.

It is an offence under Sections 48 and 69 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* for any party other than a licensed archaeologist to make any alteration to a known archaeological site or to remove any artifact or other physical evidence of past human use or activity from the site, until such time as a licensed archaeologist has completed archaeological 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*.

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*.

*The Cemeteries Act*, R.S.O. 1990 c. C.4 and the *Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act*, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33 (when proclaimed in force) require that any person discovering human remains must notify the police or coroner and the Registrar of Cemeteries at the Ministry of Consumer Services.

Reports recommending further archaeological fieldwork or protection for one or more archaeological sites must include the following standard statement: "Archaeological sites recommended for further archaeological fieldwork or protection remain subject to Section 48 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and may not be altered, or have artifacts removed from them, except by a person holding an archaeological licence."



## **6.0 IMPORTANT INFORMATION AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS REPORT**

Golder Associates Ltd. (Golder) has prepared this report in a manner consistent with that level of care and skill ordinarily exercised by members of the archaeological profession currently practicing under similar conditions in the jurisdiction in which the services are provided, subject to the time limits and physical constraints applicable to this report. No other warranty, expressed or implied is made.

This report has been prepared for the specific site, design objective, developments and purpose described to Golder by Taggart Miller Environmental Services (Taggart Miller - the Client). The factual data, interpretations and recommendations pertain to a specific project as described in this report and are not applicable to any other project or site location.

The information, recommendations and opinions expressed in this report are for the sole benefit of the Client. No other party may use or rely on this report or any portion thereof without Golder's express written consent. If the report was prepared to be included for a specific permit application process, then upon the reasonable request of the client, Golder may authorize in writing the use of this report by the regulatory agency as an Approved User for the specific and identified purpose of the applicable permit review process. Any other use of this report by others is prohibited and is without responsibility to Golder. The report, all plans, data, drawings and other documents as well as all electronic media prepared by Golder are considered its professional work product and shall remain the copyright property of Golder, who authorizes only the Client and Approved Users to make copies of the report, but only in such quantities as are reasonably necessary for the use of the report by those parties. The Client and Approved Users may not give, lend, sell, or otherwise make available the report or any portion thereof to any other party without the express written permission of Golder. The Client acknowledges the electronic media is susceptible to unauthorized modification, deterioration and incompatibility and therefore the Client cannot rely upon the electronic media versions of Golder's report or other work products.

Unless otherwise stated, the suggestions, recommendations and opinions given in this report are intended only for the guidance of the Client in the design of the specific project.

Special risks occur whenever archaeological investigations are applied to identify subsurface conditions and even a comprehensive investigation, sampling and testing program may fail to detect all or certain archaeological resources. The sampling strategies incorporated in this study comply with those identified in the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (2011).



## 7.0 REFERENCES

Anderson, T.W.,

1988 **Late Quaternary Pollen Stratigraphy of the Ottawa Valley** - Lake Ontario Region and its Application in Dating the Champlain Sea, *in* Gadd, N.R., ed., 1988, The Late Quaternary Development of the Champlain Sea Basin: Geological Association of Canada, Special Paper 35, p. 207-224.

Archaeological Services Inc.

1999 **The Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton: Planning Report.** Archaeological Master Plan study prepared for the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, on file, City of Ottawa & Ministry of Culture, Toronto.

Arsenault, G & B. Johnson

1970 **Land Capability for Wildlife – Waterfowl.** Canada Land Inventory, Ottawa 31G.

Belden, H.

1881 **Prescott and Russell Supplement in the Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada.** H. Belden and Co., Toronto

Brassard, J.M and R. Bouchard

1971 **Land Capability for Wildlife – Ungulates.** Canada Land Inventory, Ottawa 31G.

Canada Department of Agriculture

1963 **Soil Survey of Russell and Prescott Counties.** Ottawa.

Chapman, L.J. & D.F. Putman

1984 **The Physiography of Southern Ontario.** 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Cumberland Township Historical Society (CTHS)

n.d. Cumberland Township Historical Society; Cumberland Township, **History of Cumberland Township.** <http://www.cths.ca/english/7/7-1.html>.

Coffin, William

1825 Township of Cumberland. NMC 0003425, National Library and Archives Canada.

Cronin, T.M., Manley, P.L., Brachfield, T.O., Willard, D.A., Guilbault, J-P., Rayburn, J.A., Thunell, R., Berke, M.

2008 **Impacts of post-glacial lake drainage events and revised chronology of the Champlain Sea episode 3-9ka.** In; Paleogeography, Paleoclimatology, Paleoecology 262 (2008) 46-60.

Currie, T.M.

2009 **The Ottawa Valleys Great Fire of 1870-** The Nineteenth Century Press and the Reality of a Great Disaster. Creative Bound International Inc.



Daechsel, Hugh J.

- 2007 **Stage 4 Archaeological Investigation of the McNee Site, BiGc-5, Highway 17 Twinning, Arnprior Lot 7, Concession B, Geographic Township of McNab, Arnprior, Renfrew County.** Report prepared by Heritage Quest Inc., on file Ministry of Tourism and Culture, Toronto.
- 1980 **An Archaeological Evaluation of the South Nation River Drainage Basin.** Report prepared for the South Nation Conservation Authority, Berwick, Ontario.
- 1981 **Sawdust Bay-2: The Identification of a Middle Woodland Site in the Ottawa Valley.** Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Department of Anthropology, McMaster University.

Daechsel, Hugh & Bauer, Carmen.

- 2004 **Archaeological Resource Inventory and Assessment of Potential Russell Township, Prescott Russell County.** Consultant's report prepared by Heritage Quest Inc. for Stantec Engineering.

Golder

- 2011 **Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Highway 417 Corridor from 8<sup>th</sup> Line to OC Road 26, Lots 20-18, Concession 5; Lots 18-12, Concession 6; Lots 12-5, Concession 7; Lot 5 Concession 7; Lot 5, Concession 8; Lot 1, Concession 9, Ottawa Front, Geographic Township of Gloucester; Lot 21, Concession 11, Geographic Township of Cumberland, Ottawa, Ontario.** Report prepared for Marshall Macklin Monaghan.
- 2009 **Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, North South Light Rail Transit (LRT) Corridor, Geographic Township of Gloucester and Nepean, City of Ottawa, Ontario.** Report prepared for Marshall Macklin Monaghan.

Heindenreich, C., & Wright, J. V.

- 1987 **Population and Subsistence.** In R. C. Harris (Ed.), *Historical Atlas of Canada (Vol. I: From the Beginning to 1800)*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Jamieson, James B

- 1989 **An Inventory of the Prehistoric Archaeological Sites of Ottawa-Carleton.** Paper submitted to the Ontario Archaeological Society, Ottawa Chapter.

Kershaw, Linda

- 2001 **Trees of Ontario.** Lone Pine, Toronto

Marshall, I.B., Dumanski, j., Huffman, E.C., and Lajoie, P.G.

- 1979 **Soils, capability and land use in the Ottawa Urban Fringe. Land Resource Research Branch. Agriculture Canada.** Prepared Jointly by the Research Branch, Agriculture Canada and the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food.

McGilvray, Rob

- 2005 **Cumberland Pioneers.** <http://web.ncf.ca/cv297/cumberland.html>



Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport

2011 **Standards and Guidelines for Consulting Archaeologists.** Ministry of Tourism and Culture, Toronto.

N.A.

1923 Prescott and Russell Counties Map.

Pilon, Jean-Luc, ed.

1999 "La prehistoire de l'Outaouais / Ottawa Valley Prehistory." **Outaouais Thematic Publication Journal No. 6.** Hull: Outaouais Historical Society.

Rocheleau, C. Dubois, J-M. Provencher, L. Plourde, M. Grondin, F. Simon, Y. Trudeau, M. & Roy, J.

2008 **Interprovincial Crossings Environmental Assessment Study.** Archaeological Potential Study-Gatineau/Ottawa Area. Report on file with Ministry of Culture.

Rowe, J.S.

1977 **Forest Regions of Canada.** Canadian Forestry Service, Department of Fisheries and the Environment, Ottawa.

Spence, Michael W., Robert H. Pihl and Carl R. Murphy

1990 **Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of Proposed Central Canada-Exhibit, Albion Road Site, Part Lots 24 and 25, Concession 3, Gloucester Township (Geo.), City of Ottawa.** Summary report, on file, Ministry of Culture, Toronto.

Swayze, Ken

2004 **Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment of a Proposed Subdivision on Part of Lots 5 & 6, Concession 4, Gloucester (OF) Township (Geo), City of Ottawa.** Report prepared by Kinickinick Heritage Consultants, on file, Ministry of Culture, Toronto.

2003 **A Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment of a Proposed Subdivision in Honeygables Lot 18 Broken Front Concession Gloucester Twp. (Geo.) City of Ottawa.** Summary report, on file, Ministry of Culture, Toronto.

2001 **Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment of a Proposed Subdivision on Part of Lots A, B & C, Conc. 8 & 9, Cumberland Township, City of Ottawa.** Consultants report submitted to the Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture.

Von Bitter, Robert

2012 **Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sports Registered Sites Database.** [email] Message to E. Wilson (Erin\_Wilson@golder.com). Jan 13, 2012.



Watson, Gordon

1982 "Prehistoric Peoples of the Rideau Waterway." In **Archaeological and Historical Symposium, October 2-3, 1982, Rideau Ferry, Ontario.** F.C.L. Wyght, ed., Smiths Falls: Performance Printing.

Wright, J.V.

1995 **A history of the Native Peoples of Canada (Volume I)** Mercury Series, Archaeological Survey of Canada, Canadian Museum of Civilization, Ottawa, ON.

1999 **A history of the Native Peoples of Canada (Volume II)** Mercury Series, Archaeological Survey of Canada, Canadian Museum of Civilization, Ottawa, ON.

2004 **A history of the Native Peoples of Canada (Volume III)** Mercury Series, Archaeological Survey of Canada, Canadian Museum of Civilization, Ottawa, ON.

**National Air Photo Library**

A9611-84 1945

A14755-65 1955

A18649-23 1964

A31016-122 1975

A26469-227 1984

A28361-202 1998

**Documents from the National Archives of Canada**

M-7735. 1840 Census Map of Cumberland Township, Russell County.