Stage 1 and Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
“Riverbend Subdivision”
Part Lots 7 & 8, Concession 4
Geographic Township of Goulbourn
City of Ottawa

Prepared for: Greg Winters
Novatech Engineering Consultants Ltd
200-240 Michael Cowpland Drive
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, K2M 1P6
Office: 613-254-9643 Fax: 613-254-5867
g.winters@novatech-eng.com

Licensee: Nick Adams MA
Prepared by: Nick Adams
Date: October 21, 2010
License # P003
Stage 1 PIF# P003-255-2009
Stage 2 PIF# P003-291-2010
STAGE 1 REPORT

This report was prepared in 2009 under PIF#P003-255-2009

It is included here in full to provide context for the Stage 2 investigations
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The site of the proposed development on parts of lots 7 and 8, Concession 4, Goulbourn Township (now City of Ottawa), County of Carleton, Ontario, was assessed by Adams Heritage for its archaeological potential. Specifically; historical research was undertaken, the Ministry of Culture archaeological database was examined, and the geography of the site considered, to determine whether significant historical or prehistoric cultural resources might exist on the property and to determine whether further archaeological investigations are warranted.

The historical research indicates that prior to the development of the Riverbend Golf Course, the property has been primarily used for farming. Spanning the Jock River, the property has a high archaeological potential for pre-contact period First Nations sites and a moderate to high potential for historic period sites.

Based on the Stage 1 investigations Adams Heritage makes the following recommendations.

- *Stage 2 archaeological investigations should be undertaken on those parts of the property indicated on Figure 9 prior to any development work which results in soil disturbance.*

Compliance with Legislation

a. This report is submitted to the Minister of 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 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, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario.

b. 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.

c. The Cemeteries Act requires that any person discovering human remains must notify the police or coroner and the Registrar of cemeteries, Ministry of Small Business and Consumer Services.

d. 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, except by a person holding an archaeological licence'.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

At the request of Greg Winters, Novatech Engineering Consultants Ltd., acting on behalf of the owners, a Stage 1 archaeological assessment was carried out on lands scheduled to be developed within part of Lots 7 and 8, Concession 4, Geographic Township of Goulbourn (Figures 1, 2, & 6).

The subject property lies approximately 10 kilometres to the southwest of Stittsville. It fronts on to the Franktown Road and backs on Copeland Road. The northeastern side of the property abuts farm land. The southwestern side of the property lies along an existing estate residential subdivision.

Current plans involve the development of a 26 lot rural subdivision by scaling back the existing golf course.

A field review of the property was completed on October 8th 2009 under ideal conditions. It was therefore possible to determine the general characteristics of the landscape and identify some significant elements which have a direct bearing on the archaeological potential of the property.

The whole property is currently in use as a golf course. This has resulted in some modification of the natural landscape in order to create bunkers, traps, greens and fairways. Nevertheless, substantial portions of the landscape remain essentially unaltered, and thus may retain their archaeological potential.

A log barn is present near the southwestern corner of the property.

Figure 1: The Study Area - General Location
Figure 2: Concept Plan - Riverbend Golf Course Development showing the two proposed development areas.
2.0 THE STUDY AREA

2.1 Topography and Environment

Bedrock / Physiography
The study area lies within the physiographic region of the Smiths Falls Limestone Plain (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 196), “the largest and most continuous tract of shallow soil over limestone in southern Ontario” (Ibid.). However no bedrock is visible within the study area which is predominately level former farm land.

Drainage
The study area is bisected by the Jock River. The Jock River flows generally east towards the Rideau River, joining it near Barrhaven.

Climate
The soil climate of the Ottawa region is humic, mild and mesic (Schut and Wilson 1987) with mean annual soil temperatures of between 8 and 15 degrees and a relatively short growing season lasting 200 and 240 days. Rainfall is moderate averaging 850 mm. per year. This climate, while adequate using modern farming techniques, was not particularly favourable for prehistoric agriculture.
Soils
The soils within the study area consist of Grenville - North Gower soils. These are poorly drained soils derived from the glacial till and marine clay (Schut and Wilson 1987:41, 56) - sediments deposited in the Champlain Sea (Ibid: 36, 56).

Figure 4: Soils of the Study Area (generalized study area boundaries) (Schut and Wilson 1987).
Figure 5: Surficial Geology, Kemptville, Ontario / Géologie de surface, Kemptville, Ontario. Richard, S H, 1982. Geological Survey of Canada, 1492A. Showing the study area. 1a = Till Plain, R= Rock.
2.2 Registered Archaeological Sites

The Ontario Ministry of Culture maintains the Ontario portion of the National Archaeological Sites database. No registered sites lie within or close to the study area¹.

2.3 Archaeological Summary

The following summary of the prehistory of central eastern Ontario is based on data from a wide variety of published and unpublished sources.

2.3.1 Palaeo-Indian Period

Archaeologists have called Ontario's first people Palaeo-Indians (meaning 'old' or 'ancient' Indians). The Palaeo-Indian Period is estimated to have begun (in Ontario) about 11,000 years ago, and lasted for approximately 1,500 years (longer in northern Ontario). These people may have hunted migrating herds of caribou along the shores of vast glacial lakes, moving north into Ontario as the ice of the last glaciation receded. They have left little evidence of their passing, except for a few beautifully made lance-shaped spear-points, and some campsites and places where they made their tools. Although the remains left by Palaeo-Indian people are quite sparse, through careful analysis of what has been found archaeologists are beginning to understand something about the way these ancient people lived. Palaeo-Indian people depended on hunting gathering and probably fishing for their subsistence. They did not raise crops. In order to gain a living from the sub-arctic environment in which they lived, Palaeo-Indian people had to exploit large territories. It is likely that they used toboggans, sleds and possibly watercraft in order to aid them move from one area to the next. The Palaeo-Indian period has been divided into two subdivisions: the Early Palaeo-Indian period (11,000 - 10,400 B.P.) and the Late Palaeo-Indian period (10,400-9,500 B.P.) based on changes in tool technology. No Paleolithic sites are known in the vicinity of the study area.

2.3.2 The Archaic Period

As the glacial ice continued to recede, the climate gradually became milder and more land became available for exploration and occupation. The Archaic Period spans the long time between the end of the Palaeo-Indian Period and the beginning of the use of pottery in Ontario (about 2900 years ago). During the 6,500 years of the Archaic Period the exquisite stone tool workmanship of the Palaeo-Indian period was slowly abandoned. Archaic spear-points rarely reach the quality of workmanship of those of their forebears and are made from a greater variety of rocks. The Archaic period was one of long and gradual change. The long seasonal migratory movements of the Palaeo-Indians seem to have been abandoned as Archaic people focussed more closely on local food resources. They modified the equipment they made to cope with the transition from an open sub-arctic landscape to a more temperate, forested one. Archaic people began to make a wide variety axes, hammers and other tools by pecking and grinding rocks to the desired shape. There are no Archaic period sites known in the vicinity of the study area.

¹ Information courtesy of Robert von Bitter, Archaeological Data Coordinator, Ontario Ministry of Culture.
2.3.3 Early Woodland Period
Some time around 1000 B.C. the idea of using fired clay to make pottery containers began to spread into Ontario. This technology probably had little impact on the people of this province, however it is of enormous importance to archaeologists because although pots readily break in use, the broken pieces tend to last extremely well in the ground.

All over the world potters have found the semi-hard clay surface of freshly shaped pots (ie. before firing) to be an irresistible canvas for decoration and art. Since fashions and design preferences gradually change through time and from one people to another, the patterns of pottery decoration, and even the shape of the pots themselves provide valuable and accurate clues to the age and culture of the people who made them. The Early Woodland people of Ontario were the first to use pottery in this province. In may other respects, people of the Early Woodland Period (c. 900 B.C. - 300 B.C.) continued to live in much the same way as their predecessors of the Late Archaic. Like the Late Archaic people, they buried their dead with great ceremony, often including attractive and exotic artifacts in the graves. The Early Woodland people of Ontario appear to have been in contact with, or at least heavily influenced by their neighbours to the south - particularly the Adena people of the Ohio Valley. To date no Early Woodland archaeological sites have been recorded in the immediate vicinity of the study area.

2.3.4 The Middle Woodland Period
The most distinctive way in which the Middle Woodland period (2300 B.P. - 1100 B.P.) differs from the Early Woodland is in the way the people of Ontario had broadened the methods they used to decorate their pots. Changes in the shapes and types of tools used, the raw materials chosen and the ways in which these were acquired and traded are also apparent. However, these subtle technological changes mask more fundamental differences. Evidence from numerous archaeological sites indicate that by the Middle Woodland Period the people of Ontario began to identify with specific regions of the province. The artifacts from Middle Woodland period sites in southwestern Ontario differ quite noticeably, for instance, from those of the people in eastern Ontario. For the first time it is possible to distinguish regional cultural traditions - sets of characteristics which are unique to a part of the province. Archaeologists have named these cultural traditions LAUREL (throughout northern Ontario), POINT PENINSULA (in eastern and south-central Ontario), SAUGEEN (in much of southwestern Ontario) and COUTURE (in extreme southwestern Ontario).

Archaeologists have developed a picture of the seasonal patterns these people used in order to exploit the wide variety of resources in their home territories. During the spring, summer and fall groups of people congregated at lakeshore sites to fish, collect shellfish (in the south) and hunt in the surrounding forests. As the seasons progressed the emphasis probably shifted away from fishing and more towards hunting, as the need to store up large quantities of food for the winter became more pressing. By late fall, or early winter, the community would split into small family hunting groups and each would return to a 'family' hunting area inland to await the return of spring.

Some Middle Woodland people may have been influenced by a vigorous culture to the south - the Hopewell. These people buried some of their dead in specially prepared
burial mounds, and accompanied the bodies with many and varied objects. Some Ontario people, especially those in the Rice Lake and Bay of Quinte areas adopted this practice, although they tailored it to suit their local needs. Some archaeologists have argued that since not all people were buried in the same way, these rich burials indicate that a hierarchy or class structure was beginning to develop as has been noted among the Hopewell. Such class distinctions do not seem to have lasted long, however, and were not part of Late Woodland life.

Middle Woodland archaeological sites have been recorded to the south-west of the study area in the vicinity of Innisville, but none are known near the study area.

2.3.5 The Late Woodland Period
The easiest way for archaeologists to distinguish Late Woodland period archaeological sites from earlier Middle Woodland sites is by looking at the pottery. During the Middle Woodland period the people made conical based pottery vessels by the coil method and decorated them with various forms of stamps. By the beginning of the Late Woodland (ie. by A.D. 900) period the coil method had been abandoned in favour of the paddle and anvil method, and the vessels were decorated with 'cord-wrapped stick' decoration. While these transitions are useful to archaeologists they provide only a hint to the more fundamental changes which were occurring at this time.

Sometime after A.D. 500, maize (corn) was introduced into southern Ontario from the south. Initially this cultivated plant had little effect on the lives of people living in Ontario, but as the centuries past, cultivation of corn, beans, squash, sunflowers and tobacco gained increasingly in importance. Not surprisingly, this transition from an economy based on the products of the lake and forest, to one in which the sowing, tending and harvesting of crops was important, also hastened cultural and technological changes. Initially at least, the changes were small. People were naturally conservative, and the risks of crop failure must have been too high to allow for too much reliance on the products of the field. Some re-orientation of the seasonal movements of these people must have occurred at this time. Fishing and hunting sites continued to be used although the pattern of summer gathering along the shores of the major lakes of the region probably diminished as the small plots of cultigens needed to be tended and harvested during the summer. Gradually however, the settlements adjacent to the corn fields began to take on a greater permanency as cultigens became more of a staple food. The best quality, light, and easily tillable farmland was sought out for cultivation, with village sites located nearby, near a reliable source of water.

As agricultural success increased, it became possible to store a supply of food for the winter. For the first time it was possible to stay in and around the village all year (in southern Ontario at least) instead of dispersing into family winter hunting camps. Villages became larger and more heavily populated. Hostilities erupted between neighbouring peoples, so that by A.D. 1000, some people found it necessary to defend their villages with stockades and ditch defences. By the end of the Late Woodland period, the people of southern Ontario had grouped themselves into distinct regional populations separated by vast, unoccupied areas of 'no-mans-land'. No evidence of the Late Woodland occupations has yet been found in the vicinity of the study area.
# TABLE 1 Generalized Cultural Chronology of the Ottawa Valley Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>TIME RANGE</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PALAEO-INIAN</td>
<td>Fluted Point Hi - Lo</td>
<td>11000 - 10400 B.P</td>
<td>big game hunters small nomadic groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10400 - 9500 B.P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHAIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Side Notched Corner Notched</td>
<td>10000 - 9700 B.P</td>
<td>nomadic hunters and gatherers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bifurcate Base</td>
<td>9700 - 8900 B.P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8900 - 8000 B.P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Early Middle Archaic Laurentian</td>
<td>8000 - 5500 B.P</td>
<td>transition to territorial settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5500 - 4000 B.P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Narrow Point Broad Point</td>
<td>4500 - 3000 B.P</td>
<td>polished / ground stone tools, river/lakeshore orientation burial ceremonialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Point Glacial Kame</td>
<td>4000 - 3500 B.P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3500 - 3000 B.P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ca. 3000 B.P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Meadowood Middlesex</td>
<td>2900 - 2400 B.P</td>
<td>introduction of pottery elaborate burials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2400 - 2000 B.P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Point Peninsula Sandbanks/Princess Point</td>
<td>2300 B.P. - 1300 B.P.</td>
<td>long distance trade burial mounds agriculture begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1500 B.P. - 1200 B.P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Pickering Middleport Huron / St. Lawrence Iroquois</td>
<td>1100 - 700 B.P.</td>
<td>transition to defended villages, horticulture, large village sites tribal organization, warfare / abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>670 - 600 B.P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600 - 350 B.P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>300 - present</td>
<td>southward migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>225 - present</td>
<td>European settlement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 Historical Background
The Study Area comprises parts of Lots 7 and 8, Concession 4, Goulbourn Township. Township, lying along both banks of the Jock River.

Early Settlement
The settlement of Goulbourn township took place in the early years of the nineteenth century. The earliest settlers were the military settlers at Richmond, many of whom were of Irish descent. Goulbourn Township was incorporated as part of Carleton County in 1821. Some of the earliest patentees of the lands under study were Talbot Settlers. Fifteen families of the original group opted not to continue west to the original chosen locality, London Township, but settled instead along the 12th line of Goulbourn.

East Half, Lot 7, and Southeast Half, Lot 8
Records indicate that the East Half of Lot 7 was first settled by Michael McQuaide, a former private in the 99th Regiment of Foot. McQuade was born in 1794 in Aghaloo, County Tyrone, Ireland. He was in Goulbourn by 1818. By 1822, his family consisted of himself, his wife, and two children, at least one of whom was born in Goulbourn. Records suggest that the family remained in the vicinity until at least 1836, when Ann McQuade (1815-1889) was married in Nepean. Other family records indicate that the family moved to Renfrew County and the Pontiac thereafter. No McQuades are found on the 1842 Goulbourn Census.

Walling’s Map of 1863 shows all of the land in the study area in the possession of T. Anderson. According to the same map, Anderson lived on the southwest bank of the River. It is possible that he re-inhabited the McQuade homestead, although we have

---

2 http://www.goulbournmuseum.ca
3 James Stanzell, Goulbourn Early Settlers 1818 + http://www.stanzell.ca/Early%20settlers%20Goulb.htm
4 www.familysearch.org.
5 Stanzell, op.cit.
6 1822 Goulbourn Census, transcription online @ http://granniesgenealogygarden.com/Granny2/goulb2.html
7 www.familysearch.org
8 Ibid
9 1842 Census, Goulbourn Township: http://www.afhs.ab.ca/data/ontario/censuses/go1842ce_alpha.pdf
no evidence for this. The Anderson house lay on the Franktown Road frontage, the only road in the vicinity. This is the most likely position for a house during the settlement years. The 1861 Census shows Thomas Anderson with his wife Jane and their family living in the township\textsuperscript{11}. The same man, unmarried, and living in the household of Daniel Anderson, appears on the earlier 1851 Census\textsuperscript{12}. It seems likely that these are descendants of Thomas Anderson, a Scot, who arrived in the township around 1838\textsuperscript{13}.

Thomas Anderson died sometime after 1863\textsuperscript{14}. His widow and children are found on the 1871 Census for Goulbourn, and given the names of neighbours on the census, were likely living on the fourth concession, and possibly still on the family farm\textsuperscript{15}, although one transcription indicates that Hugh Anderson was farming Lot 7, while Jane, the widow of Thomas, was on Lot 2\textsuperscript{16}. By 1879, she and her family had moved on. The map in the Historical Atlas\textsuperscript{17} of this year shows that Lots 7 and 8 had been sold to three different people. George Bell had purchased the Southwest Half of Lot 8. This lies outside the study area. The northwest half of Lot 7 was in the hands of John Featherston. There was now a dwelling on the riverbank at a large bend in the river. The land fronting on the Franktown road in both lots was now owned by W.H. Fee. He had a house in Lot 7, and there was another house, shown on the 1879 map as being just over the border in Lot 8, and occupied by Mrs. C. McD. Census evidence reveals this person to be Catherine McDonald\textsuperscript{18}, the widow of Angus McDonald, who had appeared with her on the 1871 Census, along with their large family, aged between 13-6 at that time\textsuperscript{19}. By the time of the next census, the family was gone\textsuperscript{20}.

\textsuperscript{11} 1861 Census, Goulbourn Township: http://www.afhs.ab.ca/data/ontario/censuses/go1861ce_alpha.pdf

\textsuperscript{12} 1851 Personal Census, Goulbourn Township: http://www.afhs.ab.ca/data/ontario/censuses/go1851ce_alpha.pdf

\textsuperscript{13} 1842 Census, Goulbourn Township: Transcription:http://www.afhs.ab.ca/data/ontario/censuses/go1842ce_alpha.pdf

\textsuperscript{14} Based on age of youngest child on 1871 Census

\textsuperscript{15} 1871 Census, Goulbourn Township, Schedule 1, transcription: http://www.afhs.ab.ca/data/ontario/censuses/go1901ce.pdf

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid

\textsuperscript{17} Illustrated historical atlas of the county of Carleton (including city of Ottawa), Ont. Toronto: H. Belden & Co., 1879.

\textsuperscript{18} 1881 Census, Goulbourn Township: transcription online @ www.familysearch.org.

\textsuperscript{19} 1871 Census, Goulbourn Township transcription online@ http://www.afhs.ab.ca/data/ontario/censuses/go1871ce.pdf

\textsuperscript{20} 1881 Census, op.cit.
The Fee family had been in Canada since at least 1837, and W.H. Fee was living on Concession 6, Lot 7 in 1884. It is likely that he purchased Lot 7 in Concession 4 for his son Albert, who was farming there in 1884. By 1891, Albert Fee and his family had moved to Nepean.

Like Albert Fee, John Featherston (Featherson), who also owned part of Lot 7, was the son of a Goulbourn settler. William Featherson was present on the 1851 Census. He and his wife, Isabella were English, but had been in Canada since 1829, according to the birthplace data for their children. William does not appear on the 1842 Census for Goulbourn, so it's possible that they were settled elsewhere before coming to Goulbourn sometime in the 1840's. John Featherson probably moved to Lot 7 around the time of his marriage to Elizabeth Stobie, in 1875.

According to one transcription of the 1901 Census, the Feathersons had 150 acres, which included part of Lot 8. The same transcription indicates that a George Brown was farming on Lot 7 at this time. George Brown was enumerated next to George Bell who owned the Northwest quarter of Lot 8 at this time. Brown gives his station as "farm labourer", so he may have been working either for Bell or for the Featherstons.

The Feathersons remained in Goulbourn until their deaths in 1914.

Throughout the 19th century, the lands in the study area were home to several families, beginning before 1820. Transient settlement, and early deaths of some of the owners provided the opportunity for the descendants of settler's families who remained to acquire farmland close to their families. This pattern applied to both lots. Death and the promise of better opportunities elsewhere made the pattern of ownership more fluid than might have otherwise been. Map evidence indicates that several houses existed...
on the property, situated with respect to available transportation routes. The earliest dwellings were probably at the river bank, along the Franktown Road. When the Copeland Road was opened, after 1863\(^{26}\), other building sites became available. It is difficult to pinpoint exact locations of houses and other structures based on map evidence, since the depiction of the course of the Jock River on the historical maps is highly inaccurate. In addition, there may have been changes to the course of the river over time. It is possible to postulate zones of high potential for the likelihood of historical remains at various locations within the study area.

Figure 6: Part of the 1863 “Walling” map of Carleton County showing the location of Lots 7 and 8, Concession 4. Note that the size of the lots is inaccurately shown, as is the relative position of the Jock River within the lots.

\(^{26}\) Walling; op.cit.
Figure 7: Part of the 1879 Atlas of Carleton County showing the position of Lots 7 and 8, Concession 4.
3.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

In determining archaeological potential, a number of characteristics are considered. In general, these conform to the basic key archaeological site potential criteria identified by the Ontario Ministry of Culture and described in their ‘primer’ document (MOC 1997) and the Draft Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (2009). They consist of proximity to water (major or minor watercourse, wetlands, marshes, swamps etc. or ancient beaches and river terraces), the proximity of known archaeological sites in the area (not an issue in this instance), areas of elevated topography, such as drumlins, eskers and elevated plains, pockets of loose, well drained soils in areas of heavier soil, the presence of unusual landforms such as waterfalls, rock outcrops etc., and various historical landscape considerations, such as transportation routes, early settlement roads or unique patterns of historical settlement.

Not all these conditions will exist on every property. However, the presence of one or more of these characteristics has been found to be a good indicator of the potential for archaeological sites in Ontario.

Figure 8: Archaeological Potential (City of Ottawa Web Site) showing the general location of the study area in relation to areas identified as having archaeological potential in the City of Ottawa Archaeological Master Plan.
3.1 Pre-Contact Archaeological Sites

To date, virtually no evidence of the pre-contact use of the Jock River has been identified, although people have no doubt been travelling and camping along its shores for thousands of years.

The City of Ottawa archaeological potential mapping (http://apps104.ottawa.ca/emap/) indicates areas of archaeological potential over most of the property (Figure 8). This is based on the assumption that any lands within 300 metres of a water body such as the Jock River have some archaeological potential.

A revision of this potential mapping is indicated on Figure 9, based on field examination and evaluation. Portions of the study area have clearly been disturbed through excavation for golf traps, sand pits, greens and fairways however the degree to which these disturbances have affected the integrity of the original ground surface could not be determined without sub-surface testing.

It is therefore recommended that all areas of archaeological potential indicated on figure 9 which lie within the study area, be subject to archaeological field survey, with testing conducted in areas where prior disturbance has not occurred.

*The potential for pre-contact archaeological sites is high.*

3.2 Historic / Early Euro-Canadian Settlement

The frontage of the property is also flagged on the City of Ottawa archaeological potential model because the property fronts on to an early settlement road (Franktown Road). Historic map sources (Figures 6 and 7), census, and property transfer information indicate that a number of historic dwellings were located within or near to the study area. At least one of these dwellings may date to as early as 1818.

Archaeological testing should seek to identify whether any indications of these dwellings and their associated structures is present within the study area.

*The potential for historic archaeological sites is high.*
Figure 9. Archaeological potential of the study area.
Plate 1: West end of the study area near Copeland Road, looking towards the Jock River. Archaeological potential may still present between areas of disturbance which occurred during golf course construction.

Plate 2: Central portion of the Riverbend Golf Course. The Jock River lies to the right of the picture.
Plate 3: Log barn located to the south of the Jock River - possibly associated with the William Fee farm.

Plate 4: The Jock River, looking downstream from Copeland Road.
Plate 5: A small creek enters the Jock River near the western end of the eastern part of the study area. It is indicated on the 1863, but not the 1879 plans. Its course has been straightened.

Plate 6: Portions of the study area are low lying and poorly drained.
4.0 CONCLUSIONS

When evaluated against the Ontario Ministry of Culture’s archaeological potential criteria, this property exhibits a high potential for prehistoric archaeological sites. The property contains habitable lands along the Jock River, which could have been occupied at any time during the last ten thousand years.

In practice however, the archaeological potential may be somewhat limited by the degree of prior disturbance through golf course construction. Also the relatively high water table and the absence of any additional topographical characteristics which might have tended to attract past human activity to the area may have limited the areas appeal. Nevertheless, the possibility exists that some evidence of pre-Contact activity could be present, thus Stage 2 archaeological testing is warranted.

This part of the Ottawa region also has a long history of Euro-Canadian occupation, dating from the early part of the nineteenth century. The study area may contain archaeological evidence associated with pioneer families and subsequent settlers on the lots. Three general areas have been identified within which evidence of historic settlement and use is most likely - although they do not preclude the possibility of historic sites elsewhere within the study area.
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Stage 2 archaeological investigations (field testing) should be undertaken in order to determine the presence or absence of archaeological sites.

2. No activities which would result in disturbance to the ground surface should be undertaken until such time as an archaeological assessment has been completed and approved by the Ministry of Culture, Heritage Operations Unit.

3. Archaeological testing should focus on areas where past disturbances associated with golf course construction are minimal, and define areas where disturbances have removed archaeological potential.

Additionally, the following two recommendations are included in all archaeological assessment reports conducted under a licence from the Ministry of Culture:

4. If during the process of development (deeply buried / undetected) archaeological remains are uncovered, the developer or their agents should immediately notify the Archaeology Section of the Ontario Ministry of Culture (416) 314-7132.

5. In the event that human remains are encountered during construction, the proponent should immediately contact the Police, MOC, and the Cemeteries Registrar of the Ministry of Government and Consumer Services (416) 326-8394.
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PROJECT SUMMARY

PROJECT STAFF

Project Archaeologist: Nicholas R. Adams
Field Assistants: Chris Cadue, Steve Errington, Doug Kirk, John Errington
Report Author: Nicholas R. Adams
Dates of Field Testing: October 12th, 13th, 14th, 18th, 19th - 2010
Weather Conditions: Fine, Clear
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SUMMARY

At the request of Greg Winters, Planner with Novatech Engineering Consultants Ltd., acting on behalf of the property owners, a Stage 2 archaeological assessment was undertaken of the proposed Riverbend subdivision development on parts of Lots 7 and 8, Concession 4, Goulbourn Township in the County of Carleton.

In 2009 a Stage 1 archaeological assessment was conducted of the whole property (Adams 2009) under PIF# P003-255-2009 (see above). This study identified archaeological potential for pre-Contact First Nations sites over much of the property, based on the presence of habitable land in proximity to the Jock River. The potential for nineteenth century Euro-Canadian settlement evidence was also identified.

The current Stage 2 study details the examination and testing of the portions of the property which exhibit archaeological potential and which could have supported past human settlement.

Results of Stage 2 Testing

Archaeological testing was completed wherever ground conditions permitted. No evidence of archaeological sites was encountered.
1.0 STAGE 2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL TESTING

The Stage 1 archaeological assessment had indicated that a substantial percentage of the proposed development area occupied lands which indicated archaeological potential. However, since the proposed development will occupy areas which have been modified as a golf course, some degree of prior disturbance could be anticipated.

In particular, during the construction of greens, berms, traps and fairways some areas has been mechanically scraped and piled while others had been buried. The process of archaeological testing sought to address and incorporate these areas as far as possible.

The majority of the property is level with poor natural drainage and a high water table. The natural drainage has been improved by the addition of buried plastic drains. Nevertheless, during the archaeological survey, some areas were too waterlogged to be effectively tested. These existed as low spots on the fairways where water ponded at the surface, natural low areas which had been left as obstacles, and low spots created by the removal of soils for the construction of nearby berms and greens.

Plate 1: Water obstacles have been created by excavating down to below the natural water table which lies close to the surface throughout the property.

Since surface survey was not a viable option on any portion of the property, test pit survey was adopted as the only effective way to conduct the archaeological assessment.
A nominal five metre grid was employed wherever testing proved possible. Wherever practical, test pits were excavated through the upper soil zones until either sterile subsoil, bedrock or ground water was encountered. Test pits averaged 30cm. by 30 cm. and soils were sifted through 6mm. hardware cloth screen.

Although the Stage 1 assessment had indicated a low archaeological site potential for the south-east corner of the property (see Stage 1 report: Figure 9), once fieldwork was underway we opted to test the whole proposed development area. The precise location of the “Fee” farm had not been determined during the Stage 1 research, so this area was included to ensure that it was not missed.

Thus, while some localized portions of the property were not tested because of prior disturbance, no areas were excluded from the testing on the basis of perceived archaeological potential. The areas tested are indicated on Figure 1.

A comprehensive search was conducted looking for any evidence that might reveal the whereabouts of the former “Fee” house. None was located.
Figure 1: Areas Tested.
Plate 3: Archaeological testing along the fence line in the northwest corner of the study area.

Plate 4: Testing in the rough.
Plate 5: Testing in the vicinity of the presumed “Fee House” barn.

Plate 6: Standing water near the eastern edge of the western development area.
2.0 CONCLUSIONS

No archaeological sites are present on the property.

3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Full clearance of any archaeological conditions affecting the proposed Riverbend subdivision property is recommended. No further archaeological investigations or testing are warranted.

In addition, the standard and required recommendations which accompany all archaeological assessment reports are:

2. If during the process of development (deeply buried / undetected) archaeological remains are uncovered, the developer or their agents should immediately notify the Archaeology Section of the Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture (416) 314-7132.

3. In the event that human remains are encountered during construction, the proponent should immediately contact the police, the Ministry of Tourism and Culture, and the Cemeteries Regulation Unit, Ministry of Small Business and Consumer Services (416-326-8393).