

**Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
New Municipal Office
260 Concession Road 8 East
Township of Tiny
Part of Lot 10, Concession 8
Geographic Township of Tiny
Simcoe County, Ontario**

Prepared for
Township of Tiny
130 Balm Beach Road West
Tiny, ON L0L 2J0
Tel: (705) 526-4204

Licensed under
P.J. Racher
MCM Licence #P007
PIF #P007-1608-2025
ARA File #2024-0551

18/07/2025

Original Report

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Under a contract awarded in January 2025, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. carried out a Stage 2 assessment of lands with the potential to be impacted by the construction of a new municipal office at 260 Concession Road 8 East in the Township of Tiny, Simcoe County, Ontario. It is anticipated that the new office will be approximately 2,790 m². The assessment was carried out in support of a Building Permit application and were triggered by the requirements set out in Section 2.6 of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 issued under Section 3 of the *Planning Act*. This report documents the background research and potential modelling involved in the investigation and presents conclusions and recommendations pertaining to archaeological concerns.

The Stage 2 assessment was conducted in May and June 2025 under Project Information Form #P007-1608-2025. The investigation encompassed the entire project area. Legal permission to enter and conduct all necessary fieldwork activities was granted by the property owner. At the time of assessment, the project area consisted of woodlot and cleared areas.

The Stage 2 assessment did not result in the identification of any archaeological materials. It is recommended that no further land-based assessment be required within the project area. If any impacts are planned outside of the assessed area, further assessment will be required.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
ABBREVIATIONS	III
PERSONNEL	IV
ENGAGED GROUPS	IV
1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT	1
1.1 Development Context	1
1.2 Historical Context	1
1.2.1 Settlement History	2
1.2.1.1 Pre-Contact	2
1.2.1.2 Post-Contact	3
1.2.2 Traditional Knowledge	4
1.2.3 Past and Present Land Use	5
1.2.3.1 Overview	5
1.2.3.2 Mapping and Imagery Analysis	6
1.3 Archaeological Context	6
1.3.1 Condition of the Property	6
1.3.2 Registered or Known Archaeological Sites	7
1.3.3 Previous Archaeological Work	8
1.3.3.1 Perkinsfield Area Water System (Stage 1–2)	8
1.3.3.2 Tiny Township Municipal Office (Stage 1)	8
2.0 STAGE 2 PROPERTY ASSESSMENT	9
2.1 Field Methods	9
2.2 Record of Finds	10
2.3 Analysis and Conclusions	10
3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS	11
4.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION	12
5.0 IMAGES	13
6.0 MAPS	15
7.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES	30

IMAGES

Image 1: Test Pit Survey	13
Image 2: Test Pit Survey	13
Image 3: Test Pit Survey	13

Image 4: Test Pit Survey	13
Image 5: Test Pit Survey	14
Image 6: Test Pit Survey	14

MAPS

Map 1: Location of the Study Area	15
Map 2: Nearby Village Sites, Bone Pits and Forest Trails	16
Map 3: <i>Hogg's Map of the County of Simcoe</i> (1871)	17
Map 4: <i>Simcoe Supplement in Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada</i> (1881)	18
Map 5: Topographic Map (1950)	19
Map 6: Aerial Image (1954)	20
Map 7: Aerial Image (1978)	21
Map 8: Aerial Image (1989)	22
Map 9: Aerial Image (1997)	23
Map 10: Aerial Image (2002)	24
Map 11: Simcoe County's <i>Archaeological Potential</i> GIS Layer	25
Map 12: Sites in the Surrounding Area	26
Map 13: Features of Potential	27
Map 14: Assessment Methods	28
Map 15: Assessment Methods (Development Map)	29

TABLES

Table 1: Pre-Contact Settlement History	2
Table 2: Post-Contact Settlement History	3
Table 3: Chippewas of Rama First Nation History	4
Table 4: Huron-Wendat Nation History	5
Table 5: Soil Types	7
Table 6: Registered or Known Archaeological Sites	8
Table 7: Fieldwork Activities and Environmental Conditions	9
Table 8: Field Methods	10
Table 9: Documentary Record	10

ABBREVIATIONS

ARA – Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.
CIF – Contract Information Form
MCM – Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism

PIF – Project Information Form
S&Gs – Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists

PERSONNEL

Licence Holder: P.J. Racher (#P007)
Engagement Advisors: K. Kenel (#R1327)
Project Lead: T. Taylor (#R1126)
Field Director: L. Murphy (#R1251), T. Taylor
Field Technicians: R. Douglas, E. Chapman, A. Savov, S. Hall, C. Ehlebracht, A. Land, H. Gordon, A. MacGillivray, D. Randell
Cartographers: A. Bailey (#R1069), K. Crotty, M. Johnson
Report Writer: T. Taylor

ENGAGED GROUPS

Beausoleil First Nation
Contact: D. Montague
Field Representative: None

Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation
Contacts: N. Charles, J. Porte
Field Representative: None

Chippewas of Rama First Nation
Contact: B. Cousineau
Field Representative: None

Huron-Wendat Nation
Contacts: Pier-Louis Dagenais Savard
Field Representative: Nathaniel Sioui, Pier-Louis Dagenais Savard, Guy Savard

Métis Nation of Ontario
Contact: General Consultation
Field Representative: None

Moose Deer Point First Nation
Contact: Tracy Hendrick
Field Representative: None

Wahta Mohawks
Contact: S. Aubichon
Field Representative: None

1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT

1.1 Development Context

Under a contract awarded in January 2025, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. carried out a Stage 2 assessment of lands with the potential to be impacted by the construction of a new municipal office at 260 Concession Road 8 East in the Township of Tiny, Simcoe County, Ontario. It is anticipated that the new office will be approximately 2,790 m². The assessment was carried out in support of a Building Permit application and were triggered by the requirements set out in Section 2.6 of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 issued under Section 3 of the Planning Act. This report documents the background research and fieldwork involved in the investigation and presents conclusions and recommendations pertaining to archaeological concerns.

The project area consists of an irregular parcel of land with an area of 5.99 ha (Map 1). This parcel is generally bounded by Concession Road 9 East to the northwest, predominantly wooded lands to the northeast, southeast and southwest. In legal terms, the study area falls on part of Lot 10, Concession 8 in the Geographic Township of Tiny, Simcoe County. The Crown obtained these lands as part of the Lake Simcoe Purchase (Treaty 16) in 1815. The parcel falls within the treaty and shared traditional territories of the Williams Treaties First Nations, comprising the Mississauga communities of Alderville First Nation, Curve Lake First Nation, Hiawatha First Nation and Scugog Island First Nation and the Chippewa communities of Beausoleil First Nation, Georgina Island First Nation and Rama First Nation. The treaty harvesting rights of these First Nations were re-affirmed within this area as part of the Settlement Agreement in 2018. This area falls within the ancestral territory of the Huron-Wendat Nation and is also of interest to the Métis Nation of Ontario, Moose Deer Point First Nation and Wahta Mohawks.

The Stage 2 assessment was conducted in May and June 2025 under Project Information Form (PIF) #P007-1608-2025. The investigation encompassed the entire project area. Legal permission to enter and conduct all necessary fieldwork activities was granted by the property owner. As set out in Section 1.0 of the 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (S&Gs)*, the investigation was carried out to achieve the following objectives:

- Document all archaeological resources within the study area;
- Determine whether there are sites requiring further assessment; and
- Recommend appropriate strategies for Stage 3 assessment, if necessary.

The Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) is asked to review the results and recommendations presented herein and enter the report into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports. A Record of Indigenous Engagement is included in the project report package in accordance with the requirements set out in Section 7.6.2 of the 2011 *S&Gs*.

1.2 Historical Context

After a century of archaeological work in southern Ontario, scholarly understanding of the historical usage of the area has become very well-developed. With occupation beginning in the Palaeo period approximately 11,000 years ago, the greater vicinity of the study area comprises a

complex chronology of Indigenous and Euro-Canadian histories. Section 1.2.1 summarizes the region’s settlement history, Section 1.2.2 provides traditional knowledge and Section 1.2.3 documents past and present land uses. One previous archaeological report containing relevant background information was obtained during the research component of the study. This report is summarized in Section 1.3.3, and the reference appears in Section 7.0.

1.2.1 Settlement History

1.2.1.1 Pre-Contact

The Pre-Contact history of the region is lengthy and rich, and a variety of Indigenous groups inhabited the landscape. Archaeologists generally divide this history into three main periods: Palaeo, Archaic and Woodland. Each period comprises a range of sub-periods characterized by identifiable trends in material culture and settlement patterns, which are used to interpret past lifeways. The principal characteristics of these sub-periods are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Pre-Contact Settlement History
 (Wright 1972; Ellis and Ferris 1990; Warrick 2000; Fox and Garrad 2004; Munson and Jamieson 2013)

Sub-Period	Timeframe	Characteristics
Early Palaeo	9000–8400 BC	Gainey, Barnes and Crowfield traditions; Small bands; Mobile hunters and gatherers; Utilization of seasonal resources and large territories; Fluted points
Late Palaeo	8400–7500 BC	Holcombe, Hi-Lo and Lanceolate biface traditions; Continuing mobility; Campsite/Way-Station sites; Smaller territories are utilized; Non-fluted points
Early Archaic	7500–6000 BC	Side-Notched, Corner-Notched (Nettling, Thebes) and Bifurcate traditions; Growing diversity of stone tool types; Heavy woodworking tools appear (e.g., ground stone axes and chisels)
Middle Archaic	6000–2500 BC	Stemmed (Kirk, Stanly/Neville), Brewerton Side- and Corner-Notched traditions; Reliance on local resources; Populations increasing; More ritual activities; Fully ground and polished tools; Net-sinkers common; Earliest copper tools
Late Archaic	2500–900 BC	Narrow Point (Lamoka), Broad Point (Genesee) and Small Point (Crawford Knoll) traditions; Less mobility; Use of fish-weirs; True cemeteries appear; Stone pipes emerge; Long-distance trade (marine shells and galena)
Early Woodland	900–400 BC	Meadowood tradition; Crude cord-roughened ceramics emerge; Meadowood cache blades and side-notched points; Bands of up to 35 people
Middle Woodland	400 BC–AD 600	Point Peninsula tradition; Vinette 2 ceramics appear; Small camp sites and seasonal village sites; Influences from northern Ontario and Hopewell area to the south; Hopewellian influence can be seen in continued use of burial mounds
Middle/Late Woodland Transition	AD 600–900	Gradual transition between Point Peninsula and later traditions; Princess Point tradition emerges elsewhere (i.e., in the vicinity of the Grand and Credit Rivers)
Late Woodland	AD 900–1600	Area occupied by Algonquian-speaking Anishinaabeg and Iroquoian-speaking peoples such as the Huron-Petun; Early focus on the latter linguistic group identified Glen Meyer, Uren, Middleport and later traditions and tended to emphasize a linear ‘Iroquoian’ developmental sequence; There was likely a close interaction sphere between the two groups, which may have resulted in shared material culture and even some cohabitation; Algonquian sites or shared sites possibly linked with more diverse raw materials and a greater reliance on quartz; Huron-Petun associated with large villages, hunting and fishing camps, cabin sites and hamlets; Fur trade begins ca. 1580; European trade goods appear

1.2.1.2 Post-Contact

The arrival of European explorers and traders at the beginning of the 17th century triggered widespread shifts in Indigenous lifeways and set the stage for the ensuing Euro-Canadian settlement process. Documentation for this period is abundant, ranging from the first sketches of Upper Canada and the written accounts of early explorers to detailed township maps and lengthy histories. The Post-Contact period can be effectively discussed in terms of major historical events, and the principal characteristics associated with these events are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Post-Contact Settlement History
 (Smith 1846; Coyne 1895; Hunter 1909a, 1909b; Lajeunesse 1960; Cumming 1975; Ellis and Ferris 1990; Surtees 1994; AO 2024)

Historical Event	Timeframe	Characteristics
Early Exploration	Early 17 th century	Brûlé explores southern Ontario in 1610/11; Champlain travels through in 1613 and 1615/1616, making contact with a number of Indigenous groups (including the Algonquin, Huron-Wendat and other First Nations); European trade goods become increasingly common and begin to put pressure on traditional industries
Increased Contact and Conflict	Mid- to late 17 th century	Conflicts between various First Nations during the Beaver Wars result in numerous population shifts; European explorers continue to document the area, and many Indigenous groups trade directly with the French and English; ‘The Great Peace of Montreal’ treaty established between roughly 39 different First Nations and New France in 1701
Fur Trade Development	Early to mid-18 th century	Growth and spread of the fur trade; Peace between the French and English with the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713; Ethnogenesis of the Métis; Hostilities between French and British lead to the Seven Years’ War in 1754; French surrender in 1760
British Control	Mid- to late 18 th century	<i>Royal Proclamation</i> of 1763 recognizes the title of the First Nations to the land; Numerous treaties subsequently arranged by the Crown; First land cession under the new protocols is the Seneca surrender of the west side of the Niagara River in 1764; The Niagara Purchase (Treaty 381) in 1781 included this area
Loyalist Influx	Late 18 th century	United Empire Loyalist influx after the American Revolutionary War (1775–1783); British develop interior communication routes and acquire additional lands; J. Collins acquires the northern part of the Toronto Carrying Place in 1785 (subject to a confirmatory surrender as part of the Williams Treaties in 1923); <i>Constitutional Act</i> of 1791 creates Upper and Lower Canada
County Development	Late 18 th to early 19 th century	Nominally became part of Kent County in 1792 and Simcoe County in 1798; Additional land cessions included the Penetanguishene Purchase (Treaty 5) in 1798, Lake Simcoe Purchase (Treaty 16) in 1815 and Nottawasaga Purchase (Treaty 18) in 1818; All townships surveyed by the mid-1830s; Townships ceded to Waterloo County in 1837 and York County in 1838; Simcoe County independent after the abolition of the district system in 1849
Township Formation	Early 19 th century	W. Dunlop opened the Penetanguishene Road ca. 1814; Penetanguishene was developed as a military and naval depot in 1818, and retired soldiers settled sporadically along the military road; Tiny was surveyed by J. Goessman in 1821/22; Settlement largely occurred after the migration of a French-Canadian contingent from Drummond Island to Penetanguishene in 1828; Some of these settlers took up larger farms in what became the Lafontaine Settlement in the northwest; L. DesCheneaux built the first house ca. 1830, and several others had settled there by 1836; The ‘King’s Mills’ erected at Tiny Beach ca. 1832
Township Development	Mid-19 th to early 20 th century	Population reached 230 by 1842 (mainly French and Indigenous beyond Penetanguishene); Three schools were in operation by 1843; 3,336 ha taken up by 1846, with 361 ha under cultivation; Tiny and Tay were separated in 1869; Traversed by the North Simcoe Railway (1878) and the Grand Trunk Railway’s Tay Cutoff (1911); Communities at Gibson, Lafontaine, Penetanguishene, Perkinsfield, Waverly, Wyebridge and Wyevale

1.2.2 Traditional Knowledge

The study area occupies lands that fall within the treaty, traditional and/or ancestral territories of numerous Indigenous peoples and communities. Indeed, this area was used and shared by many groups over the millennia; each with their own traditions as to how they arrived, how they lived and the major events that punctuated their time there. At the time of writing, the Chippewas of Rama First Nation and Huron-Wendat Nation have provided traditional knowledge for inclusion in archaeological reports. These contributions are reproduced in Table 3–Table 4 (ordered alphabetically). It should be noted that one group’s traditional knowledge does not necessarily reflect the views of other groups, or the consultant archaeologist.

**Table 3: Chippewas of Rama First Nation History
(Provided by Chippewas of Rama First Nation)**

Rama First Nation History
<p>The Chippewas of Rama First Nation are an Anishinaabe (Ojibway) community located at Rama First Nation, ON. Our history began with a great migration from the East Coast of Canada into the Great Lakes region. Throughout a period of several hundred years, our direct ancestors again migrated to the north and eastern shores of Lake Huron and Georgian Bay. Our Elders say that we made room in our territory for our allies, the Huron-Wendat Nation, during their times of war with the Haudenosaunee. Following the dispersal of the Huron-Wendat Nation from the region in the mid-1600s, our stories say that we again migrated to our territories in what today is known as Muskoka and Simcoe County. Several major battles with the Haudenosaunee culminated in peace being agreed between the Anishinaabe and the Haudenosaunee, after which the Haudenosaunee agreed to leave the region and remain in southern Ontario. Thus, since the early 18th century, much of central Ontario into the lower parts of northern Ontario has been Anishinaabe territory.</p>
<p>The more recent history of Rama First Nation begins with the creation of the “Coldwater Narrows” reserve, one of the first reserves in Canada. The Crown intended to relocate our ancestors to the Coldwater reserve and ultimately assimilate our ancestors into Euro-Canadian culture. Underlying the attempts to assimilate our ancestors were the plans to take possession of our vast hunting and harvesting territories. Feeling the impacts of increasingly widespread settlement, many of our ancestors moved to the Coldwater reserve in the early 1830s. Our ancestors built homes, mills, and farmsteads along the old portage route which ran through the reserve, connecting Lake Simcoe to Georgian Bay (this route is now called “Highway 12”). After a short period of approximately six years, the Crown had a change of plans. Frustrated at our ancestors continued exploiting of hunting territories (spanning roughly from Newmarket to the south, Kawartha Lakes to the east, Meaford to the west, and Lake Nipissing to the north), as well as unsuccessful assimilation attempts, the Crown reneged on the promise of reserve land. Three of our Chiefs, including Chief Yellowhead, went to York under the impression they were signing documents affirming their ownership of land and buildings. The Chiefs were misled, and inadvertently allegedly surrendered the Coldwater reserve back to the Crown.</p>
<p>Our ancestors, then known as the Chippewas of Lakes Simcoe and Huron, were left landless. Earlier treaties, such as Treaty 16 and Treaty 18, had already resulted in nearly 2,000,000 acres being allegedly surrendered to the Crown. The Chippewas made the decision to split into three groups. The first followed Chief Snake to Snake Island and Georgina Island (today known as the Chippewas of Georgina Island). The second group followed Chief Aissance to Beausoleil Island, and later to Christian Island (Beausoleil First Nation). The third group, led by Chief Yellowhead, moved to the Narrows between Lakes Simcoe and Couchiching and eventually, Rama (Chippewas of Rama First Nation).</p>
<p>A series of purchases, using Rama’s own funds, resulted in Yellowhead purchasing approximately 1,600 acres of abandoned farmland in Rama Township. This land makes up the core of the Rama Reserve today, and we have called it home since the early 1840’s. Our ancestors began developing our community, clearing fields for farming and building homes. They continued to hunt and harvest in their traditional territories, especially within the Muskoka region, up until the early 1920’s. In 1923, the Williams Treaties were signed, surrendering 12,000,000 acres of previously unceded land to the Crown. Once again, our ancestors were misled, and they were informed that in surrendering the land, they gave up their right to access their seasonal traditional hunting and harvesting territories.</p>
<p>With accessing territories difficult, our ancestors turned to other ways to survive. Many men guided tourists around their former family hunting territories in Muskoka, showing them places to fish and hunt. Others worked in lumber camps and mills. Our grandmothers made crafts such as porcupine quill baskets and black ash baskets, and sold them to tourists visiting Simcoe and Muskoka. The children were forced into Indian Day School, and some were taken away to Residential Schools. Church on the reserve began to indoctrinate our ancestors. Our community, along with every other First Nation in Canada,</p>

Rama First Nation History
entered a dark period of attempted genocide at the hands of Canada and the Crown. Somehow, our ancestors persevered, and they kept our culture, language, and community alive.
Today, our community has grown into a bustling place, and is home to approximately 1,100 people. We are a proud and progressive First Nations community.

**Table 4: Huron-Wendat Nation History
(Provided by Huron-Wendat Nation)**

History of the Nation Huronne-Wendat
As an ancient people, traditionally, the Huron-Wendat, a great Iroquoian civilization of farmers and fishermen-hunter-gatherers and also the masters of trade and diplomacy, represented several thousand individuals. They lived in a territory stretching from the Gaspé Peninsula in the Gulf of Saint Lawrence and up along the Saint Lawrence Valley on both sides of the Saint Lawrence River all the way to the Great Lakes. Huronia, included in Wendake South, represents a part of the ancestral territory of the Huron-Wendat Nation in Ontario. It extends from Lake Nipissing in the North to Lake Ontario in the South and Île Perrot in the East to around Owen Sound in the West. This territory is today marked by several hundred archaeological sites, listed to date, testifying to this strong occupation of the territory by the Nation. It is an invaluable heritage for the Huron-Wendat Nation and the largest archaeological heritage related to a First Nation in Canada.
According to our own traditions and customs, the Huron-Wendat are intimately linked to the Saint Lawrence River and its estuary, which is the main route of its activities and way of life. The Huron-Wendat formed alliances and traded goods with other First Nations among the networks that stretched across the continent.
Today, the population of the Huron-Wendat Nation is composed of more than 4000 members distributed on-reserve and off-reserve.
The Huron-Wendat Nation band council (CNHW) is headquartered in Wendake, the oldest First Nations community in Canada, located on the outskirts of Quebec City (20 km north of the city) on the banks of the Saint Charles River. There is only one Huron-Wendat community, whose ancestral territory is called the Nionwentsïo, which translates to “our beautiful land” in the Wendat language.
The Huron-Wendat Nation is also the only authority that have the authority and rights to protect and take care of her ancestral sites in Wendake South.

1.2.3 Past and Present Land Use

1.2.3.1 Overview

During Pre-Contact and Early Contact times, the vicinity of the study area would have comprised a mixture of coniferous trees, deciduous trees and open areas. Indigenous communities actively utilized the land and its resources well into Post-Contact times, and they would have managed the landscape to varying degrees (e.g., establishing clearings for campsites, plant cultivation, etc.). Numerous villages, ‘bonepits’ (ossuaries) and forest trails were documented within or adjacent to the Geographic Township of Tiny by A.F. Hunter in the late 19th century (Hunter 1899). Although none of these features were located within or immediately adjacent to the study area, a forest trail and several villages were recorded to the northeast (Map 2). During the early 19th century, Euro-Canadian settlers arrived in the area and began to clear the forests for agricultural and settlement purposes. The study area was located southeast of the historical limits of Perkinsfield. The land use at the time of assessment can be classified as mixture of infrastructural and green space.

1.2.3.2 Mapping and Imagery Analysis

In order to gain a general understanding of the study area's past land uses, two historical settlement maps, one topographic map and five aerial images were examined during the research component of the study. Specifically, the following resources were consulted:

- *Hogg's Map of the County of Simcoe* (1871) (OHCMP 2019);
- *Simcoe Supplement in Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada* (1881) (MU 2001);
- A topographic map from 1950 (OCUL 2024); and
- Aerial images from 1954, 1978, 1989, 1997 and 2002 (Simcoe County 2024; U of T 2024).

The limits of the study area are shown on georeferenced versions of the consulted historical resources in Map 3–Map 10.

Hogg's Map of the County of Simcoe (1871) does not identify any occupants or farmsteads within the study area (Map 3). Given that this map does not depict any residential structures, the absence of buildings should not be taken as evidence that the parcel was unimproved. Concession Road 9 East and Concession Road 8 East appear to the northwest and southeast, respectively. The *Simcoe Supplement in Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada* (1881) similarly provides no insights regarding past occupants or land uses (Map 4). Since this publication only included information for its subscribers, these omissions are not particularly significant.

The topographic map from 1950 suggests that the study area comprised a mixture of agricultural and wooded lands, and a house is shown along Concession Road 8 East to the southeast (Map 5). The aerial images from 1954–1989 confirm this land use pattern (Map 6–Map 8), but the aerial image from 1997 indicates that the fields were no longer being cultivated (Map 9). The woodlot and nearby driveway within the clearing are visible in the aerial image from 2002 (Map 10).

1.3 Archaeological Context

The Stage 2 assessment was conducted in May 2025 under PIF #P007-1608-2025. ARA utilized an Apple iPhone SE with a built-in GPS/GNSS receiver during the investigation (UTM17/NAD83). The limits of the study area were confirmed using project-specific GIS data translated into GPS points for reference in the field, in combination with aerial imagery showing physical features in relation to the subject lands.

The archaeological context of any given study area must be informed by 1) the condition of the property as found (Section 1.3.1), 2) a summary of registered or known archaeological sites located within a minimum 1 km radius (Section 1.3.2) and 3) descriptions of previous archaeological fieldwork carried out within the limits of, or immediately adjacent to the property (Section 1.3.3).

1.3.1 Condition of the Property

The study area lies within the Great Lakes–St. Lawrence forest region, which is a transitional zone between the southern deciduous forest and the northern boreal forest. This region extends along the St. Lawrence River across central Ontario to Lake Huron and west of Lake Superior along the border with Minnesota, and its southern portion extends into the more populated areas of Ontario.

It is dominated by hardwood forests, although coniferous trees such as white pine, red pine, hemlock and white cedar commonly mix with deciduous broad-leaved species like yellow birch, sugar and red maples, basswood and red oak (MNR 2024). The study area may also contain Forked Three-awned Grass (*Aristida basiramea*), which is an endangered species. This grass, also known as Ice Age grass, is of significance to the Beausoleil First Nation people (Philips 2024).

In terms of local physiography, the subject lands fall within the Simcoe Uplands. This region consists of a series of broad, rolling till plains separated by steep-sided valleys with flat floors. The uplands are encircled by numerous shorelines, indicating that they were islands in Lake Algonquin. A range of sand hills stands above the general level in northern Oro-Medonte, and the uplands on the Penetang Peninsula were submerged by Lake Algonquin and have boulder pavement, sand and silt on the surface (Chapman and Putnam 1984:182–184). According to the Ontario Soil Survey, the study area consists primarily of Sargent gravelly sandy with small areas of loam Tioga sandy loam and Wyevale gravelly sandy loam in the south and northwest. The characteristics of these soil types are summarized in Table 5 (Hoffman et al. 1962).

Table 5: Soil Types

Soil Type	Great Soil Group	Soil Materials	Drainage	Topography	Surface Stoniness
Sargent gravelly sandy loam	Brown Forest	Pale brown, calcareous outwash gravel	Good	Smooth, gently sloping	Stonefree
Tioga sandy loam	Podzol	Grey, calcareous outwash sand	Good	Smooth, gently to irregular, steeply sloping	Stonefree to moderately stony
Wyevale gravelly sandy loam	Podzol	Grey, non-calcareous gravel outwash	Good	Smooth, gently sloping	Moderately stony

The subject lands fall within the Wye River and Copeland Creek drainage basins, both of which are under the jurisdiction of the Severn Sound Environmental Association (SSEA 2024). Specifically, the study area is located 4.6 km east of the Georgian Bay and 4.7 km west of Mud Lake. At the time of assessment, the project area consisted of woodlot and cleared areas. Soil conditions were ideal for the activities conducted. No unusual physical features were encountered that affected the results of the Stage 2 assessment.

1.3.2 Registered or Known Archaeological Sites

The Ontario Archaeological Sites Database and the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports were consulted to determine whether any registered or known archaeological resources occur within a 1 km radius of the study area. The available search facility returned one registered site located within at least a 1 km radius (the facility returns sites in a rectangular area, rather than a radius, potentially resulting in results beyond the specified distance). No unregistered sites were identified within a 1 km radius of the study area. The site is summarized in Table 6.

Table 6: Registered or Known Archaeological Sites

Borden No. / ID No.	Site Name / Identifier	Time Period	Affinity	Site Type	Distance from Study Area
BeGx-10	Crawford	Unspecified	Unspecified	Unspecified	> 1 km

The previously identified site is not located within or immediately adjacent to the subject lands; accordingly, it has no potential to traverse the study area. Additionally, the site is located over 300 m away and represents a distant archaeological resource.

1.3.3 Previous Archaeological Work

A review of available archaeological management plans and/or other archaeological potential mapping was undertaken to inform the assessment process. Specifically, Simcoe County's *Archaeological Potential* GIS Layer was examined for information that could influence the choice of fieldwork techniques or recommendations. The associated mapping indicates that the entire study area has archaeological potential, save for pockets in the northeast and northwest (Map 11).

Reports documenting assessments conducted within the subject lands and assessments that resulted in the discovery of sites within adjacent lands were sought during the research component of the study. In order to ensure that all relevant past work was identified, an investigation was launched to identify reports involving assessments within 50 m of the study area. The investigation determined that there are two available reports documenting previous archaeological fieldwork within the specified distance, one of which covers the current assessment's project area. The relevant results and recommendations are summarized below as required by Section 7.5.8 Standards 4–5 of the 2011 *S&Gs*.

1.3.3.1 Perkinsfield Area Water System (Stage 1–2)

In May 1999, Stage 1 and 2 assessments were carried out the Perkinsfield Area Water System under Contract Information Form (CIF) #1999-049-019 (AI 1999). The assessed area traverses the east-central and southern parts of the study area. The investigation did not result in the discovery of any archaeological materials, and it was recommended that no further assessment be required (AI 2009:8). Although the overlapping area appears to have been appropriately assessed using either the pedestrian survey method or test pit survey method at an interval of 5 m, the mapping is somewhat generalized and the area of overlap should be re-evaluated to confirm the past results (AI 1999:Figure 3). This area is therefore of further archaeological concern.

1.3.3.2 Tiny Township Municipal Office (Stage 1)

In June 2024, a Stage 1 assessment was carried on the subject property PIF #P007-1574-2024 (ARA 2024). The assessed area traverses the entirety of the project area. The investigation determined that the project area comprised a mix of areas of archaeological potential and areas of no archaeological potential and Stage 2 assessment was recommended (ARA 2024:12).

2.0 STAGE 2 PROPERTY ASSESSMENT

2.1 Field Methods

The Stage 2 assessment consisted of a visual inspection and test pit survey. Environmental conditions were ideal during the investigation, permitting good visibility of land features and providing an increased chance of finding evidence of archaeological resources. A breakdown of the specific fieldwork activities, weather and lighting conditions appears in Table 7. Although there was an instance of intermittent rain, there was no reduction in the ability to observe features of potential or identify archaeological resources. ARA therefore confirms that fieldwork was carried out under weather and lighting conditions that met or exceeded the requirements set out in Section 1.2 Standard 2 and Section 2.1 Standard 3 of the 2011 *S&Gs*.

Table 7: Fieldwork Activities and Environmental Conditions

Date	Activity	Field Director	Lighting	Cloud Cover	Precipitation	Temperature (°C)
05/20/2025	Test pit survey	LM	Bright	None	None	13
05/21/2025	Test pit survey	LM	Bright	Overcast	None	10
05/27/2025	Test pit survey	TT	Bright	None	None	25
05/28/2025	Test pit survey	TT	Bright	None	None	24
05/29/2025	Test pit survey	TT	Diffuse	Overcast	Intermittent	16
05/30/2025	Test pit survey	TT	Diffuse	Partial	None	16
06/09/2025	Test pit survey	LM	Bright	Overcast	None	22
06/10/2025	Test pit survey	LM	Bright	Partial	None	18

The identified areas of archaeological potential were subjected to a systematic visual inspection in accordance with the requirements set out in Section 1.2 of the 2011 *S&Gs*. This component of the investigation was conducted concurrently with the property survey. The inspection confirmed that all surficial features of archaeological potential were present where they were previously identified and did not result in the identification of any additional features of archaeological potential not visible on mapping (e.g., relic water channels, patches of well-drained soils, etc.). The visual inspection did not identify any areas of deep disturbance. No additional natural features (e.g., permanently wet lands, sloped lands, overgrown vegetation, heavier soils than expected, etc.) or significant built features (e.g., heritage structures, landscapes, plaques, monuments, cemeteries, etc.) that would affect assessment strategies were identified.

The test pit survey method was utilized to complete the assessment because ploughing was not possible or viable. Using this method, ARA crewmembers hand excavated small regular test pits with a minimum diameter of 30 cm at prescribed intervals in accordance with Section 2.1.2 of the 2011 *S&Gs*. Since the areas to be tested were located less than 300 m from any feature of archaeological potential, a maximum interval of 5 m was warranted (Image 1–Image 6). Each test pit was excavated into at least the first 5 cm of subsoil, and the resultant pits were examined for stratigraphy, potential features and/or evidence of fill. Most test pits contained dark brown sandy loam topsoil with medium compaction over light orange sandy subsoil. All soils were screened through mesh with an aperture of no greater than 6 mm and examined for archaeological resources. No locations of archaeological materials were encountered during the test pit survey. The test pits were backfilled upon completion.

The utilized field methods are presented in Map 14–Map 14. The project area is depicted as a layer in these maps. A breakdown of field methods appears in Table 8.

Table 8: Field Methods

Category	Breakdown
Pedestrian survey at an interval of 5 m	0.00% (0.00 ha)
Test pit survey at an interval of 5 m	100.00% (5.99 ha)
Test pit survey at an interval of 10 m	0.00% (0.00 ha)
Test pit survey at a modified interval due to physical constraint	0.00% (0.00 ha)
Combination of visual inspection and test pit survey to confirm disturbance	0.00% (0.00 ha)
Not assessed due to physical constraint	0.00% (0.00 ha)
Not assessed due to permanently wet areas	0.00% (0.00 ha)
Not assessed due to exposed bedrock	0.00% (0.00 ha)
Not assessed due to sloped areas	0.00% (0.00 ha)
Not assessed due to disturbed areas	0.00% (0.00 ha)
Total	100.00% (5.99ha)

2.2 Record of Finds

The investigation did not result in the discovery of any archaeological materials. An inventory of the documentary record generated in the field is presented in Table 9.

Table 9: Documentary Record

Category	Total	Nature	Location
Field notes	8	Digital	50 Nebo Road, Unit 1, Hamilton
Maps	3	Digital	50 Nebo Road, Unit 1, Hamilton
Photographs	45	Digital	50 Nebo Road, Unit 1, Hamilton

2.3 Analysis and Conclusions

No archaeological sites were identified within the assessed lands.

3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The Stage 2 assessment did not result in the identification of any archaeological materials. It is recommended that no further assessment be required within the project area.

4.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION

Section 7.5.9 of the 2011 *S&Gs* requires that the following information be provided for the benefit of the proponent and approval authority in the land use planning and development process:

- This report is submitted to the Minister of Citizenship and Multiculturalism 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 MCM, 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 *Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act*, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33 requires that any person discovering human remains must notify the police or coroner and the Registrar at the Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery.

5.0 IMAGES



Image 1: Test Pit Survey
(May 20, 2025; Facing North)



Image 2: Test Pit Survey
(May 20, 2025; Facing South)



Image 3: Test Pit Survey
(May 21, 2025; Facing North)




Image 4: Test Pit Survey
(May 21, 2025; Facing North)




Image 5: Test Pit Survey
(May 28, 2025; Facing North)




Image 6: Test Pit Survey
(May 29, 2025; Facing North)




Map 2: Nearby Village Sites, Bone Pits and Forest Trails
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri; Hunter 1999:2)



Map 3: Hogg's Map of the County of Simcoe (1871)
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri; OHCMP 2019)




Map 4: Simcoe Supplement in Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada (1881)
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri; MU 2001)



Map 5: Topographic Map (1950)
 (Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri; OCUL 2024)



Map 6: Aerial Image (1954)
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri; U of T 2024)




Map 7: Aerial Image (1978)
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri; Simcoe County 2024)



Map 8: Aerial Image (1989)
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri; Simcoe County 2024)



Map 9: Aerial Image (1997)
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri; Simcoe County 2024)




Map 10: Aerial Image (2002)
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri; Simcoe County 2024)




Map 11: Simcoe County's Archaeological Potential GIS Layer
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri; Simcoe County 2024)




Map 12: Sites in the Surrounding Area
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri; Simcoe County 2024)



Map 13: Features of Potential
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri)



Map 14: Assessment Methods
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri)



Map 15: Assessment Methods (Development Map)
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri)

7.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES

Archaeologix Inc. (AI)

1999 *Archaeological Assessment (Stages 1 and 2), Perkinsfield Area Water System, Township of Tiny, Simcoe County, Ontario*. CIF #1999-049-019. AI.

Archives of Ontario (AO)

2024 *Access our Collections*. Accessed online at:
http://www.archives.gov.on.ca/en/access/our_collection.aspx.

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

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

Coyne, J. H.

1895 *The Country of the Neutrals (As Far as Comprised in the County of Elgin): From Champlain to Talbot*. St. Thomas: Times Print.

Cumming, R. (editor)

1975 *Illustrated Atlas of the County of Simcoe, Ont.* Reprint of 1881 Edition (Toronto: H. Belden & Co.). Port Elgin: Cumming Atlas Reprints.

Ellis, C.J., and N. Ferris (editors)

1990 *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter, OAS Number 5. London: Ontario Archaeological Society Inc.

Fox, W., and C. Garrad

2004 Hurons in an Algonquian Land. *Ontario Archaeology* 77/78:121–134.

Hoffman, D.W., R.E., Wicklund, and N.R Richards

1962 *Soil Survey of Simcoe County, Ontario*. Report No. 29 of the Ontario Soil Survey. Ottawa: Research Branch, Canada Department of Agriculture.

Hunter, A.F.

1899 *Notes of Sites of Huron Villages in the Township of Tiny (Simcoe County) and Adjacent Places*. Toronto: Warwick Bros. & Rutter.

1909a *A History of Simcoe County: Volume 1 – Its Public Affairs*. Barrie: The County Council.

1909b *A History of Simcoe County: Volume 2 – The Pioneers*. Barrie: The County Council.

Lajeunesse, E.J.

1960 *The Windsor Border Region: Canada's Southernmost Frontier*. Toronto: The Champlain Society.

McGill University (MU)

2001 *The Canadian County Atlas Digital Project*. Accessed online at:
<http://digital.library.mcgill.ca/countyatlas/default.htm>.

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF)

2024 *Forest Regions*. Accessed online at: <https://www.ontario.ca/page/forest-regions>.

Munson, M.K., and S.M. Jamieson (editors)

2013 *Before Ontario: The Archaeology of a Province*. Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Ontario Council of University Libraries (OCUL)

2024 *Historical Topographic Map Digitization Project*. Accessed online at: <https://ocul.on.ca/topomaps/>.

Ontario Historical County Maps Project (OHCMP)

2019 *The Ontario Historical County Maps Project*. Accessed online at: <http://maps.library.utoronto.ca/hgis/countymaps/>.

Philips, A.

2024 Could Ice Age Grass Freeze Plans for New Tiny Township Building? *Orillia Matters* 1 April. Accessed online at: <https://www.orilliamatters.com/local-news/could-ice-age-grass-freeze-plans-for-new-tiny-township-building-8537081>.

Severn Sound Environmental Association (SSEA)

2024 *Severn Sound Environmental Association*. Accessed online at: <https://www.severnsound.ca/>.

Simcoe County

2024 *Interactive Map*. Accessed online at: <https://opengis.simcoe.ca/>.

Smith, W.H.

1846 *Smith's Canadian Gazetteer: Comprising Statistical and General Information Respecting all Parts of the Upper Province, or Canada West*. Toronto: H. & W. Rowsell.

Surtees, R.J.

1994 Land Cessions, 1763–1830. In *Aboriginal Ontario: Historical Perspectives on the First Nations*, edited by E.S. Rogers and D.B. Smith, pp. 92–121. Toronto: Dundurn Press.

University of Toronto (U of T)

2024 *Map & Data Library*. Accessed online at: <https://mdl.library.utoronto.ca/>.

Warrick, G.

2000 The Precontact Iroquoian Occupation of Southern Ontario. *Journal of World Prehistory* 14(4):415–456.

Wright, J.V.

1972 *Ontario Prehistory: An Eleven-Thousand-Year Archaeological Outline*. Archaeological Survey of Canada, National Museum of Man. Ottawa: National Museums of Canada.