

**Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport**

Culture Programs Unit  
 Programs and Services Branch  
 Culture Division  
 401 Bay Street, Suite 1700  
 Toronto ON M7A 0A7  
 Tel.: (416) 314-7691  
 Email: Ian.Hember@ontario.ca

**Ministère du Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport**

Unité des programmes culturels  
 Direction des programmes et des services  
 Division de culture  
 401, rue Bay, bureau 1700  
 Toronto ON M7A 0A7  
 Tél. : (416) 314-7691  
 Email: Ian.Hember@ontario.ca



Sep 5, 2014

Walter Frank McCall (P389)  
 Stantec Consulting  
 835 Paramount Stoney Creek ON L8J 0B4

**RE: Review and Entry into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports: Archaeological Assessment Report Entitled, "Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment: Windsor Solar Project Part of Lots 105 to 123, Concession 3 Petite Côte Geographic Township of Sandwich Now City of Windsor, Ontario ", Dated Jul 18, 2014, Filed with MTCS Toronto Office on Jul 23, 2014, MTCS Project Information Form Number P389-0121-2014, OPA Reference Number FIT-FXXXXXX**

Dear Doctor, McCall:

This office has reviewed the above-mentioned report, which has been submitted to this ministry as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c 0.18. <sup>1</sup> This review has been carried out in order to determine whether the licensed professional consultant archaeologist has met the terms and conditions of their licence, that the licensee assessed the property and documented archaeological resources using a process that accords with the 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists set by the ministry, and that the archaeological fieldwork and report recommendations are consistent with the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario.<sup>2</sup>

The report documents the assessment/mitigation of the study area as depicted in Supplementary Documentation Figure 2 of the above titled report and recommends the following:

The Stage 2 assessment conducted by Stantec resulted in the identification of 23 archaeological sites including 4 pre-contact Aboriginal sites (Sites 2, 4 (AbHr-22), 14 (AbHr-32), and 20 (AbHr-37)) and 19 Euro-Canadian sites (Sites 1 (AbHr-20), 3 (AbHr-21), 5 (AbHr-23), 6 (AbHr-24), 7 (AbHr-25), 8 (AbHr-26), 9 (AbHr-27), 10 (AbHr-28), 11 (AbHr-29), 12 (AbHr-30), 13 (AbHr-31), 15 (AbHr-33), 16, 17 (AbHr-34), 18 (AbHr-35), 19 (AbHr-36), 21 (AbHr-38), 22 (AbHr-39), and 23. Given that Sites 2, 14 (AbHr-32) and 20 (AbHr-37) are isolated findspots and Sites 16 and 23 date to the early 20th century, the cultural heritage value or interest of these sites is considered to be sufficiently documented and no further archaeological assessment is recommended. Otherwise, further Stage 3 archaeological assessment is recommended for 18 sites, including: 1 (AbHr-20), 3 (AbHr-21), 4 (AbHr-22), 5 (AbHr-23), 6 (AbHr-24), 7 (AbHr-25), 8 (AbHr-26), 9 (AbHr-27), 10 (AbHr-28), 11 (AbHr-29), 12 (AbHr-30), 13 (AbHr-31), 15 (AbHr-33), 17 (AbHr-34), 18 (AbHr-35), 19 (AbHr-36), 21 (AbHr-38), and 22 (AbHr-39).

The Stage 3 archaeological assessment of Site 4 (AbHr-22) should employ both the controlled surface pick-up and hand excavated test unit methodology as outlined in Sections 3.2, as well as Table 3.1, of the MTCS' Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011b) to further test the nature and density of this site. Prior to conducting the field work, if ground visibility has decreased since the Stage 2 pedestrian survey, the site should be reploughed and allowed to weather for the controlled surface pick-up. The test unit excavation should consist of one metre by one metre test units laid out in a five metre grid across the site. Each test unit should be excavated by hand in systematic levels and into the first five centimetres of subsoil. Additional one-metre test units, amounting to 20% of the grid total,

will be placed in areas of interest within the limits of the site. Given that Site 4 (AbHr-22) is a confirmed single component Paleo-Indian site situated in heavy soil, at least 10% of excavated soil will be screened through three millimetre mesh as per Section 3.2.2 Standard 7 of the MTCS' Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011b). The rest of the excavated soil will be screened through six millimetre mesh. Any artifacts recovered will be recorded and catalogued by the corresponding grid unit designation. If a subsurface cultural feature is encountered, the plan of the exposed feature will be recorded and geotextile fabric will be placed over the unit before backfilling the unit. The already existing program of Aboriginal engagement should be continued during the Stage 3 archaeological assessment. The Stage 3 archaeological assessment for all other sites listed above should employ both the controlled surface pick-up and hand excavated test unit methodology as outlined in Section 3.2, as well as Table 3.1, of the MTCS' Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011b) to further test the nature and density of this site. Prior to conducting the field work, if ground visibility has decreased since the Stage 2 pedestrian survey, the site should be reploughed and allowed to weather for the controlled surface pick-up. The test unit excavation should consist of one metre by one metre test units laid out in a five metre grid across the site. Each test unit should be excavated by hand in systematic levels and into the first five centimetres of subsoil. Additional one-metre test units, amounting to 20% of the grid total, will be placed in areas of interest within the limits of the site. All excavated soil will be screened through six millimetre mesh; any artifacts recovered will be recorded and catalogued by the corresponding grid unit designation. If a subsurface cultural feature is encountered, the plan of the exposed feature will be recorded and geotextile fabric will be placed over the unit before backfilling the unit. The Stage 3 archaeological assessment for all sites except Site 4 (AbHr-22) will also include additional site-specific archival research, in order to supplement previous background study concerning land use and occupation history. This additional research should include, but is not limited to: land registry documents, census records, and historical settlement maps.

Based on the information contained in the report, the ministry is satisfied that the fieldwork and reporting for the archaeological assessment are consistent with the ministry's 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists and the terms and conditions for archaeological licences. This report has been entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports. Please note that the ministry makes no representation or warranty as to the completeness, accuracy or quality of reports in the register.

Should you require any further information regarding this matter, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Ian, Hember  
Archaeology Review Officer

cc. Archaeology Licensing Officer  
Daniel Choi, Samsung Renewable Energy Inc.  
Ian Parrott, Approval Services, Environmental Approvals Branch, MOE

<sup>1</sup>This letter constitutes the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's written comments where required pursuant to section 22 of O. Reg. 359/09, as amended (Renewable Energy Approvals under the Environmental Protection Act), regarding the archaeological assessment undertaken for the above-captioned project. Depending on the study area and scope of work of the archaeological assessment as detailed in the report, further archaeological assessment reports may be required to complete the archaeological assessment for the project under O. Reg. 359/09. In that event Ministry comments pursuant to section 22 of O. Reg. 359/09 will be required for any such additional reports.

<sup>2</sup>In no way will the ministry be liable for any harm, damages, costs, expenses, losses, claims or actions that may result: (a) if the Report(s) or its recommendations are discovered to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent; or (b) from the issuance of this letter. Further measures may need to be taken in the event that additional artifacts or archaeological sites are identified or the Report(s) is otherwise found to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent.