

Conducting Archaeology within Saugeen Ojibway Nation (SON) Territory:

Process and Standards for Approval Authorities, Development Proponents and Consultant Archaeologists



Environment Office
Saugeen Ojibway Nation
10129 Hwy 6
Georgian Bluffs, Ontario
N0H 2T0
(519) 534-5507

July 2025

Our people have been driven from their homes, and have been cajoled out of the few sacred spots where the bones of their ancestors and children lie; and where they themselves expected to lie, when released from the trials and troubles of life. Were it possible to reverse the order of things, by placing the whites in the same condition, how long would it be endured? There is not a white man, who deserves the name of man, that would not rather die, than be deprived of his home, and driven from the graves of his relatives. "Oh shame, where is thy blush!"

*Kahgegagahbowh
Ojibway Methodist missionary
Saugeen village 1843, 1845*

*The Life, History, and Travels of Kah-ge-ga-gah-bowh
(George Copway), 1847*

Cover illustration:

Paul Kane
Indian Wigwams Owens Sound
June/July 1845
[Stark Museum of Art, Orange, Texas]

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	2
1.1 Required Consultation when Preparing to Conduct Archaeology	3
2. Conducting Archaeology in Saugeen Ojibway Nation (SON) Territory	5
2.1 Field Preparations	7
2.2 Deployment in SON Territory	7
2.3 New Amplifications to Archaeological Survey Methods (2024)	7
2.3.1 Survey Transect Intervals	7
2.3.2 Test-pitting	8
2.3.3 Field Walking / Controlled Surface Pick-up	8
2.3.4 Instruments and Mapping	8
2.3.5 Artifact Counts	8
3. Current Archaeological Process and Practice	9
3.1 Ministry of Culture Standards and Guidelines	10
4. The Need for Enhanced Archaeological Standards and Engagement	12
5. Stage 1: Background Study and Property Inspection	13
6. Stage 2: Property Assessment	15
6.1 SON Modifications and Amplifications of MCM Standards and Guidelines	17
6.2 Site Significance	18
7. Stage 3: Site-specific Assessment	19
8. Stage 4: Mitigation and Protection	19
9. Appendices	30
9.1 Counties and Municipalities within SON Territory	21
9.2 Natural Heritage Sources	24
9.3 Culture History Sources	30
9.4 Archaeological Sources	37
9.5 Air Photos, LiDAR and Topographic Maps	44

1.0 Introduction

The Saugeen Ojibway Nation (SON), comprised of the Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation and the Chippewas of Saugeen First Nation, residing within Saukiing Anishnaabekiing — spanning approximately 2.5 million acres.

The Saukiing Anishnaabekiing has been the homeland of the people of SON and that of their ancestors since time immemorial. A Territory map of Saukiing Anishnaabekiing is included within these standards for reference purposes.

The Crown has a duty to consult and accommodate SON with respect to any projects or related Crown decision-making that might adversely affect SON's Aboriginal and Treaty rights and interests.

Specifically for archaeology, the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) has defined, for consultant archaeologists, mandatory and recommended rules of engagement with indigenous communities - *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (2011)* and *Engaging Aboriginal Communities in Archaeology Technical Bulletin (2011)*.

Cultural heritage sites are irreplaceable. The archaeological manifestations of the habitation, resource-procurement, ritual, and burial sites of the Saugeen Ojibway and their ancestors continue to be threatened and destroyed across their Territory. Left unchecked, all present-day land use activities - regardless of their scale, have the potential to erase these dwindling heritage aspects from the historical record, taking with it, SON's culture.

SON requires that approval authorities, development proponents, and consultant archaeologists make every reasonable effort to locate, properly evaluate, and thoroughly investigate all archaeological manifestations of these non-renewable cultural heritage sites before land is impacted by any and all types of surface or sub-surface alteration. Where appropriate, cultural sites must be protected from development.

SON Territory is composed of a diversity of landscapes, some of which cannot be adequately investigated for cultural sites using MCM-defined and commonly-practiced archaeological field methods.

Furthermore, many archaeological sites in SON Territory can easily avoid detection when MCM-defined and commonly-practiced archaeological investigative strategies are implemented. For instance, cultural sites tend to be small and of short duration - leaving behind small amounts of cultural material, and they can be buried below the shallow depths that archaeological assessment methods penetrate.

The implementation of enhanced, area-specific archaeological standards within

the Territory of the Saugeen Ojibway Nation is critical for the preservation of SON culture, history and their ancestors. Enhanced standards will benefit approval authorities, development proponents, and consultant archaeologists who lack familiarity with the landscape and cultural history of the Territory of the Saugeen Ojibway Nation.

To ensure that the cultural heritage sites of the Saugeen Ojibway and their ancestors are neither overlooked nor destroyed, approval authorities, development proponents and consultant archaeologists must engage with SON during all project phases - from conception through completion, and, if warranted, beyond. SON must review all archaeological assessment reports as drafts before they are provided to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism for review.

Proponents, developers, and archaeologists are required to comply with the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism's requirements and the Saugeen Ojibway Nation's Archaeological Standards and Guidelines. Where there is any divergence between SON's Standards and MCM protocols, including matters related to isolated finds, site identification, bordenization, or interpretive frameworks, the SON Archaeological Standards take precedence and must be followed in full consultation with SON Archaeology. SON strongly encourages proponents to establish an Archaeological Protocol with SON early in the planning process to address procedural and capacity considerations across individual or multiple projects—well in advance of any fieldwork or construction.

1.1 Required Consultation when Preparing to Conduct Archaeology

Consult with SON prior to obtaining a consultant archaeologist or conducting any Stage 1 or Stage 2 archaeological assessment. Any public or private development project (land or marine) must consult with SON:

- A proposed work plan and the property/ assessment details should be submitted to SON Archaeology prior to scheduling work or deployment to ensure that the assessment design will meet SON standards.
- SON Archaeology will not accept an archaeological assessment that is produced in the absence of consultation with SON. Specialist reviews are conducted, and reassessment of problematic work that was undertaken without SON engagement may be required.
- SON may require an assessment in cases where the subject property appears to be “disturbed” or is located outside of areas deemed high archaeological potential. Please consult with SON Archaeology prior to making any determinations with regard to the necessity of archaeological assessment in SON Territory.

Figure 1. Map of SON Territory (Saukiing Anishnaabekiing)



Figure 2. Counties within SON Territory



2.0 Conducting Archaeology in SON Territory

- Work Plans: Parameters of any Stage 1 or Stage 2 assessment design should be undertaken in consultation with SON.
- Scoping/Building Envelopes: Archaeological assessments should not be “scoped.” The entire property should be assessed in consultation with SON.
 - Consultation with SON will provide clarity concerning the extent of the archaeological assessment requirements in instances where the subject property is exceptionally large, and some degree of scoping might be acceptable. Other factors that can influence the extent of the archaeological assessment include characteristics contributing to archaeological potential, special features on/near the property, knowledge / concerns unique to SON, and limitations with regard to planning tools that may be alternatively utilized to ensure future protection of SON’s rights and interests.
- Severances: Both the retained and severed portions of a property must be subject to assessment and review, with the scope and extent of the assessment to be determined in consultation with SON (see the above section concerning Scoping / Construction Envelopes). In low concern instances / depending on the size of properties, SON may accept some degree of scoping by utilizing planning tools like an archaeological holding provision or condition that will ensure future consultation. SON Archaeology can advise if a holding provision can be left on the unassessed portion of the property in unique circumstances where deemed acceptable.
- Zoning: Environmental Protection Zones (EP) and hazard areas, etc. should be

included in the Study Area and are considered viable for testing. Please consult with SON Archaeology on the parameters of Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment and to develop an acceptable Work Plan.

- Disturbance: Must be established in consultation with SON and should be demonstrated via archaeological assessment and testing. SON may require archaeological assessment of properties / areas deemed “disturbed” by consultants, planners or planning authority. Please consult with SON archaeology to provide documentation / evidence of disturbance and to determine if a site visit or Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment will be necessary.
- Slope: Sites in SON Territory are often discrete, sloped areas can possess archaeological potential and can be tested in consultation with SON Archaeology.
- Sites: In the MCM guidelines an archaeological site must be no more than 20 metres away from a pre-existing find to represent a singular (larger) site. SON Archaeology may not necessarily adhere to this as a maximal distance for a site. The extent of a site and the relationship between finds that constitute larger sites should be established in consultation with SON on a case-by-case basis.
- SON Archaeology Monitors: SON Archaeology Monitors must be given the opportunity to participate in all fieldwork conducted within SON Territory, in full consultation with the Saugeen Ojibway Nation. It is the responsibility of the proponent to fully resource this participation, including covering all costs associated with the deployment of SON Monitors.
- Repatriation: Ancestral artifacts must be repatriated in consultation with SON.
- Ancestral remains: In the event that ancestral remains are discovered, stop all work and contact SON Archaeology immediately at 519-534-5507 and via email to manager.ri@saugeenojibwaynation.ca and archaeology@saugeenojibwaynation.ca.

2.1 Field Preparations

Appropriate field conditions are critical to conducting effective fieldwork, especially in the context of agricultural fields. Ploughing must be undertaken in consultation with SON in order to properly prepare the field conditions for field walking / terrestrial survey:

- Ploughing and field preparations must be undertaken in consultation with SON Archaeology.
- A mouldboard plough that turns the ground over must be used; a chisel plough is not acceptable.

- Ploughing should be followed by discing that results in a minimum of 80% ground surface visibility. However, please consult with SON Archaeology regarding the need for discing.
- Fields must not be planted, rolled or altered following ploughing/weathering, prior to assessment.
- Ploughed fields must be inspected or validated by SON Archaeology prior to scheduling fieldwork to confirm appropriate conditions for assessment.
- Ploughing of a high potential / concern area may need to be undertaken with SON presence, please consult with SON Archaeology.

2.2 Deployment in SON Territory

- Consultant field archaeologists / technicians should be briefed on the unique archaeology and conditions of SON Territory, as well as the requirements identified in the SON Archaeological Standards that enhance those set by the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism.
- Consultant field archaeologists / technicians should be capable of identifying chert, flakes, lithics, ground stone tools, fire cracked rock, pottery and site features.

2.3 New Amplifications to Archaeological Survey Methods (2024)

Due to the unique nature of sites and artifacts distributed within SON Territory, and in the interest of better detecting archaeological resources and landscapes, additional amplifications are implemented in consultation with SON.

2.3.1 Survey Transect Intervals

In high potential / high concern areas for SON, transects must be intensified in consultation with SON Archaeology. Most commonly this will be required within 300 metres from Lake Huron, Georgian Bay, river/creek system or registered / known sites:

- 3-4 metre spacing instead of 5 m for test-pitting depending on level of concern, determined in consultation with SON Archaeology.
- 3-4 metre spacing for terrestrial/pedestrian survey, depending on the level of concern determined in consultation with SON Archaeology.

2.3.2 Test-pitting

- Testing into subsoil must be amplified in high potential areas to sufficient depth in consultation with SON (exceeding MCM standards). This amplification is especially important in: dune environments, ridges or relict shorelines (Nipissing, Algonquin, etc.), sandy subsoil, etc. where buried A-horizons may be present.
- If there are concerns with archaeological visibility or buried A-horizons (i.e. topsoil and old living surfaces), test-pitting may be required within agricultural fields, especially in areas of deep soil / sand or deemed higher potential or concern for SON.

2.3.3 Field Walking / Controlled Surface Pick-up (CSP)

- For pedestrian survey in ploughed fields, especially with a high aggregate density, the pace of field walking of transects must be slow and methodical to ensure documentation of all visible finds.

2.3.4 Instruments and Mapping

- Findspots (artifact location) and sites should be mapped and recorded utilizing precision instruments capable of recording geospatial location under 1 metre.

2.3.5 Artifact Counts

- Consistent with the 2011 SON Archaeological Standards, the recovery of (1) artifact, including an isolated flake, remains sufficient to document a site and proceed to Stage 3 in consultation with SON (also see Section 6.2, below). SON Archaeology requires that during a Stage 2, if an isolated flake or any isolated, non-diagnostic (flake, shatter, fire cracked rock, ground stone, etc) is recovered, a 1m x 1m unit must be opened on the location of the isolated find(s), and additional units may be necessary in consultation with SON. It is critical that SON be consulted regarding the necessity of intensifications, and fully engaged on any Stage 2 Archaeological fieldwork and reporting.
- All Stage 3 Assessments in areas of high potential or concern as defined by SON, should proceed to a zero-artifact count—including *lithic flakes*—unless an alternative threshold is established in consultation with SON Archaeology.
- The significance and Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI) of Fire Cracked Rock (FCR), chert shatter, ground stone fragments, etc., must be established in consultation with SON Archaeology.

3.0 Current Archaeological Process and Practice

Further to the government of Ontario's Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists' call for

Indigenous engagement, the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) specifically recognized the importance of consulting with First Nations on planning matters that may impact a First Nations rights and interests. The PPS 2024 Policy 6.2.2 now similarly instructs planning authorities to coordinate planning matters with First Nations and requires that: “Planning authorities shall undertake early engagement with Indigenous communities and coordinate on land use planning matters to facilitate knowledge-sharing, support consideration of Indigenous interests in land use decision-making and support the identification of potential impacts of decisions on the exercise of Aboriginal or treaty rights.” Moreover, PPS 2024 Policy 4.6.5 holds that: “Planning authorities shall engage early with Indigenous communities and ensure their interests are considered when identifying, protecting and managing archaeological resources, built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes.” In short, Indigenous consultation is necessary at the outset of, and throughout, any activities conducted in SON Territory that fall under the purview of the 2024 Provincial Policy Statement. These activities include archaeological fieldwork, survey, or assessment. Policy 6.1.2 demands that the implementation of the PPS shall be consistent with the recognition and affirmation of existing Aboriginal and treaty rights in section 35 of the Constitution Act of 1982. The Provincial Planning Statement applies to all decisions in respect of the exercise of any authority that affects a planning matter made on or after October 20, 2024.

SON acknowledges that consultant archaeologists must legally comply with the relevant archaeological statutes and regulations of the *Ontario Heritage Act (1990)*. This includes the standards and guidelines outlined in the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism's *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (2011)* and *Engaging Aboriginal Communities in Archaeology Technical Bulletin (2010)*.

Consultant archaeologists must, however, acknowledge their ethical and professional responsibilities to conduct themselves in a manner that will not overlook or result in a negative impact on SON's cultural heritage resources.

For an archaeological consultant to knowingly furnish false information to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism is an offence under Section 69 of the *Ontario Heritage Act (1990)*. It could result in a fine or imprisonment as set out in Section 69 and/or the suspension or revocation of the consultant archaeologist's licence in accordance with Section 48(9) of the Act.

Archaeological obligations are also defined for approval authorities and development proponents in other provincial legislation and policies:

- *Provincial Policy Statement (2024)*
- *Planning Act (1990)*
- *Environmental Assessment Act (1990)*
- *Aggregate Resources Act (1990)*
- *Cemeteries Act (Revised)(1990)*

- *Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act* (2002)
- *Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act* (1990)

3.1 MCM Archaeological Standards and Guidelines

Consultant archaeologists are required to complete the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) Archaeological Checklist as part of their reporting obligations. The Saugeen Ojibway Nation requires that proponents or their archaeologists contact SON prior to completing and submitting this checklist to ensure that SON review and input is reflected appropriately. This is especially critical for confirming consultation dates, adequately documenting archaeological potential, consideration of indigenous / SON knowledge, and ensuring acceptable methodological approaches to fieldwork. SON reserves the right to dispute any submission where consultation has not occurred or is inaccurately represented in the checklist.

The Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism's *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (2011) supersedes the Ministry's 1993 technical guidelines for any stage of archaeological investigation that commences on or after January 1, 2011. The MCM *Standards and Guidelines* set out that a development project may have as many as four sequential stages:

- **Stage 1:** Background study and optional property inspection
- **Stage 2:** Property assessment
- **Stage 3:** Site-specific assessment
- **Stage 4:** Mitigation (site protection or removal)

Within each of the four investigative stages MCM presents basic, mandatory "standards" that all consultant archaeologists must follow. In addition, there are more comprehensive "guidelines" that *may* be implemented based on the "professional judgement" of a consultant. In addition to SON's Archaeological Standards, proponents and consultant archaeologists should be aware of the following MCM standards:

ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION

Standard 1

a. This report is submitted to the Minister of Citizenship as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c0.18. The report is reviewed to ensure that it complies with the standards and guidelines that are issued by the Minister, and that the archaeological fieldwork and report recommendations ensure the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario. When all matters relating to

archaeological sites within the project area of a development proposal have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism, a letter will be issued by the minister stating that there are no further concerns with regard to alterations to archaeological sites by the proposed development.

b. 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 complete 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.

c. 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.

d. The Cemeteries Act, R.S.O. 1990 c. C.4 and the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002, c.33 requires that any person discovering human remains must notify the police or coroner and the Registrar of cemeteries, Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery (416 212-7499).

Standard 2

Archaeological sites recommended for further archaeological fieldwork or protection remain subject to Section 48 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act and may not be altered, or have artifacts removed from them, except by a person holding an archaeological licence.

4.0 The Need for Enhanced Archaeological Standards and Engagement

Existing provincially-mandated engagement, archaeological processes and practices are insufficient for the proper identification, investigation, protection, and preservation of cultural heritage resources in SON Territory. While the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism's (2011) Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists remain a standard for archaeological work in Ontario, they are increasingly out of step with the 2024 Provincial Planning Statement (PPS), the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA), and other planning and environmental frameworks emphasizing the importance of early and

meaningful engagement with Indigenous communities. Along with newly developed Archaeological Management Plans (AMPs) and County Plans, these reflect a broader shift towards reconciliation, recognizing and upholding Indigenous rights and interests, fostering consultation and engagement early in the development process. The Saugeen Ojibway Nation's Standards are informed by and aligned with this evolving legal and policy context.

The role of the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism in the archaeological process is limited and its ability to "conserve, protect, and preserve" the cultural heritage of Ontario is not sufficient in SON's view. MCM's archaeological review officers offer technical advice to consultant archaeologists and review the archaeological assessment reports they submit to determine if the reports comply with MCM's standards and guidelines. The archaeological review officers, however, rely exclusively on information provided by the consultant archaeologist. Therefore, it is critical that SON be included in all stages of archaeological investigations (Stage 1-4) that are conducted in SON Territory, and likewise that SON plays an integral role in reviewing all subsequent reporting prior to submission to MCM.

The Saugeen Ojibway Nation identifies three aspects of the archaeological process that can be improved through engagement:

- Approval authorities, development proponents, and consultant archaeologists must engage with SON at all stages of a development project and archaeological assessment
 - SON must be involved in all decision-making activities related to the application of an archaeological condition, fieldwork strategies, and evaluation of assessment reports
 - SON monitors must accompany consultant archaeologists in all field activities - i.e., Stages 2 through 4
- MCM's Stage 1 and Stage 2 standards do not fully address the search for and investigation of certain types of sites in SON Territory, therefore SON Territory specific Stage 2 standards must be implemented
- MCM lacks the capacity to enforce their archaeological standards. There is a demonstrated need for compliance monitoring, especially during field activities.

5.0 Stage 1: Background Study and Property Inspection

Preparing a thorough Stage 1 background in consultation with SON Archaeology is critical to understanding the natural and cultural heritage of a property and its surrounding area. Unfamiliarity has resulted in significant archaeological sites being missed by consultant archaeologists.

While MCM presents a list of the types of cultural information, landscape features, and natural resources that could be used to indicate a property's archaeological potential, it does not mandate that approval authorities, development proponents, or consultant archaeologists must have regard for the sources that would provide such insight.

SON requires that consultant archaeologists consult with the sources listed in Appendices 9.2 through 9.5. These Appendices provide sources of readily accessible information that will facilitate a better understanding and appreciation of the natural and cultural heritage of the Territory of the Saugeen Ojibway and their ancestors.

Planning authorities will benefit from the production and utilization of an Archaeological Management Plan (AMP), produced in consultation with SON. While AMPs are not a substitute for consultation, these tools can assist with initial efforts to identify archaeological potential and known sites / features.

SON requires that all initial determinations of a property's archaeological potential and Stage 1 background studies must be based on MCM *Standards and Guidelines*, as well as SON knowledge and Archaeological Standards, including:

- consultation with SON Archaeology
- a thorough examination of MCM's Ontario Archaeological Site Database for registered sites
 - if a registered site is present on an impacted lot, the site record must be examined, site location(s) confirmed, and location(s) and nature of existing artifact collections documented
- a search for accounts of and artifact collections from unregistered archaeological sites
- a detailed overview of the property's Quaternary geology (including glacial landforms and especially pro- and post-glacial lakeshore complexes) and present-day drainage systems and wetlands for areas of potential cultural activity (habitation, resource procurement, ritual, burial)
- an examination of provincial land surveyors' maps, field books, journals and diaries from the 1820s through 1870s for accounts of Indigenous and Euro-Canadian activity
- a visual inspection of the property to confirm and supplement information pertaining to landscape features and field conditions defined in the background study

- a review of available mapping derived from technological advances such as LiDAR data that may be available for the Study Area is strongly recommended. These data are available online for much of SON Territory via the MNR / Ontario Digital Terrain Model (Lidar-Derived): <https://geohub.lio.gov.on.ca/maps/mnrf::ontario-digital-terrain-model-lidar-derived>

Many cultural sites within SON Territory tend to be small - whether defined by habitation, resource-procurement, ritual or burial. Therefore, any type or scale of surface alteration could affect knowledge of SON's history and damage archaeological artifacts vital to SON and that are protected by the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Property developments of any size must be subjected to archaeological assessment.

Those properties/Study Areas deemed by approval authorities, development proponents, and consultant archaeologists to be disturbed and unworthy of archaeological assessment must be shown to be disturbed. SON has had experience in which proponents or their archaeologists make unsupported statements that areas are disturbed, but when the area is actually investigated, a significant, multi-component site is found.

For all large scale projects, the archaeological potential of each concession lot that will be impacted by construction must be individually assessed. A collective, superficial evaluation of the archaeological potential of a large study area is not acceptable. The Stage 1 assessment (including a visual inspection) must identify, in consultation with SON, those areas that would or would not require Stage 2 field investigations (see Section 2.0 for additional guidance). SON must also have the opportunity to comment on the report content and recommendations prior to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism accepting any report into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeology Reports. Based on well-documented errors and omissions by consultant archaeologists, approval authorities, development proponents, and the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism, consultation with SON Archaeology is critical to ensure acceptable assessment and reporting.

6.0 Stage 2: Property Assessment

Great scrutiny must be employed by consultant archaeologists when searching for the evidence of past cultural activity within SON Territory.

Stage 2 property assessments must take into consideration that even into the 21st century the Saugeen Ojibway Nation continue to pursue cultural practices and seasonally-available food sources away from their principal residence or community. Short-duration resource-procurement sites - past and present, tend to be small and leave behind limited evidence. This, however, does not lessen their cultural importance. Equally inconspicuous to the archaeologist are other small, special- purpose sites - notably locations of ritual activity and unmarked

burying grounds.

While river mouths, confluences, and banks adjacent to rapids tend to be the foci of repeated visitations and habitations – in some instances for millennia (and hence highly-visible to most archaeologists) – it is becoming evident, based on an increasing number of interior isolated artifact finds, that there is a significant number of less-visible cultural sites awaiting discovery.

Also hindering the discovery of sites of all sizes across a substantial portion of SON Territory are capping deposits of sterile, wind-borne sand and beds of sand and cobbles pushed by storm surges onto and beyond active shoreline beaches. Too often during Stage 2 assessments when consultant archaeologists not familiar with the area's landscape and post-glacial lakeshore environments encounter a sterile sand or cobble horizon they proceed no further. Not infrequently, once-stable surface horizons that may contain cultural material are capped by these sterile deposits. They will be visible as organic lenses sandwiched between sterile deposits of sand, pebbles, or cobbles.

MCM's Stage 2 *Standards and Guidelines* for the physical investigation of a property, with the modifications and amplifications detailed in the SON Archaeological Standards, must be rigorously applied to increase the probability that small sites, lower artifact density sites, and deeply-buried sites are found.

6.1 SON Modifications and Amplifications of MCM Standards and Guidelines

6.1.1 ***bedrock exposures:*** with much of the Saugeen (Bruce) Peninsula consisting of exposed bedrock, MCM's 2. 1 *Property Survey Standard 2.a.ii* must be ignored - areas of exposed bedrock must be examined for evidence of cultural activity

6.1.1.1 ***cobble beaches:*** with cobble beaches so being so common, and since they are found both at active shorelines and abandoned shorelines (for example, the Nipissing, or Algoma water levels), all cobble beaches should be examined for evidence of cultural activity, including the presence of Pukaskwa pits. All Pukaskwa pits should be treated as archaeological features, regardless of whether any artifacts are found.

6.1.2 ***pedestrian survey:*** all active agricultural fields—including those under short-term rotation crops (e.g., corn, beans, wheat, rye), long-term rotation crops (e.g., clover, alfalfa, canola), grazing pastures, abandoned agricultural fields and meadows, must be completely and appropriately moldboard ploughed and weathered prior to assessment in accordance with Section 2.1. These preparations are considered a baseline standard and must be undertaken in consultation with SON, including discussion of field conditions and the potential need for discing. In some unique instances, particularly in more naturalized or sensitive conditions where ploughing may risk damaging cultural resources or stratigraphic integrity—alternative approaches may be considered.

6.1.2.1 since each ploughing is unlikely to produce consistent surface artifact exposures - especially on low artifact density sites, SON Archaeology may require that fields must be ploughed, weathered, and assessed on two occasions

6.1.3 ***controlled surface pick-up (CSP):*** the precise recording of all individual artifact locations identified on the surface of a site must be undertaken during the Stage 2 property assessment, not during the Stage 3 site-specific assessment. See also Section 2.3.1 and 2.3.3 (above) for potential amplifications to CSP.

6.1.3.1 MCM's 2.1.1 *Pedestrian survey Standard # 8* only requires that formal artifact types be collected from the surface at Stage 2. Not recording the precise location of all artifacts recovered within a site results in a loss of contextual information

6.1.3.2 MCM's 3.2.1 *Controlled survey pick-up* standards and guidelines should be implemented

SON may require an additional CSP at the start of the Stage 3 fieldwork to augment the first CSP

6.1.4 ***shovel test-pitting***: in conditions where this is the only option (e.g., woodlots with soil development, etc.), consultant archaeologists must excavate proper shovel test-pits (minimum standard 30cm diameter shovel test) at 5-metre intervals [400 shovel test-pits per hectare in a fully testable area (1 hectare = 2.47 acres)]. See also Section 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 (above) for potential amplifications test pitting intervals and depth.

6.1.4.1 SON Archaeology must be consulted regarding the possible implementation of 10-metre sampling intervals in unique circumstances.

6.1.5 ***test-excavation***: where there is a reasonable expectation that cultural deposits may be deeply buried, heavy excavating machinery can only be used to remove surface capping material (eg., a road surface or fill that can be demonstrated to be of recent origin)

6.1.5.1 If there is no recent capping material or once the recent capping material has been mechanically removed, a 1-metre by 1-metre excavation unit must be manually excavated to determine if there are buried ground surfaces.

6.2 Site Significance (also See section 2.3.5)

Large-scale systematic archaeological investigations are a relatively recent phenomenon within some parts of SON Territory. To get a better appreciation of the nature, distribution, and density of cultural sites across the area, all cultural discoveries located during a Stage 2 property assessment-including isolated finds, must be provided with Borden numbers and be registered within the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism's Ontario Archaeological Site Database.

Furthermore, all of these registered archaeological sites - regardless of size or artifact density, must be subjected to an MCM Stage 3 site-specific assessment in consultation with SON, to better understand their size, function, and chronological placement.

Even sites consisting of historic material dating into the late-19th century (especially if situated away from concession and side roads) should be investigated in consultation with SON. The Saugeen Ojibway Nation continues to

pursue traditional subsistence activities throughout their Territory. Sites with historic material should not automatically be considered to be ethnically Euro-Canadian.

7.0 Stage 3: Site-specific Assessment

With the exception of the aforementioned controlled surface pick-up methodology and amplifications outlined within the SON Archaeological Standards that must be implemented, consultant archaeologists must follow MCM's Stage 3 *Standards and Guidelines*.

8.0 Stage 4: Mitigation and Protection

Cultural heritage sites and artifacts of SON and its ancestors are of spiritual, cultural and educational value to the SON. Accordingly, the protection and conservation of archaeological sites and artifacts is of the highest importance to SON.

Consultant archaeologists and proponents are required to respect the recommendations of SON regarding the mitigation procedures for any Stage 4 site. SON may require that avoidance and protection are the sole mitigation measures appropriate for a site.

SON requires that any mitigation plan include provisions that address long-term protection of the artifacts and/or the culture heritage site.

The details of the implementation of mitigation procedures should be negotiated with SON as part of an Archaeological Protocol.

9.0 Appendices

9.1 Counties and municipalities located within SON Territory

Bruce County (entire 4156 km²)

- Township of Huron-Kinloss (*former Village of Lucknow, Village of Ripley, Huron Township, Kinloss Township*)
- Municipality of South Bruce (*former Village of Mildmay, Village of Teeswater, Hamlet of Formosa, Carrick Township, Culross Township*)
- Municipality of Brockton (*former Town of Walkerton, Brant Township, Greenock Township*)
- Municipality of Kincardine (*former Town of Kincardine, Kincardine Township, Bruce Township*)
- Town of Saugeen Shores (*former Town of Southampton, Town of Port Elgin, Saugeen Township*)
- Municipality of Arran-Elderslie (*former Town of Chesley, Village of Paisley, Village of Tara, Arran Township, Elderslie Township*)
- Town of South Bruce Peninsula (*former Town of Wiarton, Village of Hepworth, Amabel Township, Albemarle Township*)
- Municipality of Northern Bruce Peninsula (*former Village of Lion's Head, Eastnor Township, Lindsay Township, St. Edmunds Township*)

Dufferin County (partial)

- Town of Mono (278 km²) (*former Mono Township*)
- Township of Amaranth (264 km²)
- Township of East Garafraxa (166 km²)
- Township of Melancthon (313 km²) (*transferred from Grey County in 1881*)
- Mulmur Township (287 km²)
- Township of East Luther-Grand Valley (158 km²) (*former East Luther Township – transferred from Wellington County in 1883*)
- Town of Shelburne (5 km²)
- Town of Orangeville (16 km²)

Grey County (entire 4426 km²)

- Municipality of West Grey (*former Town of Durham, Village of Neustadt, Normanby Township, Glenelg Township, Bentinck Township*)
- Township of Southgate (*former Village of Dundalk, Proton Township, Egremont Township*)
- Municipality of Grey Highlands (*former Village of Flesherton, Village of Markdale, Artemesia Township, Euphrasia Township, Osprey Township*)
- Town of the Blue Mountains (*former Town of Thornbury, Collingwood Township*)
- Municipality of Meaford (*former Town of Meaford, St. Vincent Township, Sydenham Township*)
- Township of Chatsworth (*former Village of Chatsworth, Holland Township, Sullivan Township*)
- Township of Georgian Bluffs (*former Derby Township, Sarawak Township, Keppel Township*)
- City of Owen Sound

Huron County (partial)

- Township of Ashfield-Colborne-Wawanosh (598 km²) (*former Ashfield Township, Colborne Township, West Wawanosh Township*)
- Town of Goderich (8 km²)
- Township of North Huron (179 km²) (*former East Wawanosh Township, Town of Wingham, Village of Blyth*)
- Municipality of Morris-Turnberry (377 km²) (*former Morris Township, Turnberry Township*)
- Township of Howick (287 km²)
- Municipality of Huron East (669 km²) (*former Town of Seaforth, Village of Brussels, Grey Township, McKillop Township, Tuckersmith Township*)

- Municipality of Central Huron (448 km²) (*former Town of Clinton, Goderich Township, Hullett Township*)

Perth County (partial)

- Municipality of North Perth (493 km²) (*former Wallace Township, Elma Township, Town of Listowel*)

Simcoe County (partial)

- Clearview Township (557 km²) (*former Nottawasaga Township, Sunnidale Township, Town of Stayner, Village of Creemore*)
- Springwater Township (536 km²) (*former Flos Township, Vespra Township, part Medonte Township, Village of Elmvale*)
- Essa Township (280 km²)
- Adjala-Tosorontio Township (372 km²) (*former Township of Adjala, Township of Tosorontio*)
- Town of New Tecumseth (274 km²) (*former Tecumseth Township and Town of Alliston*)
- Town of Collingwood (34 km²)
- Town of Wasaga Beach (58 km²)
- Canadian Forces Base Borden (90 km²)

Wellington County (partial)

- Township of Wellington North (524 km²) (*former Village of Arthur, Town of Mount Forest, West Luther Township, Arthur Township, part of West Garafraxa Township*)
- Mapleton Township (535 km²) (*former Maryborough Township and Peel Township*)
- Town of Minto (300 km²) (*former Minto Township, Town of Palmerston, Town of Harriston, Village of Clifford*)

9.2 Natural Heritage Sources

Paleozoic and Quaternary maps and reports can be downloaded from:
www.geologyontario.mndmf.gov.on.ca/

Paleozoic Geology

Armstrong, D.K.

1993 Paleozoic Geology of the Central Bruce Peninsula. Ontario Geological Survey Open File Report 5856.

1993 Paleozoic Geology of the Central Bruce Peninsula. Ontario Geological Survey Preliminary Map P.3191.

1993 Paleozoic Geology of the Southern Bruce Peninsula, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Open File Report 5875.

1993 Paleozoic Geology of the Southern Bruce Peninsula, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Preliminary Map P.3236.

2001 A Regional Evaluation of the Shale Resource Potential of the Upper Ordovician Queenston Formation, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Open File Report 6058.

2001 A Resource Evaluation of the Upper Ordovician Shales of Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Open File Report 6070.035.

Armstrong, D.K. and M.P. Dubord

1992 Paleozoic Geology of the Northern Bruce Peninsula, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Open File Map 198.

Dodge, J.E.P., D.K. Armstrong and R.I. Kelly

2005 Paleozoic Geology Map of Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Open File Report 6172.029.

Eley, Betty E. And Peter H. Von Bitter

1989 Cherts of Southern Ontario. Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto.

Gao, C., J.E.P. Dodge and I.M.L. MacDonald

2002 A Seamless Quaternary Geology Map of Southern Ontario: Second Phase. Ontario Geological Survey Open File Report 6100.029.

Johnson, M.D., D.K. Armstrong, B.V. Sanford, P.G. Telford and M.A. Rutka

1992 Paleozoic and Mesozoic Geology of Ontario. In, Geology of Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Special Volume 4, Part 2:907-1008.

Liberty, B.A.

1969 Paleozoic Geology of the Lake Simcoe District, Ontario. Geological Survey of Canada Memoir 355.

Liberty, B.A. and T.E. Bolton

1971 Paleozoic Geology of the Bruce Peninsula Area, Ontario. Geological Survey of Canada Memoir 360.

Liberty, B.A., I.J. Bond and P.G. Telford

1976 Paleozoic Geology of the Orangeville Area, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Map 2339.

1976 Paleozoic Geology of the Dundalk Area, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Map 2340.

Telford, P.G.

1976 Paleozoic Geology of the Collingwood-Nottawasaga Area, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Map 2341.

Quaternary Geology, Climate, and Vegetation

Anderson, Thane W.

1971 Postglacial Vegetative Changes in the Lake Huron-Lake Simcoe District, Ontario, with Special Reference to Glacial Lake Algonquin. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Waterloo, Waterloo.

1979 Stratigraphy, Age, and Environment of a Lake Algonquin Embayment Site at Kincardine, Ontario. Geological Survey of Canada Paper 79-1B:147-152.

Bajc, A.F., S.J. Leney, S. Evers, S. Van Haaften and J. Ernsting

2001 A Seamless Quaternary Geology Map of Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Open File Report 6070.033.

Barnett, P.J.

1992 Quaternary Geology of Ontario. In, Geology of Ontario. Edited by P.C. Thurston, H.R. Williams, R.H. Sutcliffe and G.M. Stott. Ontario Geological Survey Special Volume 4 Part 2:1011-1088.

Burwasser, G.J.

1974 Quaternary Geology of the Collingwood-Nottawasaga Area, Southern Ontario. Ontario Division of Mines Preliminary Map P.919.

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

1984 The Physiography of Southern Ontario. Special Volume 2, Third Edition. Ontario Geological Survey.

Cooper, A.J. and W.D. Fitzgerald

1977 Quaternary Geology of the Goderich Area, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Map P.1232.

Cooper, A.J., W.D. Fitzgerald and J. Clue

1977 Quaternary Geology of the Seaforth Area, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Map P.1233.

Cowan, W.R.

1973 Quaternary Geology of the Orangeville Area, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Map P.848.

1976 Quaternary Geology of the Orangeville Area, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Report 141.

1976 Quaternary Geology of the Palmerston Area, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Map P.1185.

1977 Quaternary Geology of the Palmerston Area, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Map 2383.

1979 Quaternary Geology of the Palmerston Area, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Report 187.

Cowan, W.R., A.J. Cooper and J.J. Pinch

1986 Quaternary Geology of the Wingham-Lucknow Area, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Map P.2957.

Cowan, W.R. and J.J. Pinch

1986 Quaternary Geology of the Walkerton-Kincardine Area, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Map P.2956.

Cowan, W.R. and D.R. Sharpe

1976 Quaternary Geology of the Orangeville Area, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Map 2326.

2007 Surficial Geology of the Bruce Peninsula, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Open File Report 6211.

Davis, Donald John

1967 The Geomorphology of the Beaver Valley, Ontario. Unpublished M.Sc. thesis, University of Western Ontario, London.

Eschman, Donald F. and Paul F. Karrow

1985 Huron Basin Glacial Lakes: A Review. In, Quaternary Evolution of the Great Lakes. Edited by Paul Karrow and P.E. Calkin. Geological Association of Canada Special Paper 30:79-83.

Feenstra, B.H.

1994 Quaternary Geology of the Markdale Area, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Map P.3251.

Gao, C., J.E.P. Dodge and I.M.L. MacDonald

2002 A Seamless Quaternary Geology Map of Southern Ontario: Second Phase. Ontario Geological Survey Open File Report 6100.029.

Goldthwait, J.W.

1910 An Instrumental Survey of the Shorelines of the Extinct Lakes Algonquin and Nipissing in Southwestern Ontario. Geological Survey Branch, Department of Mines Memoir No. 10, Ottawa.

Gwyn, Q.H.J.

1972 Quaternary Geology of the Dundalk Area, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Map P.727.

1975 Quaternary Geology of the Dundalk Area, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Open File Report 5132.

Karrow, P.F.

1980 The Nipissing Transgression around southern Lake Huron. Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences 17:1271-1274.

1986 Valley terraces and Huron basin water levels, southwestern Ontario. Geological Society of America Bulletin 97:1089-1097.

2004 Ontario Geological Events and Environmental Change in the Time of the Late Palaeo-Indian and Early Archaic Cultures (10,500 to 8,500 B.P.) In, The Late Palaeo-Indian Great Lakes: Geological and Archaeological Investigations of Late Pleistocene and Early Holocene Environments. Edited by Lawrence J. Jackson and Andrew Hinshelwood. Canadian Museum of Civilization Mercury Series Archaeology Paper 165:1-23.

Karrow, P.F., T.W. Anderson, L.D. Delorme, B.B. Miller and L.J. Chapman
1995 Late-glacial Paleoenvironment Lake Algonquin Sediments near Clarksburg, Ontario. *Journal of Paleolimnology* 14:297-309.

Karrow, P.F., E.C. Appleyard and A.L. Endres
2007 Geological and geophysical evidence for pre-Nipissing (>5,000 years BP) transgression infilled valleys in the Lake Huron basin, Ontario. *Journal of Paleolimnology* 37:419-434.

Lewis, C.F.M., T.C. Moore, D.K. Rea, D.L. Dettman, A.M. Smith and L.A. Mayer
1994 Lakes of the Huron Basin: Their Record of Runoff from the Laurentide Ice Sheet. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 13:891-922.

Lewis, C.F. Michael, Paul F. Karrow, Stefan M. Blasco, Francine M.G. McCarthy, John W. King, Theodore C. Moore, Jr., and David K. Rea
2008 Evolution of lakes in the Huron basin: Deglaciation to present. *Aquatic Ecosystem Health & Management* 11(2):127-136.

Luinstra, B., F.R. Brunton and W.R. Cowan
2006 Devonian Carbonate Investigation in the Grey-Sauble-Saugeen Area and Quaternary Mapping of the Bruce Peninsula. Ontario Geological Survey Open File Report 6192.036.

Sharpe, D.R. and B.E. Brostner
1977 Quaternary Geology of the Durham Area, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Map P.1556.

Sharpe, D.R. and W.A.D. Edwards
1979 Quaternary Geology of the Chesley-Tiverton Area, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Map P.2314.

Sharpe, D.R. and G.R. Jamieson
1982 Quaternary Geology of the Warton Area, Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey Map P.2559.

Soil Surveys

All Ontario Soil Survey reports and maps can be downloaded from:
<http://sis.agr.gc.ca/cansis/publications/on/index.html>

Gillespie, J.E. and N.R. Richards

1954 Soil Survey of Grey County. Report No. 17 of the Ontario Soil Survey. Experimental Farm Service, Canada Department of Agriculture and the Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph.

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

1952 Soil Survey of Perth County. Report No. 15 of the Ontario Soil Survey. Experimental Farm Service, Canada Department of Agriculture and the Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph.

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

1954 Soil Survey of Bruce County. Report No. 16 of the Ontario Soil Survey. Experimental Farm Service, Canada Department of Agriculture and the Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph.

Hoffman, D.W., B.C. Matthews and R.E. Wicklund

1963 Soil Survey of Wellington County. Report No. 35 of the Ontario Soil Survey. Experimental Farm Service, Canada Department of Agriculture and the Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph.

Hoffman, D.W., B.C. Matthews and R.E. Wicklund

1964 Soil Survey of Dufferin County. Report No. 38 of the Ontario Soil Survey. Experimental Farm Service, Canada Department of Agriculture and the Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph.

Hoffman, D.W., N.R. Richards and F.F. Morwick

1952 Soil Survey of Huron County. Report No. 13 of the Ontario Soil Survey. Experimental Farm Service, Canada Department of Agriculture and the Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph.

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

1962 Soil Survey of Simcoe County. Report No. 29 of the Ontario Soil Survey. Experimental Farm Service, Canada Department of Agriculture and the Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph.

9.3 Culture History Sources

Biggar, Henry P.

(editor) 1922-

1936 *The Works of Samuel de Champlain*. The Champlain Society, Toronto.

Bohaker, Heidi Rosemary

2006 *Nindoodemag: Anishinaabe Identities in the Eastern Great Lakes Region, 1600-1900*.

Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto.

Canada

1891 *Indian Treaties and Surrenders, Volume 1: Treaties 1-138*. Queen's Printer, Ottawa.

Davidson-Hunt, Iain and Fikret Berkes

2003 *Learning as you Journey: Anishinaabe Perception of Social-ecological Environments and Adaptive Learning*. *Conservation Ecology* 8(1).

Enemikeese (Conrad van Dusen)

1867 *The Indian Chief: An Account of the Labours, Losses, Sufferings, and Oppression of Ke-zig-ko-e-ne-ne (David Sawyer) a Chief of the Ojibbeway Indians of Canada West*. 66 Paternoster Row, London.

Fitzgerald, William

2004 *Digging Deeper into Sarawak's Past: Old Myths and New Insights*. *The Grey County Historian* 6:32-39.

2005 *Paul Kane: On the Threshold of a Dream*. Bruce County Museum & Cultural Centre, Southampton.

McMullen, Stephanie

1997 *Disunity and Dispossession: Nawash Ojibwa and Potawatomi in the Saugeen Territory, 1836-1865*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Calgary, Calgary.

Robertson, Norman

1906 *The History of the County of Bruce*. William Briggs, Toronto.

Schmalz, Peter S.

1977 *The History of the Saugeen Indians*. Ontario Historical Society Research Publication No. 5.

1991 *The Ojibwa of Southern Ontario*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Smith, Donald B.

2001 *Important Evidence: Nineteenth Century Anishinabeg Perspectives on the Algonquian-Iroquois Wars in Seventeenth Century Southern Ontario*. In, *Aboriginal People and the Fur Trade: Proceedings of the 8th North American Fur Trade Conference, Akwesasne*. Edited by Louise Johnston, pp.122-128.

Steckley, John

1990 *Names for the Odawa*. *Arch Notes (Newsletter of the Ontario Archaeological Society)* 90(3):47-52.

Strickland, Samuel

1853 *Twenty-Seven Years in Canada West or the Experience of an Early Settler*. Richard Bentley, London.

Thwaites, Reuben G. (editor)
1896-
1901 The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents. Burrows Brothers, Cleveland.

Waisberg, Leo Gilbert
1978 The Ottawa: Traders of the Upper Great Lakes. Unpublished M.A. thesis, McMaster University, Hamilton.

Provincial Surveyors' Plans, Field Books, Notes, and Diaries

[an important source of SON and historic cultural information for the period between treaty signings and land sales – include locations of homesteads, maple sugar camps, mills, burial grounds, trails, portages...]

Winearls, Joan
1991 Mapping Upper Canada 1780-1867: An Annotated Bibliography of Manuscript and Printed Maps.
University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Natural Resources Canada
615 Booth Street
Room 558
Ottawa, Ontario

Office of the Surveyor General
Ministry of Natural Resources
300 Water Street
2nd Floor South Tower
Peterborough, Ontario

The Archives of Ontario
134 Ian Macdonald Boulevard
Toronto, Ontario

Toronto Reference
Library 789 Yonge Street
Toronto, Ontario

Land Sales Books and Crown Patents

[documents payments and transfer of interest from initial installment to issuance of Crown Patent]

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada
Geomatics and Imagery
10 Wellington Street
Room 1720H
Gatineau, Québec

Crown Lands Registry
Ministry of Natural Resources
300 Water Street
5th Floor South Tower
Peterborough, Ontario

Land Registry Offices

[generally only record land ownership after Crown Patent issued – owners may not always be tenants]

Bruce County
203 Cayley
Street
Walkerton, Ontario
Dufferin County
41 Broadway Avenue
Unit 7
Orangeville, Ontario

Grey County
1555 16th Street East
Suites 1 and 2
Owen Sound, Ontario

Huron County
38 North Street
Goderich, Ontario

Perth County
5 Huron
Street
Stratford, Ontario

Simcoe County
Court House
114 Worsley Street
Barrie, Ontario

Wellington County
1 Stone Road West
Guelph, Ontario

Ontario Land Property Records Portal: <https://www.onland.ca/ui/>

Federal Census Reports, County Directories, and Township Papers

[initial census reports document Saugeen Ojibway presence within and outside of reserves]

Ryder, Dorothy E.

1979 Checklist of Canadian Directories, 1790-1950. National Library of Canada, Ottawa.

Bruce County Museum and Cultural
Centre 33 Victoria Street North
Southampton, Ontario

Dufferin County Museum and Archives
936029 Airport Road
Rosemont, Ontario

Grey Roots Museum and Archives
102599 Grey Road 18
Owen Sound, Ontario

Huron County Museum and Historic Gaol
110 North Street
Goderich, Ontario
Simcoe County Archives
1149 Highway 26
RR2
Minesing, Ontario

Stratford-Perth Archives
24 St. Andrews Street
Stratford, Ontario

Wellington County Museum and Archives
0536 Wellington Road 18
Fergus, Ontario

9.4 Archaeological Sources

Published Reports

Boyle, David

1888 Archaeological Report. In, Annual Report of the Canadian Institute, Session 1886-1887, being Part of Appendix to the Report of the Minister of Education, Ontario 1887, pages 9-17. Warwick & Sons, Toronto.

1889 Archaeological Report. In, Annual Report of the Canadian Institute, Session 1888-9, being Part of Appendix to the Report of the Minister of Education, Ontario 1889, pages 1-20. Legislative Assembly, Toronto.

Bursey, J.A.

1997 Stone Artifacts from the McQueen-McConnell Site, A Protohistoric Petun Village. Ontario Archaeology 63:85-100.

Clark-Wilson, Elizabeth and Michael Spence

1988 The Port Elgin Burial. KEWA (Newsletter of the London Chapter, Ontario Archaeological Society) 88(7):11-19.

Fecteau, Rodolphe David

2004 Preliminary Analysis of Carbonized Macro-botanical Remains from Petun Sites in Grey and Simcoe Counties, Ontario. Ontario Archaeology 77/78:160-170.

Finlayson, William D.

1977 The Saugeen Culture: A Middle Woodland Manifestation in Southwestern Ontario. Archaeological Survey of Canada Mercury Series Paper 61, National Museum of Man, Ottawa.

Fitzgerald, William and Camille Ramlukan

1995 Accessing the Supernatural: Algonkian Devotional Items from the Hunter's Point (BfHg-3) Site. Arch Notes (Newsletter of the Ontario Archaeological Society) 95(2):8-17.

Fitzgerald, William, Ruth-Erika Romanowski and Darlene Johnston

1998 When a Sacred Site might not be Considered Sacred: The Case of Hunter's Point, Georgian Bay, Ontario. In, Sacred Lands: Aboriginal World Views, Claims, and Conflicts. Edited by Jill Oakes, Rick Riewe, Kathi Kinew, and Elaine Maloney. Canadian Circumpolar Institute Occasional Publication No. 43:173-188.

Fox, William A.

1979 Lithic Tools from the Sidey-Mackay Site (BbHa-6). Arch Notes (Newsletter of the Ontario Archaeological Society) 79(2):6-11.

1979 Lithic Tools from the Melville Site (BbHa-7). KEWA (Newsletter of the London Chapter, Ontario Archaeological Society) 79(3):3-7.

1979 Lithic Tools from the Haney-Cook Site (BcHb-27). KEWA (Newsletter of the London Chapter, Ontario Archaeological Society) 79(9):2-8.

1980 Lithic Tools from the McEwen Site (BcHb-17). KEWA (Newsletter of the London Chapter, Ontario Archaeological Society) 80(4):2-13.

1984 An Early Woodland Camp on Inverhuron Bay. KEWA (Newsletter of the London Chapter, Ontario Archaeological Society) 84(6):3-14.

- 1990 The Odawa. In, *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*. Edited by Chris J. Ellis and Neal Ferris. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter, OAS Number 5:457-473.
- 1992 Odawa Lithic Procurement and Exchange: A History Carved in Stone. *ArchaeoLogiques* 5/6:52-58.
- Garraad, Charles
1969 Bear Jaw Tools from Petun Sites. *Ontario Archaeology* 13:54-60.
- 1978 The Sidey-Mackay BbHa-6 Site in 1977. *Arch Notes* (Newsletter of the Ontario Archaeological Society) 78(2):14-27.
- 1986 Paradise, a Dinner Plate and a Pickering Pot. *Arch Notes* (Newsletter of the Ontario Archaeological Society) 86(4):18-20.
- 1989 The Plater-Fleming BdHb-2 Site: A Review. *Arch Notes* (Newsletter of the Ontario Archaeological Society) 89(3):7-25.
- 1994 Three Jesuit Rings and a Medallion from Petunia. *Arch Notes* (Newsletter of the Ontario Archaeological Society) 94(1):23-27.
- 1995 Thoughts about the Hunter's Point (BfHg-3) Site. *Arch Notes* (Newsletter of the Ontario Archaeological Society) 95(3):32-35.
- 2003 The MacMurchy Site: Fifty Years On. *Arch Notes* (Newsletter of the Ontario Archaeological Society) 8(3):8-29.
- 2003 The Long Site (BcHb-9): Twp. Nottawasaga (Clearview) NE½ Con 9 Lot 26. *Arch Notes* (Newsletter of the Ontario Archaeological Society) 8(4):23-25.
- 2005 The Duggan Site: Finding the Unfindable in the Petun Country. *Arch Notes* (Newsletter of the Ontario Archaeological Society) 10(5):12-19.
- 2006 The Bowman Site (BcHa-6): A Late Middleport Occupation in the Petun Country. *Arch Notes* (Newsletter of the Ontario Archaeological Society) 11(2):13-17.
- 2006 The Black Bears at the Plater-Fleming Site. *Arch Notes* (Newsletter of the Ontario Archaeological Society) 11(3):11-16.
- Hamalainen, Peter
1984 Bear Claw Artefacts from the Plater-Martin Site. *Arch Notes* (Newsletter of the Ontario Archaeological Society) 84(3):40-41.
- Heidenreich, C.E.
1974 A Relict Indian Corn Field Near Creemore, Ontario. *Canadian Geographer* 18(4):379-394.
- Jackson, Lawrence J., Christopher Ellis, Alan V. Morgan and John H. McAndrews
2000 Glacial Lake Levels and Eastern Great Lakes Palaeo-Indians. *Geoarchaeology* 15:415-440.
- Kenyon, Water
1959 The Inverhuron Site, Bruce County, Ontario. Art and Archaeology Division, Royal Ontario Museum Occasional Paper 1, Toronto.

Lee, Thomas E.

1952 A Preliminary Report on an Archaeological Survey of Southwestern Ontario for 1950. National Museum of Canada Bulletin 126:64-75, Ottawa.

1959 An Archaeological Survey of Southwestern Ontario and Manitoulin Island. Pennsylvania Archaeologist 29(2):80-92.

1960 The Lucas Site, Inverhuron, Ontario. National Museum of Canada Bulletin 167:29-65, Ottawa.

Lennox, Paul A.

2000 The Rentner and McKean Sites: 10,000 Years of Settlement on the Shores of Lake Huron, Simcoe County, Ontario. Ontario Archaeology 70:16-65.

Molto, J.E.

1979 Saugeen Osteology: The Evidence of the Second Cemetery at the Donaldson Site. Museum of Indian Archaeology Bulletin 14, London.

Pearce, Robert J.

1989 Preliminary Assessment of Site BdHb-2 (formerly known as the Plater-Fleming Site), Collingwood Township, Grey County. Arch Notes (Newsletter of the Ontario Archaeological Society) 89(2):9-15.

Ramsden, Peter

1976 Rocky Ridge: A Stratified Archaic Site near Inverhuron, Ontario. Ministry of Culture and Recreation, Historical Planning & Research Branch Research Report 7, Toronto.

Storck, Peter L.

1997 The Fisher Site: Archaeological, Geological and Paleobotanical Studies at an Early Paleo - Indian Site in Southern Ontario, Canada. Museum of Anthropology Memoir No. 30, Ann Arbor.

2004 Journey to the Ice Age: Discovering an Ancient World. UBC Press, Vancouver.

Storck, Peter L. And Peter von Bitter

1989 The Geological Age and Occurrence of Fossil Hill Formation Chert: Implications for Early Paleoindian Settlement Patterns. In, Eastern Paleoindian Lithic Resource Use. Edited by Christopher J. Ellis and Johnathan C. Lothrop. Westview Press, Boulder, pp.165-189.

Wright, J.V.

1972 The Knechtel I Site, Bruce County, Ontario. National Museum of Man Mercury Series, Archaeological Survey of Canada Paper 4, Ottawa.

1974 The Nodwell Site. National Museum of Man Mercury Series, Archaeological Survey of Canada Paper 22, Ottawa.

Wright, J.V. and J.E. Anderson

1963 The Donaldson Site. National Museum of Canada Bulletin 184, Ottawa.

Unpublished Reports, Field Notes, Site Records, Artifact Collections

Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (license reports and artifact repositories)
Archaeological field notes and site records (1920s onward)

Canadian Museum of Civilization
[Research and Collections (Archaeology and History); Library, Archives and Documentation Services]
100 rue Laurier
Gatineau, Québec

Royal Ontario Museum
[Department of World Cultures; Library and Archives]
100 Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario

Artifact collections

Museum of Ontario Archaeology
1600 Attawandaron Road
London

University of Toronto
[Department of Anthropology]
19 Russell Street
Toronto

Bruce County Museum and Cultural
Centre 33 Victoria Street North
Southampton

Dufferin County Museum and Archives
936029 Airport Road
Rosemont

Grey Roots Museum and Archives
102599 Grey Road 18
Owen Sound

Meaford Museum
111 Bayfield Street
Meaford

Simcoe County Museum
1151 Highway 26
Minesing

Collingwood Museum
45 St. Paul Street
Collingwood

Wellington County Museum and Archives
0536 Wellington Road 18
Fergus

Stratford-Perth Museum
270 Water Street South
Stratford

Huron County Museum and Historic Gaol
110 North Street
Goderich

North Huron District Museum
274 Josephine Street
Wingham

Craigleith Station Heritage Museum
113 Lakeshore Road
Town of the Blue Mountains

Huronian Museum
549 Little Lake Park Road
Midland

9.5 Air Photos, LiDAR and Topographic Maps

Air Photos (1930s onward)

McMaster University Library | Historical Hamilton Portal (1954 series covers all of southern Ontario)
<https://library.mcmaster.ca/maps/aerialphotos/index.html>

Recent Ontario Air Photos / GIS layer
<https://tiles.arcgis.com/tiles/TJH5KDher0W13Kgo/arcgis/rest/services>

National Air Photo Library
 Centre for Topographic Information
 Natural Resources Canada
 615 Booth Road
 Room 180
 Ottawa, Ontario

Grey Sauble Conservation Authority
 237897 Inglis Falls Road
 Owen Sound, Ontario

Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority
 261123 Grey Road 28
 Hanover, Ontario

Maitland Valley Conservation Authority
 1093 Marietta Street
 Wroxeter, Ontario

Ausable Bayfield Conservation Authority
 71108 Morrison Line
 Exeter, Ontario

Grand River Conservation Authority
 400 Clyde Road
 Cambridge, Ontario

Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority
 8195 8th Line
 Utopia, Ontario

LiDAR

Ontario Digital Terrain Model (Lidar-Derived):
<https://geohub.lio.gov.on.ca/maps/mnrf::ontario-digital-terrain-model-lidar-derived>

Topographic Maps (first editions – 1940s/1950s based on aerial photography)

Lloyd Reeds Map Collection
 McMaster University
 1280 Main Street West
 Hamilton, Ontario