

**Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport**

Archaeology Programs Unit  
Programs and Services Branch  
Culture Division  
401 Bay Street, Suite 1700  
Toronto ON M7A 0A7  
Tel.: (807) 475-1628  
Email: Paige.Campbell@ontario.ca

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

Unité des programmes d'archéologie  
Direction des programmes et des services  
Division de culture  
401, rue Bay, bureau 1700  
Toronto ON M7A 0A7  
Tél. : (807) 475-1628  
Email: Paige.Campbell@ontario.ca



Nov 21, 2016

Lawrence Jackson (P025)  
Northeastern Archaeological Associates Ltd.  
PO BOX 493 Port Hope ON L1A 3Z4

**RE: Review and Entry into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports: Archaeological Assessment Report Entitled, "STAGE 3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT OF BdGm-22, THE PILGRIM'S REST ISLAND SITE, PART LOT 3, CONCESSION 11, GEOGRAPHIC TOWNSHIP OF BURLEIGH, PETERBOROUGH COUNTY, ONTARIO", Dated Oct 24, 2016, Filed with MTCS Toronto Office on Nov 2, 2016, MTCS Project Information Form Number P025-0491-2015, MTCS File Number 0004194**

Dear Dr. Jackson:

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.

The report documents the assessment of the study area as depicted in Map 10.3 and the supplementary document of the above titled report and recommends the following:

Diagnostic material which recovered from the site BdGm-22 suggests an Archaic-Period median date with a possible Late Paleo-Indian component. Later components are possible but not substantiated by diagnostics. The early date, as well as high artifact counts in the central site area, and a relatively undisturbed context means that BdGm-22 meets the requirements for Stage 4 mitigation as per Section 3.4 (MTCS 2011):

1. The following site types always require Stage 4 mitigation:

- c. Paleo-Indian archaeological sites (shows the earliest human occupation of the province), regardless of size or artifact yield
- d. large, dense lithic scatters (very high yields of artifacts per unit)

As well as Table 3.2 of Section 3.4.3 “Indicators showing cultural heritage value or interest”, in regards to site rarity, productivity, and integrity.

If Avoidance and Protection of the site is pursued long-term protection of the site area in the form of a protective zoning amendment or other protective covenant must be implemented. Avoidance would require a 10m buffer beyond established site limits which would be fenced and communicated to all construction personnel (Section 4.1, MTCS 2011). Site limits and buffer setbacks cover the entire central portion of the island as illustrated in Map 3 of the Supplementary Documentation.

If Stage 4 Excavation and Removal is pursued block excavations should be undertaken in accordance with Section 4.2 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTCS, 2011). In the case of BdGm-22, the presence of an Early Archaic/Paleo-Indian site would necessitate the use of 3mm mesh on a portion of the excavation units as per Standard 5, Section 4.2.2 (MTCS 2011). Any Stage 4 mitigation must take place with full consultation and cooperation of local First Nations.

At this time the proponent has elected avoid and protect the site by removing the island containing BdGm-22 from the development area completely, and forgoing further development in this area. A statement to this effect from the proponent’s attorney is attached to this report as Appendix D.

Due to the physical barrier represented by the sites location on a small island there is no danger of accidental disturbance by construction machinery, and fencing and monitoring should not be necessary. If any future development outside the site area but within the island is proposed, it is recommended that the buffer area be fenced as illustrated in Supplementary Map 5 and a licensed archaeologist be retained to undertake Stage 4 monitoring of the construction area.

Based on these conditions it is recommended that the development area of the property (now limited to the mainland), not be subject to any further archaeological assessment.

A letter from Curve Lake First Nation confirming their satisfaction with the Stage 3 assessment and their involvement is included as Appendix C, as well as in the Supplementary Documentation Package.

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,

Paige Campbell  
Archaeology Review Officer

cc. Archaeology Licensing Officer  
Pieter Venema, 2293040 Ontario Inc. / Pilgrim's Rest Campground  
Jim Sangster, Township of North Kawartha

<sup>1</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.