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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In December 2011 the City of Windsor initiated a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) study to investigate environmental issues and alternatives for the proposed development of a parcel of land located within part of Lots 136-140, Concession 3 in the Geographic Township of East Sandwich (see Appendix A – Map I). The proposed developments consist of the construction of a rail spur track extending northward from the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) main track to the south side of the C.S. Wind property limits, with the proposed rail spur track alignment crossing City-owned lands; the extension of Twin Oaks Drive east of the proposed rail spur track; the relocation of a portion of the Lachance drain; and the provision of full site servicing to the adjacent properties.

To facilitate this study, planned as a Schedule “B” project under the Municipal Engineers Association “Class Environmental Assessment” document of 2000, as amended 2007 (City of Windsor, 2012a), Archeoworks Inc. was retained by MMM Group Limited to conduct a Stage 1 archaeological assessment (AA).

The Stage 1 AA identified potential for the recovery of historic Euro-Canadian and Aboriginal archaeological remains within undisturbed portions of the study area due to the proximity of the Little River, which would have been able to sustain food resources within 300 metres of its limits. In addition, a review of historic maps and the local history of the area revealed that the study area lies immediately adjacent to a historic road laid out in 1795. A desktop review of field conditions through Google Street View confirmed the presence of features indicating extensive disturbance (i.e. removal of archaeological potential) within the footprints of several existing buildings, paved areas and roadways within the study area, as well as the lack of evidence of complete disturbance in other portions of the study area.

As a result of these findings, the areas currently occupied by present-day structures, paved lots and roadways were exempted from further archaeological work. The remainder of the entire study area is considered to have archaeological potential, and thus recommended to undergo a Stage 2 AA employing pedestrian survey in ploughed agricultural fields, and shovel test pit survey in all remaining areas, at standard intervals of 5 metres, prior to any construction activities.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary .................................................................................................................. i
Table of Contents ..................................................................................................................... ii
Project Personnel .................................................................................................................... iii

1.0 Project Context
  1.1 Development Context ................................................................................................. 1
  1.2 Historical and Archaeological Context ................................................................... 1-5

2.0 Confirmation of Archaeological Potential ...................................................................... 5-6

3.0 Analysis and Conclusions .............................................................................................. 7

4.0 Recommendations ........................................................................................................... 7-8

5.0 Advice on Compliance with Legislation ....................................................................... 8-9

6.0 Bibliography and Sources .............................................................................................. 10-11

Tables
  Table 1: History of Occupation in Southern Ontario .......................................................... 3-4
  Table 2: Checklist for Determining Archaeological Potential .............................................. 6

Appendices
  Appendix A: Maps ............................................................................................................ 12-16
  Appendix B: Images ........................................................................................................... 17-19
  Appendix C: Development Maps ...................................................................................... 20-22
  Appendix D: Inventory of Documentary and Material Record ........................................... 23
PROJECT PERSONNEL

Project Director ................................................................. Jessica Marr – MTCS licence P334
Field Archaeologist ............................................................. Kim Slocki – MTCS licence P029
Report Preparation .............................................................. Jay Villapando
Report Review ................................................................. Kim Slocki – MTCS licence P029
Graphics ............................................................................... Jay Villapando
1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT

1.1 Development Context

In December 2011 the City of Windsor initiated a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) study to investigate environmental issues and alternatives for the proposed development of a parcel of land located within part of Lots 136-140, Concession 3 in the Geographic Township of East Sandwich (see Appendix A – Map 1). The proposed developments consist of the construction of a rail spur track extending northward from the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) main track to the south side of the C.S. Wind property limits, with the proposed rail spur track alignment crossing City-owned lands; the extension of Twin Oaks Drive east of the proposed rail spur track; the relocation of a portion of the Lachance drain; and the provision of full site servicing to the adjacent properties (City of Windsor, 2012a) (see Appendix C).

To facilitate this study, planned as a Schedule “B” project under the Municipal Engineers Association “Class Environmental Assessment” document of 2000, as amended 2007 (City of Windsor, 2012a), Archeoworks Inc. was retained by MMM Group Limited to conduct a Stage 1 archaeological assessment (AA).

This Stage 1 AA was conducted under the project and field direction of Ms. Jessica Marr, under archaeological consulting licence P334, in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act (1990) and under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act (1990). Permission to investigate the study area and was provided by MMM Group Limited on February 17, 2012.

1.2 Historical and Archaeological Context

The Stage 1 background research is conducted to evaluate the study area’s potential to contain archaeological resources. Potential is assessed based on a combination of physical and historical features, as well as the proximity of previously identified archaeological sites. If potential is established anywhere within the study area limits, a Stage 2 assessment must be conducted to confirm the presence of archaeological resources. The Checklist for Determining Archaeological Potential, 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (“2011 S&G”) published by the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS), summarizes those features which are used to assess archaeological potential, as well as the integrity of any such resources and the impact of proposed development/construction activities.

The MTCS’s 2011 S&G considers areas of early Euro-Canadian settlement, including places of early military pioneer or pioneer settlement (e.g., pioneer homesteads, isolated cabins, farmstead complexes), early wharf or dock complexes, and pioneer churches and early cemeteries, as having archaeological potential. There may be commemorative markers of their history, such as local, provincial, or federal monuments or heritage parks. Early historical transportation routes (trails, passes, roads, railways, portage routes), properties listed in a municipal register or designated under the Ontario Heritage Act.
Archeoworks Inc. conducted a comprehensive review of listed and designated heritage properties, and registered archaeological sites within close proximity to its limits. Furthermore, a review of the physiography of the overall area and its correlation to locating archaeological remains, as well as consultation of available historical documentation was performed. The results of this background research are documented below.

1.2.1 Physical Features
The study area is situated within the St. Clair Clay Plains physiographic region of Southern Ontario. This extensive clay plain adjacent to Lake St. Clair covers around 5900 sq. km., an area which includes parts of the counties of Essex, Lambton and Kent. It is characterized as a region of little relief, lying between 175-215 metres above sea level. The overburden is deep and the bedrock under much of Essex is limestone. Most of Lambton and Essex Counties are essentially clay till plains smoothed by shallow deposits of lacustrine clay, which settled in the depressions while the knolls were being lowered by wave action. The Essex sub-region has such imperfect drainage that dredged ditches and tile underdrains had to be installed in order to provide satisfactory conditions for crop growth and tillage. Summer conditions in the Essex plain are similar to those of the northern fringe of the American Corn Belt, and its location between lakes Erie and St. Clair helps reduce the daily temperature range and prolong the frost-free season (Chapman & Putnam, 1984: pp. 147-148).

In terms of archaeological potential, potable water is a highly important resource necessary for any extended human occupation or settlement. As water sources have remained relatively stable in southern Ontario since post-glacial times, proximity to water can be regarded as a useful index for the evaluation of archaeological site potential. Indeed, distance from water has been one of the most commonly used variables for predictive modeling of site location. In Southern Ontario, the 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists considers undisturbed lands in proximity to a water source to be of elevated archaeological potential. Primary hydrological features such as lakes and rivers would have helped supply plant and food resources to the surrounding area, and consequently support high potential for locating archaeological resources within 300 metres of its limits. Since the Little River is in close proximity to the study area, archaeological potential within the study area limits is established (see Section 2.0 and Table 2).

1.2.2 Current Land Condition and Uses
The study area is situated south of the built-up suburban area in eastern Windsor, encompassing industrial and agricultural lands near the city’s current eastern boundary (see Appendix C). Three buildings and their surrounding paved areas currently exist within the study area: the C. S. Wind facility at 9355 Anchor Drive, and two other industrial buildings at 9650 and 9655Twin Oaks Drive. The man-made Lachance Drain, which empties into the Little River, traverses the south-central portion of the study area.
The topography within the subject lands is fairly level, with elevation gently decreasing northward. The native soil is classified as Brookston clay, which the Ontario Soil Survey describes as dark clay over mottled clay for topsoil then blue-grey compact gritty clay for subsoil (Dominion Department of Agriculture, 1947).

1.2.3 Registered Archaeological Sites & Previous Archaeological Assessments

In order that an inventory of archaeological resources could be compiled for this study area, the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database (OASD) maintained by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) were consulted. Every archaeological site is registered according to the Borden System, which is a numbering system used throughout Canada to track archaeological sites and their artifacts. The study area is located within Borden block AbHr.

According to the MTCS, only one site is registered within a one-kilometre radius of the study area. This site, AbHr-4, is a multi-component site in which an Aboriginal findspot yielding one side-notched point of undetermined cultural affiliation was recovered in close proximity to a scatter of 30 post-1930 Euro-Canadian artifacts.

It must be noted, however, that the paucity of archaeological sites in proximity to the study area is not reflective of the scale of previous inhabitation, but more likely a lack of detailed archaeological surveys within the immediate area. In fact, the MTCS records no documentation for archaeological fieldwork previously conducted within and directly adjacent (within 50 metres) to the study area.

Despite the lack of available data on archaeological resources in proximity to the study area, it is still useful to provide the cultural history of occupation in southern Ontario, which is provided in Table 1 below. This data offers a glimpse of what may be encountered if a Stage 2 AA is recommended.

Table 1: History of Occupation in Southern Ontario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Archaeological Culture</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PALEO-INDIAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Gainey, Barnes, Crowfield</td>
<td>9000-8500 BC</td>
<td>Big game hunters. Fluted projectile points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Holcombe, Hi-Lo, Lanceolate</td>
<td>8500-7500 BC</td>
<td>Small nomadic hunter-gatherer bands. Lanceolate projectile points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHAIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Side-notched, corner notched, bifurcate-base</td>
<td>7800-6000 BC</td>
<td>Small nomadic hunter-gatherer bands; first notched and stemmed points, and ground stone celts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Otter Creek, Brewerton</td>
<td>6000-2000 BC</td>
<td>Transition to territorial settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Narrow, Broad and Small Points Normanskill, Lamoka, Genesee, Adder Orchard etc.</td>
<td>2500-500 BC</td>
<td>More numerous territorial hunter-gatherer bands; increasing use of exotic materials and artistic items for grave offerings; regional trade networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Archaeological Culture</td>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>Attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Meadowood, Middlesex</td>
<td>800-400 BC</td>
<td>Introduction of pottery, burial ceremonialism; panregional trade networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Point Peninsula, Saugeen, Jack’s Reef Corner Notched</td>
<td>400 BC-AD 800</td>
<td>Cultural and ideological influences from Ohio Valley complex societies; incipient horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Algonquian, Iroquoian</td>
<td>AD 800-1300</td>
<td>Transition to village life and agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Algonquian, Iroquoian</td>
<td>AD 1300-1400</td>
<td>Establishment of large palisaded villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORIC</td>
<td>Algonquian, Iroquoian</td>
<td>AD 1400-1600</td>
<td>Tribal differentiation and warfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Huron, Neutral, Petun, Odawa, Ojibwa</td>
<td>AD 1600 – 1650</td>
<td>Tribal displacements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Six Nations Iroquois, Ojibwa, Mississauga</td>
<td>AD 1650 – 1800s</td>
<td>Migrations and resettlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>AD 1780 - present</td>
<td>European immigrant settlements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.4 Heritage Properties and Known Historic Sites
Consultation of the records for listed and designated heritage properties within the Windsor Municipal Heritage Register (City of Windsor, 2012b) confirmed that no historic pre-1900 built structures or properties of significant cultural heritage significance were located within 300 metres of the study area limits.

1.2.5 Settlement History and Past Land Use
To further assess the study area’s potential for the recovery of historic pre-1900 remains, several historic maps and documents were reviewed. The study area encompasses the northern portions of Lots 136-140, Concession 3, McNiff’s Survey, in the Geographic Township of Sandwich East, historic Essex County.

The beginnings of the Euro-Canadian settlement of the Windsor and Essex County region can be traced to the establishment of a permanent settlement at Fort Pontchartrain in what is now Detroit, Michigan in 1701 by the French. Settlement was confined to the west/north side of the Detroit River until 1748, when a Jesuit mission was established on the east/south side, near the foot of what is now the Ambassador Bridge (Windsor-Essex EDC, 2012). This area opposite the Fort was called “Petite côte” and was under cultivation to serve the needs of the small town that would eventually become the city of Detroit (Archives of Ontario, 2009). Fort Pontchartrain was captured by the British in 1760 and by 1763, Britain was ceded all of New France, which became the Province of Quebec. In 1788, the large area of Quebec west of Montreal was divided into five districts; Hesse was the westernmost of these districts, and included Detroit (County of Essex, 2010). Even through the west/north side of the River was officially surrendered to the newly-formed United States in 1783, the British maintained effective control over the Detroit region until 1796 (Windsor-Essex EDC, 2012). During this time Loyalists who wished to remain under the British Crown began to settle the Canadian side of the Detroit River. The Hesse District Land Board was established in 1789 to deal with land issues, especially with regard to existing land ownership by the earlier, mainly Francophone settlers, and the granting of lands to mainly Anglophone Loyalists. Petite côte was
renamed Sandwich; the township that eventually took on this name contained long and narrow lots that were similar to the ones found in the St. Lawrence Valley, instead of the more square lots found in British-surveyed lands (Archives of Ontario, 2009).

In 1791 the Province of Upper Canada was established, and was divided into nineteen counties the following year; Hesse was renamed the Western District at this time, which was comprised of the counties of Essex, Kent and Lambton (County of Essex, 2010). Following the end of the British occupation of Detroit, the townsite of Sandwich was established in 1797 and became the first urban settlement within the current city limits of Windsor (Windsor-Essex EDC, 2012). After the riverfront lots were all taken up, settlement, much of it by Francophones, expanded northward to Lake St. Clair and along that lake’s south shore, establishing the communities of Belle River, Rochester and Stoney Point (County of Essex, 2010).

Though the village of Sandwich was chosen as the location of Essex County offices, the town of Windsor, just opposite Detroit, became the chief port-of-entry. By the time the Great Western Railway (now the Canadian National Railway) chose Windsor as its terminus, the town was already catching up to Sandwich in terms of population. The railway’s arrival marked the beginning of significant industrial development in Windsor. Several areas that are now within the city limits of Windsor, such as Walkerville and Ford City, were developed in the late 1800s and early 1900s as industrial and commercial companies set up operations in the region (ASI, 2008).

A review of the 1881 Essex Supplement within the Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada (see Map 2) revealed that no occupants or property owners were identified for the lots encompassed within the study area. No structures were depicted to lie within the study area limits at this time, although it appears that the area had been cleared of woodland growth. By 1898 (see Map 3) the Canadian Pacific Railway had been built through the vicinity, forming the southern boundary of the study area. Land parcel owners are identified within the map, but no structures were depicted.

Although no structures were illustrated within the study area in historic maps, it lies immediately adjacent to a historic road (presently Anchor Drive and E. C. Row Avenue East) that was originally laid out and cleared during the survey of the eastern portion of Sandwich Township in 1795 (Robinson, 1873), forming the road allowance between the second and third concessions. Because transportation routes such as early settlement roads and trails (buffered by zones of 100 metres either side) contain potential for heritage features adjacent to their rights-of-way, high potential for the location of Euro-Canadian historic archaeological resources within undisturbed portions of the study area can be established (see Section 2.0 and Table 2).

2.0 CONFIRMATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

Based on the information gathered from background research documented in the preceding sections, we confirm that there is high potential for the recovery of...
archaeological resources within undisturbed portions of the study area limits. Features contributing to archaeological potential are summarized in Table 2.

**Table 2: Checklist for Determining Archaeological Potential**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature of Archaeological Potential</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Known archaeological sites within 300 m?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Is there water on or near the property?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a Presence of primary watercourse within 300 metres of the study area (lakes, rivers, large creeks)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b Presence of secondary watercourse within 300 metres of the study area (springs, marshes, swamps, streams)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c Features indicating past presence of water source within 300 metres (former shorelines, relic water channels, beach ridges)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Elevated topography (knolls, drumlins, eskers, plateaus, etc)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes to two or more of 3-5 or 7-10, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Pockets of sandy soil in clay or rocky area</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes to two or more of 3-5 or 7-10, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Distinctive land formations (mounds, caverns, waterfalls, peninsulas, etc)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes to two or more of 3-5 or 7-10, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Is there a known burial site or cemetery that is registered with the Cemeteries Regulation Unit on or directly adjacent to the property?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Associated with food or scarce resource harvest areas (traditional fishing locations, agricultural/ berry extraction areas, etc)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes to two or more of 3-5 or 7-10, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Indications of early Euro-Canadian settlement (monuments, cemeteries, structures, etc) within 300 metres</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes to two or more of 3-5 or 7-10, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Associated with historic transportation route (historic road, trail, portage, rail corridor, etc) within 100 metres of the property</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes to two or more of 3-5 or 7-10, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property-specific Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Contains property designated under the Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes to two or more of 3-5 or 7-10, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Local knowledge (aboriginal communities, heritage organizations, municipal heritage committees, etc)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Recent ground disturbance, not including agricultural cultivation (post-1960, extensive and deep land alterations)</td>
<td>X (part only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, low archaeological potential is determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

A desktop review of current field conditions was carried out using the Google Street View feature of the Google Earth application on February 23rd, 2012.

3.1 Identified Deep and Extensive Disturbances

Areas identified as having been subjected to deep and extensive disturbance include the footprints of existing structures and existing paved areas (see Images 2-7). Section 1.3.2 of the 2011 S&G counts building footprints and infrastructure to be among extensive and deep land alterations that can cause severe damage to the integrity of archaeological resources, thus removing archaeological potential. As such, the buildings at 9650 and 9655 Twin Oaks Drive and 9355 Anchor Drive (C. S. Wind property), as well as their associated paved areas, and a small portion of Twin Oaks Drive, can be exempted from further assessment (see Map 4).

3.2 Identified Areas of Archaeological Potential

All areas outside the identified disturbances appear to not have been subjected to deep and extensive disturbance (see Images 1-2, 5-6, 8-12). There is still potential to recover pre-historic and historic archaeological resources in these undisturbed areas, which are marked on Map 5.

4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The Stage 1 archaeological assessment of the Windsor Railway Spur Extension study area, located within parts of Lots 136-140, Concession 3, McNiff’s Survey, in the City of Windsor, has indicated that, based on historical documentation and the visual documentation of suitable physiographic features, there is potential for the recovery of historic Euro-Canadian, and prehistoric Aboriginal, archaeological resources, respectively, within portions of the study area. In light of these results, the following recommendations are presented:

1. The areas described in Section 3.1 and marked in Map 4 of this report are considered to have had their archaeological potential removed due to extensive disturbance. Therefore, these areas are exempted from further assessment.

2. The remainder of the study area, which has been assessed to still contain archaeological potential, should be subjected to a Stage 2 archaeological assessment, under the field supervision and monitoring of a licensed archaeologist, prior to any construction activities, in order to minimize impacts to heritage resources. The Stage 2 AA should commence with a property survey to assess current land conditions, identify areas of low archaeological potential and determine appropriate fieldwork strategies.

Parts of the study area that had been agriculturally active lands in the recent past should be ploughed and then subjected to pedestrian survey at 5-metre intervals,
according to the standards outlined in the Standards & Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTCS, 2011). The remainder of the study area should be subjected to a shovel test pit form of survey at 5-metre intervals. Should significant archaeological resources be encountered, additional background research or fieldwork may be required by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport.

The above recommendations are subject to MTCS approval. No excavation activities shall take place within the study area prior to the MTCS (Heritage Operations Unit) confirming in writing that all archaeological licensing and technical review requirements have been satisfied.

5.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION

1. This report is submitted to the MTCS 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 Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

Under Section 6 of Regulation 881 of the Ontario Heritage Act, Archeoworks Inc. will, “keep in safekeeping all objects of archaeological significance that are found under the authority of the licence and all field records that are made in the course of the work authorized by the licence, except where the objects and records are donated to Her Majesty the Queen in right of Ontario or are directed to be deposited in a public institution under subsection 66 (1) of the Act.”
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APPENDIX A: MAPS

Map 1: National Topographical System Map (Energy, Mines and Resources Canada, 1994) identifying the study area limits.
Stage 1 AA: Windsor Railway Spur Extension within Part of Lots 136-140, Concession 3, McNiff’s Survey, Geographic Township of Sandwich East, City of Windsor, Ontario. Class EA.
Stage 1 AA: Windsor Railway Spur Extension within Part of Lots 136-140, Concession 3, McNiff's Survey, Geographic Township of Sandwich East, City of Windsor, Ontario. Class EA.
Map 4: Stage 1 AA map of extensively disturbed areas not requiring further assessment, with photo locations marked.
Map 5: Stage 1 AA map of areas with archaeological potential requiring further assessment.
APPENDIX B: IMAGES
(All images courtesy of Google © 2009)

Image 1: Looking northeast at fallow land behind 9655 Twin Oaks Drive.

Image 2: Looking east at current eastern terminus of Twin Oaks Drive and agricultural lands beyond.

Image 3: Looking northeast at existing building and paved and landscaped areas within 9650 Twin Oaks Drive.

Image 4: Looking southeast at existing building and paved and landscaped areas within 9655 Twin Oaks Drive.
Stage 1 AA: Windsor Railway Spur Extension within Part of Lots 136-140, Concession 3, McNiff’s Survey, Geographic Township of Sandwich East, City of Windsor, Ontario. Class EA.

Image 5: Looking northwest at fallow lands within the C.S. Wind property and part of the 9650 Twin Oaks Drive landscaped area.

Image 6: Looking northeast at fallow lands behind the built-up area within the C.S. Wind property.

Image 7: Looking southeast at existing building and paved and landscaped areas within the C.S. Wind property.

Image 8: Looking southeast at fallow lands east of the built-up area of the C.S. Wind facility. 9650 Twin Oaks Drive visible in the distance.
Stage 1 AA: Windsor Railway Spur Extension within Part of Lots 136-140, Concession 3, McNiff’s Survey, Geographic Township of Sandwich East, City of Windsor, Ontario. Class EA.
APPENDIX C: DEVELOPMENT MAPS

Stage 1 AA: Windsor Railway Spur Extension within Part of Lots 136-140, Concession 3, McNiff’s Survey, Geographic Township of Sandwich East, City of Windsor, Ontario. Class EA.
Stage 1 AA: Windsor Railway Spur Extension within Part of Lots 136-140, Concession 3, McNiff’s Survey, Geographic Township of Sandwich East, City of Windsor, Ontario. Class EA.
Stage 1 AA: Windsor Railway Spur Extension within Part of Lots 136-140, Concession 3, McNiff’s Survey, Geographic Township of Sandwich East, City of Windsor, Ontario. Class EA.
### APPENDIX D: INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTARY AND MATERIAL RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document / Material</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Research / Analysis / Reporting Material</td>
<td>Archeoworks Inc., 16715-12 Yonge Street, Suite 1029, Newmarket, ON, Canada, L3X 1X4</td>
<td>Stored on Archeoworks network servers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Information:**

- **Project Number:** 007-WI522-11
- **Licensee:** Jessica Marr
- **MTCS PIF:** P334-170-2012