



Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment

Elephant Lake Waterfront Development
Part of Lots 27 – 30, Concession 10 & 11
Part of Lots 27 & 28, Concession 9
Part of Lots 27 – 31, Concession 8
Geographic Township of Harcourt
Township of Dysart et al.
Haliburton County

Prepared for:
King EPCM
c/o Tony Wang
2499 Concession 3
Goodwood, Ontario
LOC 1A0

Licensee: Michael Golloher
PIF: P1037-0082-2021
Original Report



Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
2365 Watts Road,
Haliburton, Ontario
K0M 1S0

July 22, 2022

Executive Summary

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc. was retained to conduct a Stage 2 archaeological assessment of a 284.8 hectare area on part of Lots 27 – 30, Concession 10 & 11, Part of Lots 27 & 28, Concession 9, and Part of Lots 27 – 31, Concession 8, Geographic Township of Harcourt, Municipality of Dysart et al, Haliburton County, Ontario. The assessment was undertaken as part of Draft Plan of Subdivision Application and was conducted as part of the requirements defined in Section 5.4.3 of the *Dysart et al Official Plan*, which requires an archaeological assessment as a condition of development approval in subject lands that are considered to be areas of archaeological potential

The Stage 2 archaeological assessment of the study area was conducted between November 3, 2021 and July 20, 2022 under PIF #: P1037-0082-2021, issued to Michael Golloher, M.Sc. (P1037). The weather during the survey was a mix of sun and cloud and mild. At no time were weather or lighting conditions detrimental to the observation or recovery of archaeological material.

Due the location of the study area in northern Ontario the test pit strategy followed Section 2.1.5 of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. As a result, a 50 metre zone bordering the edges of the existing lakes, as well as several small feeder ponds, feeder creeks and wetlands in the middle of the study area, was test pitted at maximum intervals of 5 metres apart, accounting for 23% of the study area. Approximately 6% of the 50 metre zone of archaeological potential was not assessed due to the presence of steep slope in excess of 20° that does not require archaeological assessment under Section 2.1, Standard 2(a)iii of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. The remaining 77% of the study area was not assessed due to permanent inundation and low archaeological potential.

Each test pit was excavated by hand to 30 cm in diameter and were excavated into the first 5 centimetres of subsoil. Test pit depth averaged 15 cm. Each test pit was examined for stratigraphy, cultural features, or evidence of fill, and all soil was screened through wire mesh of 6 millimetre width. All test pits were backfilled. The soil consisted of a light brown sand topsoil horizon over an orange-brown sand subsoil. No archaeological material was identified during the course of the survey.

Based on the results of the Stage 1 background investigation and the subsequent Stage 2 test pit survey, the study area is considered to be free of archaeological material. Therefore, no additional archaeological assessments are recommended.

The Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries is requested to review this report and provide a letter indicating their satisfaction that the fieldwork and reporting for this archaeological assessment are consistent with the Ministry's 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* and the terms and conditions for archaeological licences, and to enter this report into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports.

Table of Contents

1.0	Project Context	1
1.1	Development Context	1
1.2	Historic Context	2
1.2.1	Pre-Contact Indigenous History	2
1.2.2	Oral History	3
1.2.3	European Settlement History	4
1.2.4	Land Use History of Study Area.....	6
1.2.5	Historic Plaques	6
1.3	Archaeological Context	7
1.3.1	Current Conditions	7
1.3.2	Natural Environment	7
1.3.3	Known Archaeological Sites.....	8
1.3.4	Previous Archaeological Assessments	8
2.0	Field Methods	9
3.0	Record of Finds	10
4.0	Analysis and Conclusions	11
5.0	Recommendations	12
6.0	Advice on Compliance with Legislation	13
7.0	References	14
8.0	Images	16
9.0	Maps	39

Project Personnel

Managing Director:	Anthony Butler, M.Sc. (P310)
Project Archaeologist:	Shane McCartney, M.A. (P321)
Licensed Archaeologist:	Michael Golloher (P1037)
Licensed Field Director:	Katrina Mason, B.Sc. (R1226)
Field Technician:	Trevor Tyo, B.A.
Report Production:	Shane McCartney, M.A. (P321)

1.0 Project Context

1.1 Development Context

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc. (Earthworks) was retained to conduct a Stage 2 archaeological assessment of a 284.8 hectare area on part of Lots 27 – 30, Concession 10 & 11, Part of Lots 27 & 28, Concession 9, and Part of Lots 27 – 31, Concession 8, Geographic Township of Harcourt, Municipality of Dysart et al, Haliburton County, Ontario (Map 1). The assessment was undertaken as part of Draft Plan of Subdivision Application (Map 2) and was conducted as part of the requirements defined in Section 5.4.3 of the *Dysart et al Official Plan*, which requires an archaeological assessment as a condition of development approval in subject lands that are considered to be areas of archaeological potential (Municipality of Dysart et al 2017:50)

The objectives of the Stage 2 archaeological assessment, as outlined by the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries' (MHSTCI) *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011) are as follows:

- To document archaeological resources located on the property
- To determine whether any identified archaeological resources require further assessment
- To recommend Stage 3 assessment strategies for any archaeological sites determined to require additional assessment.

Permission to access the property was provided by the proponent

1.2 Historic Context

1.2.1 Pre-Contact Indigenous History

Table 1 provides a breakdown of the general culture history of northern Ontario, as based on Munson and Jamieson (2013)

Table 1: Pre-Contact Indigenous Culture History of Northern Ontario

Culture Period	Archaeological/Material Culture	Calibrated Dates
Early Paleo-Indian		>11,500 BCE
Late Paleo-Indian		10,500 BCE 9,500 BCE 8,500 BCE
Early Archaic	Lakehead Complex	8,500 BCE 7,500 BCE 6,500 BCE
Middle Archaic		6,500 BCE 5,500 BCE 4,500 BCE 3,500 BCE 2,500 BCE 1,500 BCE 1,000 BCE 600 BCE 200 BCE
Late Archaic	Shield Archaic	
Early Woodland		
Middle Woodland	Laurel	200 BCE 1 CE 200 CE 600 CE 1,000 CE
Late Woodland	Blackduck/Selkirk, Sandy Lake	1,000 CE 1,400 CE 1,400 CE 1,800 CE

1.2.2 Oral History

The following is an excerpt from a collated oral history of the region, as recounted by Gitiga Migizi, a respected Elder and Knowledge Keeper of the Michi Saagiig Nation and provided to Earthworks by Dr. Julie Kapyrka of Curve Lake First Nation:

The traditional homelands of the Michi Saagiig (Mississauga Anishinaabeg) encompass a vast area of what is now known as southern Ontario. The Michi Saagiig are known as “the people of the big river mouths” and were also known as the “Salmon People” who occupied and fished the north shore of Lake Ontario where the various tributaries emptied into the lake. Their territories extended north into and beyond the Kawarthas as winter hunting grounds on which they would break off into smaller social groups for the season, hunting and trapping on these lands, then returning to the lakeshore in spring for the summer months.

The Michi Saagiig were a highly mobile people, travelling vast distances to procure subsistence for their people. They were also known as the “Peacekeepers” among Indigenous nations. The Michi Saagiig homelands were located directly between two very powerful Confederacies: The Three Fires Confederacy to the north and the Haudenosaunee Confederacy to the south. The Michi Saagiig were the negotiators, the messengers, the diplomats, and they successfully mediated peace throughout this area of Ontario for countless generations.

Michi Saagiig oral histories speak to their people being in this area of Ontario for thousands of years. These stories recount the “Old Ones” who spoke an ancient Algonquian dialect. The histories explain that the current Ojibwa phonology is the 5th transformation of this language, demonstrating a linguistic connection that spans back into deep time. The Michi Saagiig of today are the descendants of the ancient peoples who lived in Ontario during the Archaic and Paleo-Indian periods. They are the original inhabitants of southern Ontario, and they are still here today.

The traditional territories of the Michi Saagiig span from Gananoque in the east, all along the north shore of Lake Ontario, west to the north shore of Lake Erie at Long Point. The territory spreads as far north as the tributaries that flow into these lakes, from Bancroft and north of the Haliburton highlands. This also includes all the tributaries that flow from the height of land north of Toronto like the Oak Ridges Moraine, and all of the rivers that flow into Lake Ontario (the Rideau, the Salmon, the Ganaraska, the Moira, the Trent, the Don, the Rouge, the Etobicoke, the Humber, and the Credit, as well as Wilmot and 16 Mile Creeks) through Burlington Bay and the Niagara region including the Welland and Niagara Rivers, and beyond.

Michi Saagiig oral histories also speak to the occurrence of people coming into their territories sometime between 500-1000 A.D. seeking to establish villages and a corn growing economy – these newcomers included peoples that would later be known as the Huron-Wendat, Neutral, Petun/Tobacco Nations. The Michi Saagiig made Treaties with these newcomers and granted them permission to stay with the understanding that they

were visitors in these lands. Wampum was made to record these contracts, ceremonies would have bound each nation to their respective responsibilities within the political relationship, and these contracts would have been renewed annually (see Gitiga Migizi and Kapyrka 2015). These visitors were extremely successful as their corn economy grew as well as their populations. However, it was understood by all nations involved that this area of Ontario were the homeland territories of the Michi Saagiig.

Problems arose for the Michi Saagiig in the 1600s when the European way of life was introduced into southern Ontario. Also, around the same time, the Haudenosaunee were given firearms by the colonial governments in New York and Albany which ultimately made an expansion possible for them into Michi Saagiig territories. There began skirmishes with the various nations living in Ontario at the time. The Haudenosaunee engaged in fighting with the Huron-Wendat and between that and the onslaught of European diseases, the Iroquoian speaking peoples in Ontario were decimated.

The onset of colonial settlement and missionary involvement severely disrupted the original relationships between these Indigenous nations. Disease and warfare had a devastating impact upon the Indigenous peoples of Ontario, especially the large sedentary villages, which mostly included Iroquoian speaking peoples. The Michi Saagiig were largely able to avoid the devastation caused by these processes by retreating to their wintering grounds to the north, essentially waiting for the smoke to clear.

Michi Saagiig Elder Gitiga Migizi (2017) recounts:

“We weren’t affected as much as the larger villages because we learned to paddle away for several years until everything settled down. And we came back and tried to bury the bones of the Huron but it was overwhelming, it was all over, there were bones all over – that is our story.

There is a misnomer here, that this area of Ontario is not our traditional territory and that we came in here after the Huron-Wendat left or were defeated, but that is not true. That is a big misconception of our history that needs to be corrected. We are the traditional people, we are the ones that signed treaties with the Crown. We are recognized as the ones who signed these treaties and we are the ones to be dealt with officially in any matters concerning territory in southern Ontario.

We had peacemakers go to the Haudenosaunee and live amongst them in order to change their ways. We had also diplomatically dealt with some of the strong chiefs to the north and tried to make peace as much as possible. So we are very important in terms of keeping the balance of relationships in harmony.

1.2.3 European Settlement History

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton

The study area enters the historic record in 1615, when Samuel de Champlain arrived at the western boundary of Muskoka, who recorded the inhabitants of the area as Algonquin Aboriginals and who travelled with them in the area to the Nipissing and the Huron (Rogers 1978). Early accounts by European explorers suggest the study area was considered part of a loosely defined overlapping hunting territory associated with the Huron Confederacy and the Nipissing, who inhabited Lake Nipissing approximately 143 kilometres north of the study area (Trigger 1994, Trigger and Day 1994). European influence in the region was generally restricted to the beaver pelt trade, and Indigenous groups practiced a way of life that did not differ significantly from the Pre-Contact period. By the 1640's, the increasing scarcity of beaver pelts prompted the invasion of Huronia by the League of Five Nations Iroquois. By 1649, five Huron villages were destroyed, and the remainder abandoned, resulting in the complete disintegration of the Huron Confederacy and the absorption of their members into the Petun, Neutral and other groups (Stone and Chaput 1978). Additionally, the Nipissing were defeated in a skirmish with the Mohawk in 1653 and relocated west to Lake Nipigon (Day 1978:789). The Nipissing returned to the area in 1667 following a peace agreement between the French and the Mohawk.

There is little evidence to suggest a concentrated period of settlement in the region during the eighteenth century, with Anishinaabeg groups known to traverse through the area practicing traditional hunting and fishing. Following their defeat of the French at the Battle of the Plains of Abraham in 1759, the British began purchasing large tracts of land in Ontario through treaties with the Indigenous communities in the region. The Royal Proclamation of 1763 asserted British sovereignty over the region while declaring the land to be in possession of the Indigenous people who occupied it while establishing the policies for Crown purchase of these lands (Surtees 1994:93). These purchasing efforts were intensified following the conclusion of the American Revolutionary War in 1783 and the War of 1812 in 1814, which saw successive waves of migration of United Empire Loyalists and British settlers into Upper Canada. The current study area forms part of Treaty 20, also known as the Rice Lake Purchase, which ceded possession of nearly one million hectares of land from the Rice Lake Mississauga at Smith's Creek to the British Government in 1818 (Surtees 1994:113).

Haliburton County did not undergo large scale European settlement until the mid-nineteenth century. This began with the construction of the Bobcaygeon colonization road in 1856, and the construction of the Peterson Road which ran through the township of Dudley (Cummings 1963:29). In 1861, the Canadian Land and Emigration Company of London, England was incorporated in order to promote settlement in what would later become Haliburton County. The company invested funds into the area for development and sold lots to potential settlers at reduced rates. In 1865, the company completed their purchase of nine townships in the area including Dysart, Dudley, Harcourt, Guilford, Harburn, Bruton, Havelock, Eyre, and Clyde. The town plot of Haliburton was Surveyed in 1864, and a sawmill was erected in the same year (Emmerson 2015:15). The potential for large scale farming in the area was quickly dismissed by settlers and economic activity and growth in the region became almost entirely dependent on the lumber industry. In order to take advantage of the lumber and mineral potential in the region the Victoria Railway began construction in 1872, and completed its connection to Haliburton in 1875 (Cummings 1963:149).

The official formation of the Provisional County of Haliburton started in 1874, and settlers arrived mainly from the neighbouring Peterborough and Victoria Counties. Haliburton County officially formed in 1983 and currently consists of the Municipalities of Algonquin Highlands, Dysart et al, Highlands East, and Minden Hills.

Harcourt Township was first surveyed in 1860 by James W. Fitzgerald (Mika & Mika 1981:234). The Burleigh Road was constructed in 1864 to encourage settlement in the township, and by 1871 the township population was listed at 61. The lumber industry was the main source of economic activity in the area, with an early sawmill constructed at Kennaway. Kennaway became a regional centre for the area, and immigration into the area improved with the construction of the Irondale, Bancroft & Ottawa Railway through the township in 1890. The township has remained as a low density cottage destination area through to the present day.

1.2.4 Land Use History of Study Area

The study area consists of several lots across Concession 8, 9, 10, and 11. Background research presented in the Stage 1 archaeological assessment report indicates the study area has remained as vacant land through to the present day (AS&G 2021:6)

1.2.5 Historic Plaques

As per Section 1, Standard 1.1 of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*, Earthworks consulted local historical plaques in order to inform archaeological potential and assessment strategies. No local plaques were found which related to the history of the current study area.

1.3 Archaeological Context

1.3.1 Current Conditions

The study area consists of a mixed wooded area with steep slopes leading to several small ponds and streams (Images 1 thru 42).

1.3.2 Natural Environment

The study area is situated within a spillway and shallow till and rock ridges of the Algonquian Highlands, a physiographic region overlaying Precambrian bedrock and granite. It mostly consists of a shallow horizon of acidic, sandy and stony soil, with frequent valleys floored with outwash sand and gravel or covered in swampland (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 211). The surficial geology consists of a mix of silty sand till, interstratified complex of sand and gravel, and undifferentiated deposits of sand, silt, and clay. The soil of the study area consists of rock and Monteagle Sandy Loam, an excessively stony, well-drained Podzol which developed on glacio-fluvial outwash sand (Hoffman *et al.* 1964).

The nearest water source is Elephant Lake, the York River, and Benoir Lake located along the western and southern edges of the study area. This area forms part of the Upper Madawaska watershed which drains into the Ottawa River approximately 125 kilometres to the northeast of the study area.

The study area is located within the Algonquin Park District of the Georgian Bay Ecozone, which itself is situated on the southern part of the Ontario Shield Ecozone. This region encompasses 7,447,869 hectares, and contains a diverse array of flora and fauna. It is characterized by a mix of eastern white pine, red pine, eastern hemlock, and yellow birch, in addition to sugar maple, American beech, wild black cherry, American basswood, and white ash in the southern part of the region.

Representative fauna include little brown bat, American black bear, moose, fisher, North American river otter, beaver, common loon, osprey, broad-winged hawk, ruby-throated hummingbird, pileated woodpecker, yellow-bellied sapsucker, winter wren, veery, Blackburnian warbler, black-throated blue warbler, yellow-rumped warbler, scarlet tanager, rose-breasted grosbeak, red-spotted newt, northern two-lined salamander, four-toed salamander, gray treefrog, pickerel frog, American bullfrog, snapping turtle, smooth greensnake, and northern ring-necked snake. In the numerous lakes and rivers, fish such as lake trout, brook trout, lake whitefish, yellow perch, walleye, bluegill, rock bass, brown bullhead, bluntnose minnow, northern redbelly dace, and golden shiner are found.

(Crins et al. 2009:40-41)

1.3.3 Known Archaeological Sites

A search of registered archaeological sites within the MHSTCI Archaeological Sites Database was conducted. BhGm-1 is located within one kilometre of the study area, and is listed as a Euro-Canadian logging site.

1.3.4 Previous Archaeological Assessments

The study area was previously subject to a Stage 1 archaeological assessment in 2021 under PIF #: P124-0049-2021. The results of the background research indicated the study area contained archaeological potential, and a Stage 2 archaeological assessment was recommended (AS&G 2021)

2.0 Field Methods

The Stage 2 archaeological assessment of the study area was conducted between November 3, 2021 and July 20, 2022 under PIF #: P1037-0082-2021, issued to Michael Golloher, M.Sc. (P1037). The weather during the survey was a mix of sun and cloud and mild. At no time were weather or lighting conditions detrimental to the observation or recovery of archaeological material.

Due the location of the study area in northern Ontario the test pit strategy followed Section 2.1.5 of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. As a result, a 50 metre zone bordering the edges of the existing lakes, as well as several small feeder ponds, feeder creeks and wetlands in the middle of the study area, was test pitted at maximum intervals of 5 metres apart, accounting for 23% of the study area (Images 45 thru 51). Approximately 6% of the 50 metre zone of archaeological potential was not assessed due to the presence of steep slope in excess of 20° that does not require archaeological assessment under Section 2.1, Standard 2(a)iii of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*.

The remaining 77% of the study area was not assessed due to permanent inundation and low archaeological potential.

Each test pit was excavated by hand to 30 cm in diameter and were excavated into the first 5 centimetres of subsoil. Test pit depth averaged 15 cm. Each test pit was examined for stratigraphy, cultural features, or evidence of fill, and all soil was screened through wire mesh of 6 millimetre width. All test pits were backfilled. The soil consisted of a light brown sand topsoil horizon over an orange-brown sand subsoil (Image 46). No archaeological material was identified during the course of the survey.

The results of the Stage 2 archaeological survey are presented in Maps 3 thru 5.

3.0 Record of Finds

Table 2 provides an inventory of the documentary record generated in the field

Table 2 Information Inventory of Documentary Record

Document	Location	Description
Field Notes	Earthworks Office Project File	1 page of notes
Photographs	Earthworks Office Project File	160 digital photographs,
Field Map	Earthworks Office Project File	1 page

4.0 Analysis and Conclusions

A Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment was conducted on a 284.8 hectare area on part of Lots 27 – 30, Concession 10 & 11, Part of Lots 27 & 28, Concession 9, and Part of Lots 27 – 31, Concession 8, Geographic Township of Harcourt, Municipality of Dysart et al, Haliburton County, Ontario. A Stage 2 test pit survey was conducted between November 3, 2021 and July 20, 2022.

The Stage 2 archaeological survey did not yield any evidence of archaeological material. As a result, no additional archaeological assessments are required.

5.0 Recommendations

Based on the results of the Stage 1 background investigation and the subsequent Stage 2 test pit survey, the study area is considered to be free of archaeological material. Therefore, no additional archaeological assessments are recommended.

The MHSTCI is requested to review this report and provide a letter indicating their satisfaction that the fieldwork and reporting for this archaeological assessment are consistent with the Ministry's 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* and the terms and conditions for archaeological licences, and to enter this report into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports.

6.0 Advice on Compliance with Legislation

This report is submitted to the Ministry of Heritage Sport Tourism and Culture Industries 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 Heritage Sport Tourism and Culture Industries, a letter will be issued by the ministry stating that there are no further concerns with regard to alterations to archaeological sites by the proposed development.

It is an offence under Sections 48 and 69 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* for any party other than a licensed archaeologist to make any alteration to a known archaeological site or to remove any artifact or other physical evidence of past human use or activity from the site, until such time as a licensed archaeologist has completed fieldwork on the site, submitted a report to the Minister stating that the site has no further cultural heritage value or interest, and the report has been filed in the Ontario Public Register of Archaeology Reports referred to in Section 65.1 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Should previously undocumented archaeological resources be discovered, they may be a new archaeological site and therefore subject to Section 48(1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The proponent or person discovering the archaeological resources must cease alteration of the site immediately and engage a licensed consultant archaeologist to carry out archaeological fieldwork, in compliance with Section 48(1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

The *Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act*, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33 (when proclaimed in force) require that any person discovering human remains must notify the police or coroner and the Registrar of Cemeteries at the Ministry of Consumer Services.

7.0 References

AS&G (AS&G Archaeological Consulting)

2021 *Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Elephant Lake Waterfront Residence Development, Parts or Whole of Lots 32 and 33, Concession 12, Lots 27-31, Concession 11, Lots 27-31, Concession 10, Lots 27-33, Concession 9, and Lots 27-31, Concession 8, Harcourt Township, County of Haliburton, Municipality of Dysart et al, Ontario.* Report on file with the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries, Toronto.

Chapman, Lyman John and Donald F. Putnam

1984 *The Physiography of Southern Ontario.* 3rd edition. Ontario Geological Survey Special Volume 2. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Toronto.

Conner, J. C

1869 *The County of Peterborough Directory for 1870-71.* J.C Conner; Toronto.

Crins, William J., Gray, Paul A., Uhlig, Peter W.C., and Monique C. Wester

2009 *The Ecosystems of Ontario, Part 1: Ecozones and Ecoregions.* Technical Report, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Science & Information Branch.

Cummings, H.R.

1963 *Early Days in Haliburton.* The Ontario Department of Lands and Forests, Toronto.

Government of Ontario

2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists.* Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, Culture Division, Programs and Services Branch, Culture Programs Unit, Toronto.

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

1964 *Soil Associations of Southern Ontario.* Ontario Soil Survey Report No. 30.

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton

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

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

Municipality of Dysart et al.

2017 *Official Plan Municipality of Dysart et al.* Available Online
<<https://www.dysartetal.ca/en/build-and-invest/Planning%20Resources/Dysart%20Official%20Plan.pdf>>

Surtees, Robert J.

1994 Land Cessions, 1763-1830. In *Aboriginal Ontario*, Edward S. Rogers and Donald B. Smith (eds.). Dundurn Press, Toronto.

8.0 Images



Image 1: Study Area Conditions. Facing Southeast.



Image 2: Study Area Conditions. Facing South.

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 3: Study Area Conditions. Facing East.



Image 4: Study Area Conditions. Facing Northwest.

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 5: Study Area Conditions. Facing Southwest.



Image 6: Study Area Conditions. Facing West.

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 7: Study Area Conditions. Facing Northeast.



Image 8: Study Area Conditions. Facing East.

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 9: Study Area Conditions. Facing West.



Image 10: Study Area Conditions. Facing West.

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 11: Study Area Conditions. Facing Southwest.



Image 12: Study Area Conditions. Facing North.

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 13: Study Area Conditions. Facing South.



Image 14: Study Area Conditions. Facing East.



Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 15: Study Area Conditions. Facing East.



Image 16: Study Area Conditions. Facing East.

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 17: Study Area Conditions. Facing Southeast.



Image 18: Study Area Conditions. Facing Northwest.

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 19: Study Area Conditions. Facing South.



Image 20: Study Area Conditions. Facing North.

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 21: Study Area Conditions. Facing East.



Image 22: Study Area Conditions. Facing Southeast.



Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 23: Study Area Conditions. Facing East.



Image 24: Study Area Conditions. Facing Northeast.



Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 25: Study Area Conditions. Facing Southeast.



Image 26: Study Area Conditions. Facing West.

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 27: Study Area Conditions. Facing Northwest.



Image 28: Study Area Conditions. Facing West.

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 29: Study Area Conditions. Facing South.



Image 30: Study Area Conditions. Facing Southeast.

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 31: Study Area Conditions. Facing Northeast.



Image 32: Study Area Conditions. Facing Northwest.

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 33: Study Area Conditions. Facing North.



Image 34: Study Area Conditions. Facing Southeast.

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 35: Study Area Conditions. Facing North.



Image 36: Study Area Conditions. Facing Southwest.

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 37: Study Area Conditions. Facing Southwest.



Image 38: Study Area Conditions. Facing Northwest.

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 39: Study Area Conditions. Facing South.



Image 40: Study Area Conditions. Facing East.



Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 41: Study Area Conditions. Facing Northeast.



Image 42: Study Area Conditions. Facing West.

Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton



Image 43: Test Pit Survey in Progress. Facing Northwest.



Image 44: Test Pit Survey in Progress. Facing West.



Image 45: Test Pit Survey in Progress. Facing North.






Image 46: Open Test Pit showing Subsurface Stratigraphy.

9.0 Maps



Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
 Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
 Elephant Lake
 Haliburton




Legend

Study Area


Reference:
 Canvec Data. Scale 1:50000
 Ontario Basic Mapping. Scale 1:10000
 Esri Basemap

Map 1: Regional Map

**Earthworks Archaeological Services Inc.
Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment
Elephant Lake
Haliburton**



Map 2: Site Plan




Legend

- Study Area
- 50 Metre Zone of Archaeological Potential
- Area Subject to Stage 2 Test Pit Survey at 5 metre Intervals
- Area of Steep Slope - Not Assessed
- Area of Permanent Inundation - Not Assessed
- Area of Low Archaeological Potential - Not Assessed

Reference:
Esri Basemap

**Map 3: Stage 2
Assessment Results**




Legend

- Study Area
- 50 Metre Zone of Archaeological Potential
- Area Subject to Stage 2 Test Pit Survey at 5 metre Intervals
- Area of Low Archaeological Potential - Not Assessed
- Area of Steep Slope - Not Assessed
- Area of Permanent Inundation - Not Assessed
- Photo Location and Direction

Reference:
Esri Basemap

**Map 4: Stage 2
Assessment Results**



Legend

- Study Area
- 50 Metre Zone of Archaeological Potential
- Area Subject to Stage 2 Test Pit Survey at 5 metre Intervals
- Area of Low Archaeological Potential - Not Assessed
- Area of Permanent Inundation - Not Assessed
- Area of Steep Slope - Not Assessed
- Photo Location and Direction

Reference:
Esri Basemap

**Map 5: Stage 2
Assessment Results**