



**NORTHLAND
POWER**

Glendale Solar Project

Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment

October, 2011

Disclaimer

This report has been prepared by or on behalf of Northland Power Inc. for submission to the Ontario Ministry of the Environment as part of the Renewable Energy Approval process. The content of this report is not intended for the use of, nor is it intended to be relied upon by, any other person. Neither Northland Power Inc. nor any of its directors, officers, employees, agents or consultants has any liability whatsoever for any loss, damage or injury suffered by any third party arising out of, or in connection with, their use of this report.



97 Gatewood Road, Kitchener, ON N2M 4E3
Tel: (519) 835-4427
Fax: (519) 954-4797
248 Ruby St., Midland, ON L4R 2L4
Tel: (705) 526-9518
Fax: (705) 526-4541

**Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment
Glendale Solar Project
(FIT –FAH1BFV)
Township of South Glengarry
United Counties of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry**

Prepared for
Hatch Ltd.
4342 Queen Street, Suite 500, Niagara Falls, ON, L2E 7J7
Tel: (905) 374-0701 ext. 5313 Fax: (905) 374-1157
&
The Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture

By
P. Hoskins, B.A. and T. Stilling, M.A.
Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.
97 Gatewood Road, Kitchener, ON N2M 4E3
Tel: (519) 835-4427 Fax: (519) 954-4797

Reviewed by
P.J. Racher, M.A. CAHP
Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture Licence# P-007
Project # P007-245
PIF# P007-245-2010

August 2010
Revised January 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction	1
2.0	Location	1
3.0	Geography	4
4.0	Archaeological Potential	4
5.0	Previous Archaeological Research	5
6.0	Historic Land Use Summary	5
7.0	Field Methods	11
8.0	Results and Recommendations	15
9.0	References Cited	22
	Appendix A: Project Drawing	26
	Appendix B: Artifact Registry	27
List of Figures		
	Figure 1: Location of Study Area in the Province of Ontario	2
	Figure 2: Location of Study Area in the Township of South Glengarry	2
	Figure 3: Study Area in Detail	3
	Figure 4: Section from Belden’s <i>Illustrated Historical Atlas of the Counties of Stormont, Dundas, and Glengarry</i> (1879)	11
List of Plates		
	Plate 1: View of Soil Conditions at the Time of Survey	12
	Plate 2: View of Crew Members Performing Pedestrian Survey at 5m Intervals	13
	Plate 3: View of Crewmembers Test Pitting at 5 Metre Intervals	13
	Plate 4: View of Crewmember Screening through 6mm Mesh	14
	Plate 5: Typical Test Pit, Excavated to Subsoil	14
	Plate 6: View of Swamps	15
	Plate 7: View of Gravel Fill	16
	Plate 8: Sample of Glass, Plastic and Ceramic Artifacts from Findspot 1	17
	Plate 9: Sample of Diagnostic Artifacts from Findspot 2	18
	Plate 10: Sample of Artifacts from Findspot 3	19
	Plate 11: Sample of Artifacts from Findspot 4	20

Executive Summary:

Under a contract awarded in May of 2010, **Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. (ARA)** carried out a Stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessment of the proposed **Glendale Solar Project** on Part Lots 15 and 16, Concession 5 and Part Lot 16, Concession 6, in the Township of South Glengarry, United Counties of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, Ontario. This work was completed under contract to **Hatch Ltd.** in advance of a Renewable Energy Act (REA) application.

The Stage 1 and 2 assessment was conducted in July of 2010. Research indicated a high potential for the presence of both pre-Contact and Historic-era archaeological sites in the study area. In advance of field work, legal *Permission to Enter* (PTE) was granted by the property owner. During the study, 4 potentially significant Historic-era findspots were identified. In consultations between ARA, the proponent and MTC, it was determined that the findspots could be protected by avoidance and buffering. Accordingly, it is recommended that the project be allowed to proceed without further heritage concerns.

Personnel:

Project Director: P.J. Racher, M.A., CAHP, MCL Licence #P-007

Project Manager: P.J. Racher

Field Director: H. Brown, MCL Licence #R-217

Field Work: H. Brown, V. Hicks, S. Knight, J. Landry, M. Nichols, J. Parker, S. Parker, A. Ray, A. Wong

Photographer: H. Brown

Background Research: A. Wong

Report Preparation: P. Hoskins, T. Stilling

Graphics: P. Hoskins

Acknowledgements:

Special thanks for his generous and timely research assistance are extended to Mr. Robert Von Bitter, Archaeological Data Coordinator, Archaeology Unit, Heritage Branch, Ontario Ministry of Culture, Toronto.

1.0 Introduction

Under a contract awarded in May of 2010, **Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. (ARA)** carried out a Stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessment of the proposed **Glendale Solar Project** in the Township of South Glengarry, United Counties of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, Ontario. This assessment was conducted in July of 2010 under licence# P-007, PIF # P007-245-2010. The work was completed under contract to **Hatch Ltd.** as a component of the screening process outlined in **Ontario Regulation 359/09**, which governs **Renewable Energy Approvals** under the provincial **Environmental Protection Act (EPA)**. The archaeological assessment was carried out in order to:

- Identify any known archaeological sites that might be found near or within the study area;
- Empirically determine the presence of any unknown archaeological resources which may be extant within the study area; and
- If identified, suggest appropriate strategies for the protection and management of these sites.

The assessment was carried out in accordance with the provisions of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (A.S.O. 1990), and *Draft Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Ministry of Tourism and Culture 2009). All records pertaining to this assessment are currently housed in a storage facility located at Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.'s office at 97 Gatewood Road in Kitchener, Ontario.

The Ministry of Tourism and Culture is asked to review the results and recommendations presented in this report.

2.0 Location

The study area is a 45 ha parcel of land, located east of Headline Road (County Road 44), in the Township of South Glengarry, United Counties of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, Ontario (see Figures 1-3). Irregular in shape, it is legally described as being located on Part Lots 15 and 16, Concession 5, and Part Lot 16, Concession 6, of the Township of South Glengarry, United Counties of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, Ontario.

The nearest potable water source is the Glen Fallon Drain, an artificial flow located approximately 300 metres north of study area. A beaver pond, what appeared to be a dry creek bed, and 5 small swampy areas were also noted within the limits of the study area (see Figure 3).




Figure 1: Location of Study Area in the Province of Ontario




Figure 2: Location of Study Area in the Township of South Glengarry




Figure 3: Study Area in Detail

3.0 Geography

It has long been understood that environment plays a key role in determining site location, particularly in small societies with non-complex, subsistence-oriented economies. The local environment of the study area lies within the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Forest. The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Forest is a transitional zone between the southern deciduous forest and coniferous boreal forest. Vegetation here consists of a mixture of coniferous trees, such as eastern white pine, red pine, eastern hemlock and white cedar, and deciduous trees, such as yellow birch, sugar and red maple basswood and red oak (MNR 2009). In the upper Great Lakes region it is believed that the First Nations used some 500 plant species as food, food flavourings, drinks, medicines, building materials, fibres, dyes, and basketry (Mason 1981: 59). As such, it is clear that vegetation played an important role in the site selection processes employed by pre-Contact Aboriginal groups. Furthermore, this vegetation served as home and food for a wide range of game animals such as white tailed deer, turkey, passenger pigeon, cottontail rabbit, elk, muskrat, and beaver (Ibid:60).

Physiographically, the study area is located in the Glengarry Till Plain. It is a region of low relief forming the drainage divide between the St Lawrence and the Ottawa basin (Chapman and Putnam 1984: Map). The landscape is undulating to rolling, consisting of morainic ridges and well-formed drumlins with clay flats and swamps (Ibid: 201). The soils of the area include Muck, Bottom Land, Grenville Loam, and Matilda Loam (Matthews, Richards & Wicklund 1957:Map).

4.0 Archaeological Potential

The archaeological potential of the study area was assessed using its soils, hydrology and landforms as considerations. Young et al. (1995) note that, "*either the number of streams and/or stream order is always a significant factor in the positive prediction of site presence*" (1995:23). They further note that certain types of landforms, such as moraines, seem to have been favoured by different groups throughout prehistory (Ibid:33). According to several researchers, such as Janusas (1988:1), "*The location of early settlements tended to be dominated by the proximity to reliable and potable water resources.*" Site potential modeling studies (Peters 1986; Pihl 1986) have found that most prehistoric archaeological sites are located within 300 metres of remnant or extant water sources.

While many of these studies do not go into detail as to the basis for this pattern, Young et al. (1995) suggest that the presence of streams is a significant attractor for a host of plant, game, and fish species which in turn encourage human settlement in an area. Conversely, it must be understood that non-habitational sites (e.g. burials, lithic quarries, kill sites, etc.) may be located anywhere. Potential modeling appears to break down when it comes to these idiosyncratic sites,

many of which have more significance than their habitation counterparts as a result of their relative rarity.

With the development of integrated 'complex' economies in the Historic (or Euro-Canadian) era, settlement tended to become less dependent upon local resource production and more tied to wider economic networks. As such, proximity to transportation routes became the most significant predictor of site location. In the early Historic era (pre-1850), when transport by water was the norm, sites tended to be situated along major rivers and creeks - the 'highways' of their day. With the opening of the interior of the Province to settlement after about 1850, sites tended to be located along historically-surveyed roads.

Bearing these factors in mind, it is clear that the study area would have a high potential for containing pre-Contact sites; largely due to the presence of several permanently-wet areas on the property. The property's potential for Historic-era sites is similarly high given that Belden's *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the Counties of Stormont, Dundas, and Glengarry* (1879) shows a structure present on Lot 16, Concession 5 (see Section 6 below).

5.0 Previous Archaeological Research

An archival search was conducted using the Ontario Ministry of Culture Archaeological Sites Database in order to determine the presence of any registered heritage resources which might be located on or within a 2 kilometre radius of the study area. It was found that there are no registered sites within these limits. The overall lack of sites in the area is most likely the result of a paucity of research in the area, as opposed to representing any meaningful settlement patterns.

6.0 Historic Land Use Summary

The first settlers in the Region were the Paleo-Indian people who arrived after the retreat of the Wisconsin glaciers, approximately 9,000 B.C. (Warrick 2004:83). For the next 1,500 years or so, the Paleo-Indians lived as hunter-gatherers in the boreal-like landscapes of southern Ontario. Because of the low biotic productivity of this environment, it is believed that human groups ranged over very wide territories in order to live sustainably (Ellis & Deller 1990:52). Traditionally, Paleo-Indians have been conceptualized as 'big game hunters' who lived on caribou and other Pleistocene megafauna. However, given the poor preservation of these sites (which are mostly understood only from stone tool and debris from their manufacture), much about the lifeways of these people remains unknown (Ibid.:38). In general, the impacts that humans left on their environment at these times were small (less than 200 square metres), ephemeral, and fleeting (Ibid.:51).

Beginning around 8,000 B.C., the biotic productivity of the environment began to increase as the climate warmed and the watershed was colonized by deciduous forest. As a result, more opportunities arose for the exploitation of both animal and plant food sources. The resulting broad-based economy was the basis for the archaeological cultures that are referred to as 'Archaic'. During this period (roughly 8,000 B.C. – 800 B.C.), there was an explosion in the number and variety of raw materials, tool forms, site types, and the number of sites themselves. Because Archaic sites are more recent than Paleo-Indian ones, preservation tends to be better. Artifacts composed of bone, shell, and even wood are not unheard of. During the late Archaic period, heavy wood-working tools appear, suggesting that people were building shelters or other objects, such as transportation aids (Ellis et al. 1990:66-67). It is clear from the toolkits that have been unearthed that Archaic peoples had an encyclopaedic understanding of the environment that they inhabited. The number and density of the sites that have been found suggest that the environment was exploited in a successful and sustainable way over a considerable period of time. The success of Archaic lifeways is attested to by clear evidence of steady population increases over time. Eventually, these increases set the stage for the final period of Pre-Contact occupation – the Woodland Period (Ibid.).

The Woodland Period began around 800 B.C. and is characterized by the appearance of pottery. Along the St. Lawrence River, two Early Woodland (800 B.C. – 0 A.D.) sites belonging to the so-called Meadowood Complex have been identified. Pointe-du-Buisson, near Montreal, and Ault Park, on Sheek Island near Cornwall, overlooked major rapids on the St. Lawrence. They were most likely seasonally occupied in order to take advantage of the spawning runs on the river (Spence et al. 1990: 135). It is believed that hunting, fishing and gathering remained the primary subsistence strategy and that further population growth took place as subsistence strategies grew more refined, and more successful. At the Terminal Archaic/Early Woodland transition, the first cemeteries appear, suggesting a communal regard for the dead and burial ceremonialism (Ibid).

The Middle Woodland period (roughly 0 A.D. - 500 A.D.) saw the emergence of the Point Peninsula Complex, stretching from south-central Ontario to Quebec (Ibid:157). The Ault Park site near Cornwall is the only example of a Point Peninsula site near the study area. The site is characterized by an abundance of pseudo-scallop and dentate stamped ceramics (Ibid: 163). It is suggested that the people of this complex lived in large macroband sites on lakeshores and rivers during the spring, summer, and fall; probably with an emphasis on fishing. During the winter, they would disperse into microbands and live on stored food and occasional hunting (Ibid: 164).

During the Middle to Late Woodland transition (ca. A.D. 400) the first rudimentary evidence of maize (corn) horticulture appears in Ontario. In Eastern Ontario, the Ault Park site shows a cultural continuity from the Point Peninsula Complex to the later archaeological cultures (Ibid 187). During the Late Woodland Period (roughly A.D. 1000 to A.D. 1650) maize horticulture allowed for population increases which in turn lead to larger settlement sizes, higher population densities, and increased social complexity among the peoples involved. Beginning around A.D.

1000, early Iroquoians were living in small villages comprised of a number of longhouses, producing pottery with decorated incised rims, and using pipes to smoke tobacco. Essentially, the lifeways that were observed by the first Europeans to venture into the area were in place by this time. By 1450, it is possible to differentiate between the archaeologically-represented groups that would become the Huron, Neutral, and St. Lawrence Iroquois of the early Contact period (Ibid.:446).

The St Lawrence Iroquois were organized in six regional clusters, with the group on the upper St. Lawrence River at the west end of Lake St. Francis being closest to the study area (Jamieson 1990: 396). Their material culture and settlement patterns are similar to that of the other Iroquoian groups in Ontario, particularly the Huron (Ibid: 389). Our understanding of the St. Lawrence Iroquois is hampered by an inability to define and agree on its chronology (Ibid: 401).

The Early Contact Period

Jacques Cartier was the first European to travel the St. Lawrence River in 1534. Here he encountered 300 St. Lawrence Iroquoians at the tip of the Gaspé Peninsula. Cartier travelled further up the St. Lawrence River the following year. He encountered two permanent settlements at the present locations of Quebec City and Montreal. Cartier's accounts of the people are the only accounts of the St. Lawrence Iroquois at the time of contact (Ibid: 385). When Samuel de Champlain came to the St. Lawrence in 1603 the St. Lawrence Iroquois had disappeared and the land was occupied by Algonquian speaking people (The Contact Period 2010). The disappearance of the St. Lawrence Iroquois has been attributed to the introduction of European disease and warfare with other Native groups. It has been suggested that the St. Lawrence Iroquois were attacked and dispersed by the New York Iroquois. (Jamison 1990: 403). The St. Lawrence Iroquois refugees proceeded to join with the Huron and Algonquians. A large population influx on Huron sites in the Trent Valley is indicated by a large number of St. Lawrence Iroquoian ceramics recovered solely from areas of village expansion (Ibid: 403).

The first European to venture into what would become southern Ontario was Etienne Brulé, who was sent by Samuel de Champlain to visit the area and to learn the language and customs of the First Nations there. Champlain himself made two trips to Ontario, first in 1613 and later from 1615 to 1616 (Vaugeois et al. 2004:182). The Iroquoian peoples encountered by Champlain included the Huron (or Wendat as they called themselves), the Petun, and "la nation neutre" (the Neutrals). While the former groups were concentrated in the northern part of Simcoe County and the Grey-Bruce region respectively, the Neutrals occupied the territory immediately west of Lake Ontario and across the Niagara Peninsula.

The first half of the 17th Century saw a marked increase in trading contacts between the First Nations and European colonists. It also led to increasing factionalism and tension between the First Nations as different groups vied for control of the lucrative fur trade. In what would

become Ontario, the Wendat (Huron), the Petun (Tobacco), and their Anishnabeg trading partners allied themselves with the French. In what would become New York State, the League of the Haudenosaunee, often referred to as the Six Nations (which included the Mohawk, Cayuga, Onondaga, Oneida, Seneca, and Tuscarora Nations) allied themselves with the English. Interposed between the belligerents, the Neutral Nation declined to align itself with either group. Tensions boiled over in 1649. The resulting conflict led to demise of the Neutral Nation as a distinct cultural entity and the dispersal of the Wendat and Petun Nations (Lennox & Fitzgerald 1990:456, Ramsden 1990:384). The remnants of the latter settled in Quebec (the modern-day community of Wendake), near lake St. Claire (where they were known as the Wyandot), and in the area of Michilimackinac. Many were probably adopted into the nations of the Haudenosaunee (Ibid.). By 1651, most of southern Ontario was little more than the underpopulated hunting grounds of the Six Nations Iroquois (Lajeunesse 1960:xxxii).

The land tenure vacuum that was created by the dispersal of the Wendat and Neutral Nations allowed Algonkian-speaking Anishinabeg peoples to migrate to the north shores of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario by about AD 1700. Europeans called these people the “Mississaugas”, mistaking the name of a single clan (the *Ma-se-sau-gee*) for that of the entire group (Smith 2002b: 107). At this time, Haudenosaunee settlements appear to have contracted back into New York state, possibly due to fur trade-related tensions between the League and their Anishnabeg neighbours (Warrick 2005:1).

The Historic Era

Throughout the 1700’s and early 1800’s, Anishinabeg peoples hunted, fished, gardened and camped across southern Ontario, but the footprint left by these people on the landscape they inhabited was exceedingly light. Archaeological sites dating to this time period are both rare and difficult to detect (Warrick 2005:1).

The Mississaugas had been stalwart allies of the French during the 7 Years War. After 1760, they forged a new alliance with the English. This relationship endured the English defeat at the end of the American War of Independence (1775-1783) and set the tone for the refugee movement of the United Empire Loyalists and the Six Nations into Canada (Smith 2002b:109).

The Constitutional Act (sometimes called the Canada Act) of 1791 created the Provinces of Upper Canada and Lower Canada (Craig 1993:17). John Graves Simcoe, the first Lieutenant Governor of the Province, initiated several schemes to populate and protect the newly-created province as the ongoing threat of war with the United States required the borders to be populated quickly. A settlement strategy that relied on the creation of shoreline communities and effective transportation links between the settlements was employed. In 1792, the first legislature of Upper Canada changed the names of the Districts to Eastern, Midland, Home and Western respectively (Walker 1939:90).

Glengarry County

The first settlers of Glengarry County were United Empire Loyalists who left the United States following the American Revolution. In anticipation of their arrival, Governor General Haldimand ordered new townships to be laid out along the St. Lawrence River. Samuel Holland, the Surveyor General for Canada, was tasked with this responsibility. Holland delegated the work to several surveyors, one of whom, Patrick McNiff, surveyed what would become Glengarry County in 1784 (MacGillivray 1979:6). That same year, settlers began arriving in the county.

Following the War of 1812, many building projects were begun to fortify eastern Ontario. These included the Rideau Canal and the Grenville canals which employed many Glengarry men during the 19th century (MacGillivray 1979:303).

The development of the county was aided by its position on the direct route between Toronto and Montreal. This ensured that people would be passing through at all times of the year and that roads were necessary (MacGillivray 1979:283). This was fortunate since road building was difficult due to the number of swamps found within the county (Ibid: 284). In general however, the population of Glengarry has changed little over the last century; ranging from 22,447 inhabitants in 1891, to 19,270 in 1976, and 23,515 in 2006 (MacGillivray 1979:2, Glengarry County 2010).

The Township of Charlottenburgh

South Glengarry Township was originally named Charlottenburgh Township, and was one of the first to be surveyed by Patrick McNiff in 1784 (MacGillivray 1979:6). It too was first settled by United Empire Loyalists. A 1784 report indicated that the Township was home to 36 men, 15 women and 39 children. Two years later, approximately 500 Scottish settlers made their homes in Charlottenburgh (South Glengarry Township 2010; Lankan 2010). Fur-traders of the North West Company also settled here during the late 18th Century and early 19th Century (Lankan 2010).

French-Canadian immigrants from Quebec moved into the area at the start of the 19th century. Throughout the 19th Century, the agricultural, forestry and potash industries were dominant in the County. Further commercial prosperity hit Charlottenburgh in 1855, after a Grand Trunk Railway station opened. As the 1800s came to an end, the town had become famous for its cheese making and for buggy manufacture (Lankan 2010).

Historical land records categorize the lots of the study area as “Indian Land Reservation”. These “Indian Lands” were given to the First Nations of St. Regis who claimed a large portion of the north shore of the St. Lawrence River, where the government was planning to relocate the United

Empire Loyalists. However, while this land was set aside for the Aboriginal group, no formal deed or grant was given to them and, for their purposes, the land was unsuitable for hunting or settlement. Accordingly, they began leasing the land to settlers instead. In 1809, the Indian Lands were resurveyed by Jeremiah McCarthy (MacGillivray 1979: 24-26).

The following is a summary of the land use for the individual lots on which the study area falls.

Lot 15, Concession 5

The original Crown patent holders of this lot, dating to the period of 1849-1851, were B. Clark, John MacKay and John Cain. The western half was owned by B. Clark and the eastern half by John MacKay. A small southern strip was owned by John Cain (Belden & Co. 1879). The McKay family deeded their land to the Cain family in 1897. The Cain family continued to own this land until at least 2005. The southern 50 acres of the Cain land, however, was deeded to the Grant family (Millard Grant and Sons Farm Inc.) in 1959.

Lot 16, Concession 5

This land was patented to the Clark and Cain families by the Crown in 1849 and 1851 respectively. In 1879, this lot was owned by B. Clark with the exception of a small portion, which was owned by John Cain (Belden & Co. 1879). The Cain family continued to own this land until at least 2005.

Lot 16, Concession 6

According to the 1879 county maps, Hugh McLaren owned the northern part of this lot, while P. McKay owned the smaller southern part (Belden & Co. 1879). In 1897, the McKay property was deeded to John Cain. The McLaren land was deeded to William David Watters in 1919. Watters' land was sold to the Cameron family in 1957, who then sold it to Wilfred Taillon 1966.




Figure 4: Section from Belden's *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the Counties of Stormont, Dundas, and Glengarry* (1879)

7.0 Field Methods

Given that the study area was comprised of both ploughed lands and areas not under cultivation, it was necessary to utilize both the pedestrian survey method and the test pitting method.

In areas that were under cultivation (see Plate 1), the study area was assessed using the pedestrian survey method. In this strategy, crewmembers traversed the study area along parallel transects established at intervals of either 5 or 10 metres, depending upon the archaeological potential of the property. In this case, the subject property was felt to have a high archaeological potential and, as such, was surveyed at 5 metre intervals (see Plate 2). If cultural materials were encountered in the course of the survey, the transect interval would be closed to 1 metre and a close inspection of the ground would be conducted for 20 metres in all directions. All identified diagnostic artifacts and a representative sample of non-diagnostic artifacts are collected for analysis. All remaining artifacts are left *in situ* until a proper Stage 3 Controlled Surface Collection (CSC) can be performed.

In areas not under cultivation, Ministry of Tourism and Culture guidelines (Draft 2009) required that the study area be assessed using the test pitting method (sometimes referred to as shovel-testing). In this strategy, small regular ‘test’ pits, 30 cm in diameter, were hand-excavated down to the subsoil level at a prescribed interval of 5 metres (see Plate 3). All soil materials from each pit were screened through 6 mm mesh and examined for the presence of archaeological materials (see Plate 4). All test pits were backfilled upon completion. If cultural materials were encountered in the course of the survey, each positive test pit would be documented. Clustered test pits at a transect interval of 1 metre were excavated in areas of high artifact concentrations to further delimit the site. All artifacts recovered from test pits are collected for analysis.

Artifacts that may indicate the presence of significant cultural deposits include bone, charcoal, lithics (stone tools and refuse generated by their production and use), ceramics, glass, and metal. Archaeological features such as pits, foundations, and other non-portable remains may also be detected during a Stage 2 survey. Any archaeological materials encountered are flagged, mapped, photographed and collected for further analysis. Artifact locations are recorded on topographic maps, in field notes and at +/- 5 metres accuracy on a Garmin eTrex Legend, WAAS-enabled GPS (using the **WGS-84** coordinate system). Any artifacts recovered are sent to the ARA office at 97 Gatewood Road in Kitchener, Ontario for processing, cataloguing, analysis and curation. All project photographs, mapping materials, and field notes are stored at the same facility.



Plate 1: View of Soil Conditions at the Time of Survey



Plate 2: View of a Crew Members Performing Pedestrian Survey at 5 Metre Intervals



Plate 3: View of Crew Members Test Pitting at 5 metre Intervals



Plate 4: View of Crew Members Screening through 6mm Mesh



Plate 5: Typical Test Pit, Excavated to Subsoil

8.0 Results and Recommendations

The Stage 2 archaeological assessment of the study area was carried out between July 21st and 29th of 2010. Legal *Permission to Enter* (PTE) and recover artifacts on project lands was granted by the landowner. Key personnel involved during the assessment were P.J. Racher, Project Director; H. Brown, Field Director; and 8 additional crewmembers. Field conditions were excellent with a mixture of sunny and cloudy skies. Soil conditions were dry for screening (see Plates 4 and 5).

In the course of the assessment a beaver pond, a dried creek bed and 5 small swampy areas were identified in the study area (see Plate 6). Two small areas of disturbance were also noted on the property. These were both located at the ends of tractor/farm lanes, that had been topsoil stripped covered in gravel fill (see Plate 7). Areas within 150 m of the permanently wet lands and the dried creek bed were test pitted at 5 m intervals. All other areas were test pitted at 10 m intervals. All cultivated lands were pedestrian surveyed at 5 m intervals (see Figure 3).



Plate 6: View of Swamp



Plate 7: View of Gravel Fill

During the Stage 2 archaeological assessment, 4 findspots which yielded archaeological materials were located. The following is a description of each:

Findspot 1

Description: A historic-era scatter, 10 x 10 m in size, consisting of 50+ surface artifacts.

Location: Towards the southwest corner of the study area, just east of Headline Road.

GPS Co-ordinates: N 45° 05'48.8" W 074° 43'01.6"

Materials Identified: Glass, ceramics, shell button, plastic button, metal machine part.

Diagnostics: Salt glazed coarse stoneware with albany slip interior, Vitrified white earthenware. Salt glazed stoneware with albany slip interior have gray bodies occasionally displaying cobalt decoration. These wares in North America date to between 1840 and 1900 (Hume 1976: 101). Vitrified white earthenware, also known as ironstone, first appeared in the 1840s and gained popularity in the 1870s and 1880s (Adams 1995: 102) until its decline after the 1890s (Carter, Ironstone, ND) (see Plate 8).

Cultural Affiliation: Euro-Canadian, mid to late 19th Century.

Recommendation: Avoidance. Stage 3 assessment if avoidance is not possible.



Plate 8: Sample of Glass, Plastic and Ceramic Artifacts from Findspot 1

(1: Window Glass; 2: Unidentifiable Container Glass; 3: Shell Button; 4: Plastic Button;
5: Vitrified White Earthenware; 6: Porcelain; 7: Salt Glazed Coarse Stoneware)

Findspot 2

Description: This findspot appears as a building on Belden's *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the Counties of Stormont, Dundas, and Glengarry* (1879). The findspot is located on a small knoll and consists of 150+ artifacts, including structural remains (mortar pockets, brick fragments, nails and window glass) in a 25 m by 25 m scatter.

Location: On a small towards the southern limit of the study area.

GPS Co-ordinates: N 45° 05'52.9" W 074° 43'00.0"

Materials Identified: Ceramics, a large bell, a buckle, nails, clock hardware, brick fragments, container glass, window glass.

Diagnostics: Cut nails, coarse stoneware with albany slip, W. & E. Corn ironstone, C. E. Pearson ironstone, brown transfer, blue transfer willow pattern earthenware, unidentifiable blue transfer, stamped earthenware, and hand blown bottle glass. Cut nails are easily distinguished by their rectangular shape. These nails date between 1790s and the late 1880s (Carter 1968) (see Plate 9.5). Coarse stoneware with albany slip dates between 1840 and 1900 (Hume 1976: 101) (see Plate 9.7). W. & E. Corn ironstone potters operated in Burslem and subsequently Longport, England. The Corn Company manufactured pottery between 1864 and 1904 (Sussman 1985:22). The C. E. Pearson potters operated in Cobridge, England between 1853 and 1873 (Sussman 1985:35). Blue transfer earthenware was the most popular transfer colour after the decline of pearlware in the early 19th century, followed by the appearance of black, green, purple, and red in the 1830s and 1840s (Adams 1995:103). Blue willow patterned pearlware first appeared in

1792 and began its decline in 1840 (Richardson, ND). Red and green stamped earthenware dates between 1850 and 1885 (Carter, Refined Earthenwares, ND). One aqua coloured glass fragment was found with a fold out finish. This method dates to just before the 1870s (Lindsey 2010).

Cultural Affiliation: Euro-Canadian, early to late 19th Century.

Recommendation: Avoidance. Stage 3 assessment if avoidance is not possible.



Plate 9: Sample of Diagnostic Artifacts from Findspot 2

(1: Brown Transfer Whiteware; 2: Blue Willow; 3: Stamped Whiteware; 4: Pearson Ironstone; 5: Cut Nail; 6: Blown Glass; 7: Salt Glazed Coarse Stoneware; 8: W. & E. Corn Ironstone)

Findspot 3

Description: A historic-era scatter, 10 x 15 m in size, consisting of 35 artifacts.

Location: Towards the southern limit of the study area, southeast of Findspot 2.

GPS Co-ordinates: N 45° 05'52.6" W 074° 42'57.2"

Materials Identified: Ceramic, glass, a Jew's harp.

Diagnostics: Blue and green edgeware.

One fragment of blue edgeware was found with embossed patterns, a feature which is dated to between 1820 and 1840 (Carter, Chronology of Shell Edge Styles, ND). Green edge pearlware is dated to between 1790 and 1840 (Richardson, ND). One fragment of even-scalloped shell edge

ware was found which is dated between 1800 and 1840 (Carter, Chronology of Shell Edge Styles, ND) (see Plate 10).

Cultural Affiliation: Euro-Canadian, early to mid 19th Century.

Recommendation: Avoidance. Stage 3 assessment if avoidance is not possible.




Plate 10: Sample of Artifacts from Findspot 3

(1: Scalloped Blue Edgeware; 2: Painted Earthenware; 3: Embossed Blue Edgeware; 4: Green Edgeware; 5: Beverage Container Glass; 6: Jew's Harp; 7: Salt Glazed Coarse Stoneware)

Findspot 4

Description: A historic-era scatter of artifacts, a stone lined well and 4 positive test pits within a 25 m by 25 m area. This findspot consisted of 25+ artifacts. The stone lined well, located 5 m south of the field, had an interior diameter of 60 cm.

Location: Located towards the southwest corner of the study area.

GPS Co-ordinates: N 45° 05'56.1" W 074° 42'51.7"

Materials Identified: Ceramics, and pharmaceutical glass.

Diagnostics: Blue and brown transfer earthenware.

Blue transfer earthenware was the first and most popular transfer colour in the early 19th Century followed by black, green, purple, and red in the 1830s and 1840s (Adams 1995: 103) (see Plate 11).

Cultural Affiliation: Euro-Canadian

Recommendation: Avoidance. Stage 3 assessment if avoidance is not possible.



Plate 11: Sample of Artifacts from Findspot 4

(1: Blue Transfer; 2: Blue Transfer; 3: Brown Transfer;
4: Glazed Coarse Red Earthenware; 5: Pharmaceutical Glass)

In sum, Findspots 1-4 have the potential to be archaeologically significant. However, in consultation with the proponent and MTC, it was agreed that the findspots could be protected by a combination of avoidance and a project buffer of 20 m (see Appendix A). As a result, it is recommended that the project be allowed to proceed without further heritage concerns.

This report is filed with the Minister of Tourism and Culture as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c 0.18. The report will be reviewed to ensure that the licenced consultant archaeologist has met the terms and conditions of their archaeological licence, and that the archaeological fieldwork and report recommendations ensure the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario.

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 licenced consultant archaeologist to carry out archaeological fieldwork, in compliance with Section 48 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. This condition provides for the potential for deeply buried or enigmatic local site areas not typically identified in evaluations of potential.

The Cemeteries Act requires that any person discovering human remains must immediately notify the police or coroner and the Registrar of Cemeteries, Ministry of Small Business and Consumer Services. All work in the vicinity of the discovery will be suspended immediately. Other government staff may be contacted as appropriate; however, media contact should not be made in regard to the discovery.

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, except by a person holding an archaeological licence.

9.0 References Cited

Adams, Nick

1995 **Field Manual for Avocational Archaeologists in Ontario**, 2nd Ed. North York, Ontario: The Ontario Archaeological Society Inc.

Belden, H. & Co.

1879 **Illustrated Historical Atlas of the Counties of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry**. Toronto: Belden & Co.

Carter, Trevor

ND **The Artifacts of Historical Archaeology**. General Ceramics, Compiled by Trevor Carter. Courtesy of Dr. John Triggs, Historic Archaeologist, Wilfrid Laurier University.

1968 Nails taken from *Nail Chronology*, by Lee H. Nelson.

1990 Shell Edgeware taken from *Chronology of Shell Edge Styles*, by Miller and Hunter.

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

1984 **The Physiography of Southern Ontario, 3rd Edition**. Toronto: Ontario Geological Survey, Special Volume 2.

Craig, G.M.

1963 **Upper Canada: The Formative Years, 1784-1841**. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited.

Ellis, C.J and D.B. Deller.

1990 **Paleo-Indians** 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. London: Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., pp. 37-74.

Ellis, C.J., I.T. Kenyon, and M.W. Spence.

1990 **The Archaic** 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. London: Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., pp. 65-124.

Fox, William

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. London: Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., pp. 457-474.

Glengarry County

2010 **Community Information.** Located online at:
http://www.glengarrycounty.ca/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=63&Itemid=17

Hume, Noel

1976 **A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America.** New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Janusas, S.E.

1988 **The Cultural Implication of Drainage in the Municipality of Waterloo.** Kitchener: Regional Municipality of Waterloo.

Lajeunesse, Ernest J.

1960 **The Windsor Border Region: Canada's Southernmost Frontier, A Collection of Documents.** Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Lankan, Dane

2010 **A Brief History of Glengarry.** Glengarry Historical Society. Located online at:
http://www.glengarryhistoricalsociety.com/GHS/Glengarry_History.html

Lindsey, Bill

2010 **Historic Glass Bottle Identification and Information Website, *The Society of Historical Archaeology.*** Located online at: <http://www.sha.org/bottle/index.htm>.

MacGillivray, Royce and Ewan Ross

1979 **A History of Glengarry.** Belleville: Mika Publishing Company.

Mason, R.J.

1981 **Great Lakes Archaeology.** New York: Academic Press.

Matthews, B.C., Richards, N.R., and R.E. Wicklund

1957 **Soil Surveys of Glengarry County.** Report No. 24. Guelph, Ontario: Experimental Farms Services, Canada Department of Agriculture, and the Ontario Agricultural College.

McGill University

2001 **Glengarry County.** 1880 Maps of Ontario Counties, The Canadian County Atlas Digital Project. Located online at:
<http://digital.library.mcgill.ca/Countyatlas/SearchMapframes.php>

Ministry of Natural Resources

2009 **About Ontario's Forests.** Located online at:
www.mnr.gov.on.ca/en/Business/Forests/2ColumnSubPage/STEL02_163390.html

No Author

2010 **The Contact Period.** Accessed at:
<http://www.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca/summary/contact.php>

Ontario Heritage Act

1990 **R.S.O., CHAPTER 18; R.R.O., Reg. 875**

Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture

2009 **Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists.** Toronto: Ministry of Culture.

Peters, J.

1986 **Transmission Line Planning and Archaeological Research: A Model of Archaeological Potential for Southwestern Ontario.** *Archaeological Consulting in Ontario: Papers of the London Conference 1985.* W.A. Fox, ed. Occasional Papers of the London Chapter, OAS, Inc., No. 2:19-40.

Pihl, R.

1986 **Site Potential Modeling in Archaeological Consulting.** *Archaeological Consulting in Ontario: Papers of the London Conference 1985.* W.A. Fox, ed. Occasional Papers of the London Chapter, OAS, Inc., No. 2:33-37.

Ramsden, Peter

1990 ***The Hurons: Archaeology and Culture History 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. London: Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., pp. 361-384.

Spence M.W., R.H. Pihl and C. Murphy.

1990 ***Cultural Complexes of the Early and Middle Woodland Periods 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. London: Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., pp. 125-170.

Smith, Donald B.

2002 ***Their Century and a Half on The Credit: The Mississaugas in Mississauga.*** In ***Mississauga: The First 10,000 Years*** Edited by Frank A. Dieterman. Mississauga: The Mississauga Heritage Foundation., pp. 107-122.

Township of South Glengarry, The

2010 **History**. The Township of South Glengarry. Located online at:
<http://southglengarry.com/vhistory.htm>.

Vaugeois, D., R. Litalien, & K. Roth

2004 **Champlain; The Birth of French America**. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Walker, John A.

1939 **Municipal Government in the County of Kent in Kentiana: The Story of the Settlement and Development of the County of Kent**. Chatham: The Kent Historical Society, pp. 90-94.

Warrick, G.

2000 "The Precontact Iroquoian Occupation of Southern Ontario" in **Journal of World Prehistory**, Volume 14, Number 4, pp. 415-456.

2005 *Lessons from the Past* in **Grand Actions**, Volume 10, No. 3. Cambridge: The Grand River Conservation Authority, pp.2-4.

Young, Penny M., Malcolm R. Horne, Colin D. Varley, P.J. Racher and Andrew J. Clish

1995 **A Biophysical Model for Prehistoric Archaeological Sites in Southern Ontario**. The Research and Development Branch, Ministry of Transportation, Ontario.

Appendix B: Artifact Registry

Record	Stage	Findspot	Date	Frequency	Material Code	Material	Group Code	Group	Class Code	Class Name	Object Code	Object Name	Datable Attribute Code	Datable Attribute Name	Comments	Fire Evidence
1	Stage 2	Findspot 1	21-Jul-10	1	4	Unidentifiable	4	Unidentifiable	4	Unidentifiable	4	Unidentifiable	2	Not Applicable	Concrete or Stone? Fire heated with glaze?	y
2	Stage 2	Findspot 1	21-Jul-10	1	61	Shell	16	Clothing	161	Fasteners	101	Button	2	Not Applicable	Shell 4-hole button	n
3	Stage 2	Findspot 1	21-Jul-10	1	76	Plastic	16	Clothing	161	Fasteners	101	Button	4	Unidentifiable	20th c? White plastic 2-hole button	n
4	Stage 2	Findspot 1	21-Jul-10	1	10	Composite	4	Unidentifiable	4	Unidentifiable	4	Unidentifiable	4	Unidentifiable	Metal machine part? Water powered?	n
5	Stage 2	Findspot 1	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	100	Storage/Cooking	4	Unidentifiable	190	Coarse Stoneware	grey glaze, large handle?	y
6	Stage 2	Findspot 1	21-Jul-10	2	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	100	Storage/Cooking	4	Ceramic	200	Coarse Stoneware - salt glaze	alabany slip int.	n
7	Stage 2	Findspot 1	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	100	Storage/Cooking	4	Unidentifiable	17	Coarse EW - glazed	white bodied?	n
8	Stage 2	Findspot 1	21-Jul-10	2	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	4	Unidentifiable	215	Porcelain		n
9	Stage 2	Findspot 1	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	4	Unidentifiable	4	Unidentifiable	155	Vitrified White EW		n
10	Stage 2	Findspot 1	21-Jul-10	1	12	Glass	12	Architectural	120	Window Glass	229	Pane Glass	4	Unidentifiable		n
11	Stage 2	Findspot 1	21-Jul-10	1	12	Glass	4	Unidentifiable	109	Unspecified Glass Container	4	Unidentifiable	4	Unidentifiable	Clear, flat glass	n
12	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	3	15	Metal	12	Architectural	121	Nails	316	Nails	411	Cut		n
13	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	15	Metal	16	Clothing	161	Fasteners	93	Buckle	4	Unidentifiable	Unidentifiable clear glass container	n
14	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	15	Metal	14	Furnishings	141	Decorative Furnishings	151	Clock part	4	Unidentifiable	Round toothed gear	n
15	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	15	Metal	2	Not Applicable	2	Not Applicable	2	Not Applicable	4	Unidentifiable		n
16	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	65	Brick	12	Architectural	125	Construction Materials	616	Unglazed brick	4	Unidentifiable	Large, copper (?) bell with 4 holes and clasp at top, for horses?	n
17	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	2	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	100	Storage/Cooking	360	Crock	191	Coarse Stoneware - alabany slip int.	Red brick fragment	n
18	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	100	Storage/Cooking	360	Crock	13	Coarse Red EW - glazed	Grey glaze	n
19	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	100	Storage/Cooking	4	Unidentifiable	13	Coarse Red EW - glazed	Redbeige	n
20	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	4	Unidentifiable	155	Vitrified White EW	Alabany slip int?	n
21	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	4	Unidentifiable	155	Vitrified White EW	Large serving bowl? Semporcelain	n
22	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	213	Flatware	155	Vitrified White EW	"DIEU MON DPOIT"? "ROYAL PAT. - "IRONSTONE" "W&E CO. " Semporcelain	n
23	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	4	Unidentifiable	155	Vitrified White EW	Makers mark, "KIN" "GLAZE"? Semporcelain	n
24	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	213	Flatware	155	Vitrified White EW	Makers mark, black transfer, crest, Semporcelain	n
25	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	4	Unidentifiable	155	Vitrified White EW	Makers mark, black transfer, Unidentifiable, semporcelain, stamped "n"?	n
26	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	4	Unidentifiable	155	Vitrified White EW	Makers mark, "GLAND" of England, black transfer, semporcelain	n
27	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	4	Unidentifiable	161	Vitrified White EW - moulded	Bowl or mug?	n
28	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	4	Unidentifiable	215	Porcelain	or Semporcelain?	n
29	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	4	Unidentifiable	155	Vitrified White EW	Makers mark, "C. E. Pearson" Pearson?	n
30	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	4	Unidentifiable	134	Refined White EW - other transfer	Brown transfer, geometric	n
31	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	2	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	4	Unidentifiable	137	Refined White EW - painted	Black paint, geometric, tea service?	n
32	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	4	Unidentifiable	114	Pearlware - blue transfer	Willow	n
33	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	4	Unidentifiable	133	Refined White EW - blue transfer	Carrage wheel?	n
34	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	4	Unidentifiable	114	Pearlware - blue transfer	Willow?	n
35	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	4	Unidentifiable	4	Unidentifiable	165	Vitrified White EW	Design or makers mark? Black transfer	n
36	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	4	Unidentifiable	137	Refined White EW - painted	blue paint, Unidentifiable pattern	n
37	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	4	Unidentifiable	132	Refined White EW - edged	Blue edged, chicken foot?	n
38	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	4	Unidentifiable	133	Refined White EW - blue transfer	Unidentifiable floral pattern, tree and frola?	n
39	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	2	12	Glass	12	Architectural	120	Window Glass	229	Pane Glass	4	Unidentifiable	Green and pink/purple stamped	n
40	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	4	12	Glass	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	105	Glass Beverage Container	4	Unidentifiable	4	Unidentifiable	Flat window glass	n
41	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	12	Glass	18	Medicinal/Hygiene	180	Pharmaceutical	65	Toiletry Bottle	4	Unidentifiable	Drk. Green, flat panels? Bitters bottle or beverage?	n
42	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	12	Glass	4	Unidentifiable	109	Unspecified Glass Container	4	Unidentifiable	305	Mould blown	Lavender toiletry glass?	n
43	Stage 2	Findspot 2	21-Jul-10	1	12	Glass	4	Unidentifiable	109	Unspecified Glass Container	4	Unidentifiable	317	Unknown moulded	Brown with folded out finish	n
44	Stage 2	Findspot 3	21-Jul-10	1	15	Metal	17	Personal	171	Toys/Leisure	275	Jew's Harp	4	Unidentifiable	Moulded with either folded out finish or applied finish? Lg green bottle	n
45	Stage 2	Findspot 3	21-Jul-10	1	12	Glass	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	105	Glass Beverage Container	64	Wine Bottle	4	Unidentifiable	Jew's harp	n
46	Stage 2	Findspot 3	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	100	Storage/Cooking	4	Unidentifiable	190	Coarse Stoneware	Moulded? Drk. Olive, base sherd	n
47	Stage 2	Findspot 3	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	213	Flatware	113	Pearlware - edged	Grey outer glaze, lt brown int, alabany?	n
48	Stage 2	Findspot 3	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	213	Flatware	113	Pearlware - edged	Blue edged, moulded	n
49	Stage 2	Findspot 3	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	213	Flatware	113	Pearlware - edged	blue edged, scalloped	n
50	Stage 2	Findspot 3	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	213	Flatware	113	Pearlware - edged	Edged, dark moulded rim, scalloped	n
51	Stage 2	Findspot 3	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	4	Unidentifiable	4	Unidentifiable	130	Refined White EW	Green edging	n
52	Stage 2	Findspot 3	21-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	4	Unidentifiable	137	Refined White EW - painted		n
53	Stage 2	Findspot 4	22-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	4	Unidentifiable	133	Refined White EW - blue transfer	Green, blue floral, tea service? Pearlware or RWE?	n
54	Stage 2	Findspot 4	22-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	213	Flatware	133	Refined White EW - blue transfer	body, unidentifiable pattern	n
55	Stage 2	Findspot 4	22-Jul-10	2	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	213	Flatware	131	Refined White EW - plain	rim, unidentifiable pattern	n
56	Stage 2	Findspot 4	22-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	213	Flatware	131	Refined White EW - plain	base	n
57	Stage 2	Findspot 4	22-Jul-10	1	12	Glass	18	Medicinal/Hygiene	18	Pharmaceutical	61	Pharmaceutical Bottle	4	Unidentifiable	Coarse Red EW - glazed	n
58	Stage 2	Findspot 4	22-Jul-10	3	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	213	Flatware	131	Refined White EW - plain	Aqua, square bottle	n
59	Stage 2	Findspot 4	22-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	4	Unidentifiable	133	Refined White EW - blue transfer	Base, 3 piece mend	n
60	Stage 2	Findspot 4	22-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	4	Unidentifiable	4	Unidentifiable	131	Refined White EW - plain	Unidentifiable pattern	n
61	Stage 2	Findspot 4	22-Jul-10	1	11	Ceramic	10	Food Preparation/Consumption	102	Tableware	213	Flatware	134	Refined White EW - other transfer	rim, unidentifiable pattern	n
															Brown transfer, Unidentifiable pattern, rim	n