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Executive Summary

This is a modified public access report to protect known archaeological site locations under the Ontario Heritage Act and confidential information under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

A Stage 1 archaeological and cultural heritage assessment was carried out for a proposed hydro electric project on the Blanche River in Marter Township, Timiskaming District (Figure 1). The proposed dam location is found just west of the intersection of the Misema River and the Blanche River. This hydroelectric development if successful will contribute approximately 2.1 MW of power. As a consequence of the proposed dam installation, approximately 22 Ha. of flooding will extend west and north of the dam along the Blanche River (see Figure 2).

Full recommendations are found in section 2.2 of this report.

1.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

This section of the project report provides the context for the archaeological fieldwork. The project background section covers three areas: development context, historical context, and archaeological context.

1.1 Development context

The archaeological and cultural heritage field work was required by the Ministry of Culture in advance of the future development of this hydro power facility and dam. This proposed power project in Marter Township can be located by referring to Figures 1 and 2.
The archaeological field work was performed in advance of any new ground-disturbing activities.

The area of disturbance will include road and transmission line corridors, dam, penstock and powerhouse construction as well as the 22 Ha. of inundation as a result of the dam construction.

Woodland Heritage Services received permission to pass on the property in future and perform all activities related to archaeological and cultural heritage assessments.

1.2 Historical context

Archaeologists generally divide northeastern Ontario's prehistory into the following generalized temporal/cultural sequences:

- Late Palaeo (circa 7,000 - 5000 BC)
- Shield Archaic (circa 5,000 - 500 BC)
- Middle Woodland (circa 500 BC - AD 1200)
- Late Woodland (circa AD 1200 - AD 1600)
- Historic (circa AD 1600 - present)
- Late Prehistoric and Modern Native Peoples (A.D. 1600 - 1900 A.D.)

1.3.2. Current Land Use(S), Field Conditions, Soils And Topography

The lands directly associated with the property in question current do not appear to be used for a particular purpose other than as a recreation area or canoe route.
The soils of the study area are surrounded by a dominant clay (part of the little claybelt), however, an alluvial deposit exists in the direct vicinity of the Blanche River study area. The primary component of this alluvial deposit is sand, its secondary is clay.

### 2.0 Stage 1 Assessment Background

#### 2.0.1 Property Inspection

The property inspection will be carried out during the Stage 2 Assessment field work.

### 2.1 Stage 1 Analysis and Conclusions

#### 2.1.1 Identify and describe areas of archaeological potential within the project area.

This study area is located within the Canadian Shield and as such often presents areas of complex archaeological potential. A map and satellite based analysis determined that areas of archaeological potential do exist, and that a follow-up Stage 2 assessment is recommended.

#### 2.1.2 Identify and describe areas that have been subject to extensive and deep land alterations.

Figure 2 provides a visual description of the land in question. It is unknown whether the land had been disturbed in the past.

### 2.2 Stage 1 Recommendations

#### 2.2.1 Make recommendations regarding the potential for the property.

The proposed power site and the surrounding areas of the Blanche River that will be flooded through its construction have areas of archaeological potential. It is recommended that follow up Stage 2 assessments be carried out for those areas with archaeological potential within the overall study area.
2.3 Advice on compliance with legislation

Advice on compliance with legislation is not part of the archaeological record. However, for the benefit of the proponent and approval authority in the land use planning and development process, the report must include the following standard statements:

a. This report is submitted to the Minister of 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 is reviewed to ensure that the licensed 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.

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

c. The Cemeteries Act requires that any person discovering human remains must notify the police or coroner and the Registrar of cemeteries, Ministry of Small Business and Consumer Services.

*Reports recommending further archaeological fieldwork or protection for one or more archaeological sites must include the following standard statement: ‘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.’
3.0 Figures (Maps and Images)
On following pages.
Figure 1. Project location map (location approximate).
Figure 2. Areas of inundation of the Blanche River.
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May 10, 2011

Xeneca Power Development Inc.
5160 Yonge St., Suite 520
Toronto, ON M2N 6L9

RE: Proposed Hydroelectric Development Blanche River, Marter Twp.

MNR Site # 2CJ16, 2JC17

FIT#: FIT-000650-WAT-130-301

IRIMS: HD000598
PIF: P065-127-2010

Dear Proponent:

This letter constitutes the Ministry of Tourism and Culture’s written comments as required by s. 22(3)(a) of O. Reg. 359/09 under the *Environmental Protection Act* regarding archaeological assessments undertaken for the above project.

Based on the information contained in the report(s) you have submitted for this project, the Ministry believes the archaeological assessment complies with the *Ontario Heritage Act's* licensing requirements, including the licence terms and conditions and the Ministry's 1993 Archaeological Assessment Technical Guidelines. Please note that the Ministry makes no representation or warranty as to the completeness, accuracy or quality of the Report(s).¹

The report(s) recommends the following:

- As the proposed water power site is within 1km of a known archaeological site, and through its construction will flood undisturbed areas of the Blanche River (a known travel route), an conclusion of confirmed high archaeological potential was reached. It is recommended that follow up Stage 2 assessments be carried out for those high potential archaeological areas shown in Figure 3 in advance of any construction.
It is also recommended that once the final location of access roads, new transmission lines, aggregate pits and other infrastructure are finalized, that these areas be subject to a Stage 2 assessment if they are determined to have high archaeological potential.

The Stage 2 archaeological work will be carried out after 2010, it will be subject to the 2010 Ministry of Tourism and Culture’s Standards and Guidelines in effect as of January 1, 2011.

The Ministry is satisfied with these recommendations.

This letter does not waive any requirements which you may have under the Ontario Heritage Act. A separate letter addressing archaeological licensing obligations under the Act will be sent to the archaeologist who completed the assessment and will be copied to you.

This letter does not constitute approval of the renewable energy project. Approvals of the project may be required under other statutes and regulations. It is your responsibility to obtain any necessary approvals or licences.

Please feel free to contact me if you have questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,

Andrew Hinshelwood
Archaeology Review Officer

cc. Consultant

* *In no way will the Ministry be liable for any harm, damages, costs, expenses, losses, claims or actions that may result: (a) if the Report(s) or its recommendations are discovered to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent; or (b) from the issuance of this letter. Further measures may need to be taken in the event that additional artifacts or archaeological sites are identified or the Report(s) is otherwise found to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent.*
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WOODLAND HERITAGE SERVICES LIMITED
Executive Summary

A Stage 2 archaeological and cultural heritage assessment was carried out for a proposed hydro electric project on the Blanche River in Marter Township, Timiskaming District. The proposed dam location is found just west of the intersection of the Misema River and the Blanche River (see Figures 1 and 2). This assessment follows from the Stage 1 Assessment carried out for the same project area, and focused on sub-surface testing those areas delimited in the Stage 1 study.

No archaeological or cultural heritage resources were located in those areas selected for testing as a result of the Stage 1 work.

The following recommendations have been made in section 2.6 of this report:

- As no archaeological or cultural heritage resources were located through this Stage 2 assessment that will be impacted, it is recommended that Xeneca be allowed to proceed with their plans, as described in Figure 2, to develop this water power resource. If the scope of development changes, additional archaeological or cultural heritage assessment work may be necessary. Additionally, if sub-surface disturbance is planned to be carried out in any areas outside of those described in Figure 2, additional work may be required.
1.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

This section of the project report provides the context for the archaeological fieldwork. The project background section covers three areas: development context, historical context, and archaeological context.

1.1 Development context

The archaeological and cultural heritage field work was required by the Ministry of Culture in advance of the future development of this hydro power facility and dam. This proposed power project in Lot 12, Concessions 5, 6 Marter Township, and Lot 1 Concession 6 Chamberlain Township can be located by referring to Figures 1 and 2.

The archaeological field work was performed in advance of any new ground-disturbing activities.

The area of disturbance will include road and transmission line corridors, dam, penstock and powerhouse construction as well as the 24 Ha. of inundation as a result of the dam construction.

Woodland Heritage Services received permissions to pass on the property and perform all activities related to archaeological and cultural heritage assessments.

1.2 Historical context

Cultural Prehistory

Archaeologists generally divide northeastern Ontario's prehistory into the following generalized temporal/cultural sequences;

- Late Palaeo (circa 7,000 - 5000 BC)
- Shield Archaic (circa 5,000 - 500 BC)
- Middle Woodland (circa 500 BC - AD 1200)
- Late Woodland (circa AD 1200 - AD 1600)
Historic (circa AD 1600 - present)

**Shield Archaic - 5,000 years ago**

The earliest known inhabitants of the northeastern Ontario some 6,000 – 8,000 years ago were the Shield Archaic Peoples. In northern Ontario, this era is comparable to the Archaic period in southern Ontario in terms of its longevity, representing as it does some 4,000 years of prehistoric occupation in northern Ontario stretching from the Manitoba border on the west to the Quebec border on the east. The Shield Archaic appears to evolve directly out of the preceding Late Paleo-Indian occupations. The presence of Shield Archaic quarry/workshop and habitation sites on the Nipissing beach line, the next glacial lake stage below Minong in the Thunder Bay area, combined with an emphasis on the same raw materials used in the preceding Paleo-Indian period and a similar technology centred on the production of large bifaces and somewhat less refined lanceolate points, suggests this transition. Following what appears to be the initial Shield Archaic period characterized by large bifaces and lanceolate points, there is an apparent proliferation of point styles including various forms of stemmed and notched points.

The earliest peoples whom archaeologists refer to as the Shield Archaic Tradition, were big game hunters who lived in the area following the last glacial ice-age. About 2,000 years ago, these people shifted to an economy of smaller game and fishing which required smaller tools and a seasonal round to exploit various resources at different times of the year. Fired clay pottery was added to the material culture at this time by the people who are called the Laurel Tradition or Middle Woodland Culture. The Laurel Culture gradually evolved into the late Woodland Blackduck (Ojibway) and Selkirk (Cree) pottery styles. These people were the ancestors of present day regional cultural/social groups such as the Mattagami First Nation (Settlement Surveys Ltd. 1995:37).
**Initial Woodland-Laurel- 2,000 years ago**

Economically, Laurel Tradition peoples who followed the Shield Archaic Peoples practised a hunting/gathering subsistence pattern which was similar to the Archaic patterns. Bands consisted of groups of closely related families and people probably spent much of the year in extended family groups relying on large and small game and fish for subsistence. During the summer the band would have camped together on a large lake or river.

Other than the summer group campsites, Laurel sites are generally small, possibly reflecting the establishment of a seasonal round which saw the Laurel people break up into individual families during the fall, winter and spring periods of the year to more effectively exploit available resources. Laurel site distribution and settlement patterns differ from the inland site pattern noted for the Archaic period and set the pattern for settlement in the following Terminal Woodland period. Laurel peoples showed a preference for large lakes and rivers with preferred campsites on sandy bays, portage ends, points, peninsulas and locations near waterfalls, below rapids and at river mouths. These locations served for the establishment of small, seasonal hunting and fishing camps.

**Terminal Woodland Period (Anishnabeg Peoples) 800 years ago**

Recent data from northern Ontario suggests a trend toward an increase in population during the Terminal Woodland period reflected in an increased frequency of sites recovered during archaeological surveys. This trend seems to be repeated across northern Ontario and whether this actually represents population increases or a bias in site recovery remains to be demonstrated.

Archaeological evidence suggests that a seasonal cycle of travelling to resource exploitation areas may have been well established during this era. Site locations follow an established pattern with preference given to level places on islands, peninsulas,
narrow parts of lakes, sandy beaches and portage ends, as well as rapids and waterfalls on rivers.

With the advent of the fur trade, traditional subsistence and settlement patterns became somewhat disrupted, with settlements often occurring in the vicinity of fur trade posts or near the railways especially later in the period.

**Early First Nations History**

The northern interior shield areas including the southern portions of the Mattagami River area were inhabited by Anishnabeg (Ojibwa). The northern reaches were the traditional territory of the Moose Cree. Their first contact with Europeans was with the Recollects and Jesuit missionaries and other French explorers and traders during the period 1616 to 1649.

During the middle decades of the fifteenth century there was a series of intertribal Indian wars for control of the fur trade. These wars involved the Mohawks and other Iroquoian groups (Mohawk, Onondaga, Oneida, Seneca and Cayuga) south of the Great Lakes in a conflict against the Huron-Petun and Neutral in southern Ontario. By 1640, all attempts at various treaties to allow these southern Iroquois access to the furs of northern Canada had failed. They were therefore denied access to the extensive trade of the Nipissings and their associates who were the 'middlemen' of the trade all the way north to James Bay (Hunt 1940:35,45). In 1648 the Hurons were prospering, but by May 1, 1649 they had completely decimated as a cultural entity, having abandoned their villages as a result of a March 1st, 1649 attack by a party of 1000 Mohawk and Senecas on the Huron town of St. Ignace (Hunt 1940:92).

Anishnabeg peoples who were living in northern Ontario also temporarily relocated to other areas due to the recurring raids of the Iroquois between 1649 and 1660.
The First Nation Peoples have shared the Mattagami river area for more than three hundred years with Europeans. However, their history in the area goes back a minimum of 6,000 years and perhaps several thousand years earlier to the days of the glacial lakes. The entire area was utilized including small lakes and creeks during this time period.

The broader territory of the Ojibway-speaking (Anishnabek) peoples once extended from the Ottawa valley and southern Ontario around both sides of the upper great lakes to the western prairies. The Anishnabek or Ojibway are still the largest tribal grouping north of Mexico (Ritzenthaler 1978:742).

**Timiskaming First Nation**

Timiskaming First Nation is an Algonquin community situated at the head of Lake Timiskaming, and adjacent of the municipality of Notre-Dame-du-Nord, (Quebec). The TFN’S population and infrastructure are both growing at a steady pace. There are about 1,650 members registered to the TFN, about 700 live within the territory and about 1000 across Canada, the United States and throughout the world. Frank Speck, an American anthropologist spent time with the Timiskaming and Temagami First Nations just after the turn of the 20th century. Appendix 1 is his description of the Timiskaming First Nation from 1915.

**Beaverhouse First Nation**

Beaverhouse First Nation Community is a first nation without reserve land. The community is part of the Wabun Tribal Council and has an official office in Kirkland Lake. They are currently seeking status from the Federal Government.

Beaverhouse first nation is located on Beaverhouse Lake and derives its name from a large outcropping that bears similarity to a beaver’s house. This lake is connected to the
Ottawa River system via the Misema River to the south, and to other waters via Misema Lake to the North.

Pollock in 1976 wrote “The Culture History of Kirkland Lake District, Northeastern Ontario”, it was published by the National Museum of Man – Mercury Series [1976]. In this volume he details the early history of Beaverhouse First Nation (from pages 24, 25).

The Beaverhouse Band.

This settlement is at least 100 years old [ca. 1976]. Apparently, some of the original inhabitants came from North Timiskaming, Temagami, Sturgeon Falls and Abitibi Bands. The present population has been reduced to the three permanent dwelling units of Isaac Mathias, Lucy Mathias (Mother) and Eddy James (Colquhoun 1972).

An elderly resident, aged 65 years, told the present writer [Pollock] that his father came to Indian Point on Beaverhouse Lake from the band at Temagami. Isaac built his first cabin at the age of fourteen and traded at the Hudson Bay Company until 1928, when he traded in Kirkland Lake. His mother, who was ninety-two years old in 1972, had lived on Beaverhouse Lake all her adult life. The small cemetery at the settlement had 72 graves in 1972.


1.3 Archaeological context

1.3.1 Before initiation of fieldwork, the site files and catalogued reports at Woodland Heritage Services Ltd. and/or the offices of the Archaeological Data Coordinator, Ministry of Culture were checked to determine if any pre contact or historic archaeological sites had been previously recorded either in or near the study area.

1.3.2. Current Land Use(s), Field Conditions, Soils and Topography

The lands directly associated with the property in question current do not appear to be used for a particular purpose other than as arecreation area or canoe route.
The soils around the study area range from a clay – coarse grained deltaic deposit in the southern part of the study area to Glaciolacustrine Fine-Textured Deposits (OGS Map 2661, Figure 3).

The entire study area us underlain by Granodiorite gneiss of the Round Lake Pluton (OGS Map 2043: Catherine and Marter Townships, Figure 4).

The topography is characterised by deeply incised valleys principally the result of mechanical erosion of the surficial geology by way of the Blanche River. This permanent watercourse has been transporting material from the former lacustrine plain and deltaic deposit causing both a greater incision into the plain as well as influencing the lateral movement of the watercourse itself (Figures 5-26).

1.3.3. Field Work Schedule
The field work was carried out in October 2011 and November 2012.

1.3.4. Past Fieldwork
Past fieldwork has been carried out by Woodland Heritage Services on the Misema River and Beaverhouse Lake with Beaverhouse First Nation.

1.3.5. Physical features affecting fieldwork strategy, decisions or the identification of artifacts or cultural features.
None encountered.
2.0 STAGE 2 BACKGROUND AND ASSESSMENT

2.1 Stage 2 Field methods

2.1.1 Assessment background
Areas of archaeological potential were identified through the Stage 1 Assessment and were tested using sub-surface means during the Stage 2 component. The areas identified as not having archaeological potential due to steep slopes or permanently saturated soils were documented through photographs and GPS coordinates. The weather conditions at the time of the fieldwork was conducive (bright and snow free) to the identification of archaeological resources.

Photographs and GPS waypoints were used to document the overall conditions and areas tested area.

2.1.2 Areas of Disturbance

i. a map depicting the exact limits of the area
Figures 1 and 2 depict the exact limits of the areas facing disturbance.

ii. documentation describing how the limit of the area was determined during the survey and confirming that the area included enough overlap to ensure that all adjacent impacted lands were surveyed.

Communication with Ed Larattapplied the exact locations of those areas to be impacted and the limits of the overall development.
2.2 Stage 2 Property Survey – As relevant, provide detailed and explicit descriptions:

a. of how each standard was addressed for property survey generally

A visual inspection was carried out for the entire area facing disturbance confirming the areas of archaeological potential and documented those areas that did not meet the minimum conditions of archaeological potential.

b. of how each standard was addressed for pedestrian survey and test pit survey

The standards were addressed completely for the test pit survey for those areas felt to demonstrate archaeological potential. A test pit programme was carried out for those areas along the river that demonstrated archaeological potential. All test pits were dug a minimum of 30 cm wide and to a depth sufficient to expose and investigate sterile soils. All soil was screened through 6mm hardware mesh screens.

A pedestrian survey was carried out on a section of ploughed field up on the valley rim to the west of the Blanche River. This area had been sufficiently weathered to provide adequate exposure. Transects were walked at 5 metre intervals to a distance of between 300 metres and 400 metres from the river, on the valley rim. No archaeological or cultural heritage resources were located through the pedestrian or test pit programmes.

c. to address any differences in approach for areas possessing different conditions

Several areas tested through the Stage 2 fieldwork component suggest the lateral migration of the river channel as well as the seasonal scouring and deposition events created by the spring Freshet. This was evidenced in the field by the scrub (osier dogwood / alder / vascular weeds) vegetation that can withstand the effects of ice scouring and temporary inundation. In this areas test pitting revealed completely homogenous silt soils with no stone recovered. This did not change for many of the areas that were tested. Additionally, evidence of erosion / deposition zones were noted
throughout the study area between the rapids and the chute. It is suspected that this river has the ability to travel freely laterally between the slopes of the incised valley.

It is suggested that although these areas are proximal to navigable water, the probability of them containing archaeological resources remains low due to factors explained above. Testing in many locations between the two bedrock controlled areas did not reveal any artifacts, or stone and were identically homogenous in their composition.

Follow up inspections of the area carried out in November 2012 demonstrated the high amount of energy of the river where it was observed that sediments and detritus were deposited some 20 – 30 metres from the channel of the river. This was due to rains that fell in the fall; it is suspected that the energy of the spring freshet would be greater.

As a result of this finding, sub-surface testing focussed on areas of bedrock controlled terrain – the rapids to the north and the chute to the south.

*d. of how each standard was addressed where alternative methods acceptable through Guidelines or Special Conditions were used.*

Not applicable.

**2.3 Stage 2 Property Assessment – Provide estimates of the percentage of each of the following:**

**2.3.1 The Property Surveyed, by Coverage and Survey Interval**

Sub-surface testing was carried out in all areas (100%) of archaeological potential at a 5 metre grid with test pits dug to a minimum of 30 cm in diameter, at a depth reaching rock or mineral soil and with all soils screened through a 6mm. hardware mesh screen.
The areas tested bordered the Blanche River and were associated with level terrain. The highest archaeological potential was found associated with the rapids to the northwest and the chute to the south, both of which were bedrock controlled. The areas of silt between these two areas appear to be the result of floodplain deposition and were wet to permanently saturated.

A pedestrian survey was carried out on level terrain that had been plowed up on the valley rim to the west of the river. This was performed at a 5 metre grid to a distance of between 300 and 400 metres from the river on the valley rim.

2.3.2 The Property not Surveyed because there were Areas of no Archaeological Potential

Some discrete areas lacked archaeological potential due to the presence of steep slopes or permanently saturated soils.

2.4 Record of finds

2.4.1 Inventory of field documentation.

- Photographs were taken of the study area landforms and vegetation.
- Photographs were taken of the areas to be impacted.
- Areas were noted on maps of all the areas to be impacted.
- GPS coordinates were taken using a Garmin 60 CSX with an error rated (with WAAS) to +/- 5 metres on average. All coordinates are in UTM 17T NAD 83.

No archaeological or cultural heritage resources were located through the Stage 2 field testing or reconnaissance. One portage trail around the third set of rapids was located. This trail will not be impacted with the current projections of inundation. The age of this portage is undetermined and local information points to groups of campers being led down the Blanche in the past 20 years.
2.5 Stage 2 Analysis and Conclusions

Although archaeological potential was identified and those areas were tested using sub-surface means, no archaeological or cultural heritage resources were located. This could be for several reasons: 1) the distance between the chute and rapids (area of inundation) is short and early travellers along the river would have chosen to camp at other locations rather than in the middle of a section of short portages; 2) the Blanche (in this area) may have been less used for travel than the Misema, Larder or Lac des Quinze route, all of which are easier travelling; 3) once present archaeological resources could have been destroyed by the ice scouring, erosion or seasonal flooding of the river.

2.6 Stage 2 Recommendations

As no archaeological or cultural heritage resources were located through this Stage 2 assessment that will be impacted, it is recommended that Xeneca be allowed to proceed with their plans, as described in Figure 2, to develop this water power resource. If the scope of development changes, additional archaeological or cultural heritage assessment work may be necessary. Additionally, if sub-surface disturbance is planned to be carried out in any areas outside of those described in Figure 2, additional work may be required.

2.7 Advice on compliance with legislation

Advice on compliance with legislation is not part of the archaeological record. However, for the benefit of the proponent and approval authority in the land use planning and development process, the report must include the following standard statements:

a) This report will be submitted to the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport 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 the licensed 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.

b) It is an offence under Sections 48 and 69 of the Ontario Heritage Act for any party other than a licensed archaeologist to make any alteration to a known archaeological site or to remove any artefact or other physical evidence of past human use or activity from the site, until such time as a licensed archaeological 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 Archaeological Reports referred to in section 65.1 of the Ontario Heritage Act.

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


2. Reports recommending further archaeological fieldwork or protection for one or more archaeological sites must include the following standard statement:
‘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’. 

3.0 Figures (Maps and Images) On following pages.
Figure 1. Project Location Map.

Figure 2. Development map from Xeneca showing areas of inundation.
Figure 3. Development map showing construction infrastructure.
Figure 4. Surficial geology of the study area.
Figure 5. Bedrock geology of the study area.
Figure 7. Photograph “A” looking at the train bridge.

Figure 8. Photograph “B”. Note the scrub vegetation along the banks.
Figure 9. Photograph “C” showing the second set of rapids.

Figure 10. Photograph “D” showing the second set of rapids.
Figure 11. Photograph “E” showing the bottom of the second set of rapids.

Figure 12. Photograph “F” looking at an exposed shoal.
Figure 13. Photograph “G” showing the bottom of the third set of rapids.

Figure 15. Photograph “H” looking at an exposed shoal.
Figure 16. Photograph “I” looking down the shoal.

Figure 17. Photograph “J” looking at an area tested on the right.
Figure 18. Photograph “K” showing the homogenous silt of the floodplain.

Figure 19. Photograph “L” showing the scrub vegetation of an area tested.
Figure 20. Photograph “M” looking at an area tested on the left.

Figure 21. Photograph “N” showing an area tested.
Figure 22. Photograph “O” showing another area tested on the right.

Figure 23. Photograph “P” showing an area tested.
Figure 24. Photograph “Q” of a scoured curve in the river.

Figure 25. Photograph “R” of evidence of ice scouring.
Figure 26. Photograph “S” looking across from the top of the chute.

Figure 27. Photograph “T” looking down the top of the chute.
Figure 28. Photograph “U” looking across the bottom of the chute.

Figure 29. Photograph “V” looking at the ploughed area along the valley rim.
Figure 30. Photograph “W” showing the pedestrian survey.
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February 5, 2013

John Pollock
Woodland Heritage Services Limited
17 Wellington Street, Box 2529
New Liskeard, Ontario
P0J 1P0

RE: Entry into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports: Archaeological Assessment Report Entitled, “Stage 2 Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment of a proposed Hydro Development on the Blanche River, Lot 12, Concession 5 and 6, Marter Township and Lot 1, Concession 6, Chamberlain Township, Timiskaming District, Ontario (Fit# F-000650-WAT-130-301)”, Dated December 31, 2012 Received by MTCS Toronto Office on January 17, 2013, MTCS Project Information Form Number P016-326-2011, MTCS File Number HD00598

Dear Mr. Pollock:

The above-mentioned report, which has been submitted to this Ministry as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c 0.18 has been entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports without technical review.¹

Please note that the ministry makes no representation or warranty as to the completeness, accuracy or quality of reports in the register.

Should you require further information, please do not hesitate to send your inquiry to ArchaeologyReports@Ontario.ca.

cc. Ed Laratta, Xeneca Power Development Inc.
Corrinne Nelson, Ministry of Natural Resources

¹In no way will the ministry be liable for any harm, damages, costs, expenses, losses, claims or actions that may result: (a) if the Report(s) or its recommendations are discovered to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent; or (b) from the issuance of this letter. Further measures may need to be taken in the event that additional artifacts or archaeological sites are identified or the Report(s) is otherwise found to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent.