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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Archaeological Services Inc (ASI) was contracted by SNC-Lavalin Inc. (Toronto) to conduct a Stage 1 archaeological assessment (background study and property inspection) as part of the Hurontario-Main Street Light Rail Transit (LRT) Preliminary Design and Transit Project Assessment Process. The project involves the construction of an LRT from Port Credit GO Station to Brampton GO Station following the alignment of Hurontario Street, in the City of Mississauga and the City of Brampton. This assessment is an addendum to a previous assessment completed by Archeoworks Inc. (2010) and it only covered areas added to the project area since the original assessment.

The Stage 1 archaeological assessment background study determined that eight archaeological sites have been registered within 1 km of the study areas. The following locations are included in this Stage 1 archaeological assessment:

- Brampton GO Station (Brampton study area)
- Downtown Mississauga/bridge of Highway 403 (403 and DT Mississauga study areas)
- Bridge over Highway 401 (401 study area)
- Maintenance/Storage Facility (MSF study area)
- Highway QEW underpass (QEW study area)
- CPR track underpass (CPR study area)

A review of the geography and history of the study area suggested that the study area has potential for the identification of Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian archaeological resources.

The Stage 1 archaeological assessment property inspection determined that the majority of the study areas have been previously disturbed by road construction and but that the MSF study area largely retains archaeological potential.
In light of the results of the background research and property inspection undertaken for the Stage 1 archaeological assessment of the Hurontario-Main Street LRT Preliminary Design and Transit Project Assessment Process, ASI makes the following recommendations:

1. Archaeological potential exists in the MSF study area. These lands require a Stage 2 archaeological assessment which should be conducted by pedestrian survey and test pit survey strategies where appropriate;

2. Due to extensive and deep land alterations that have severely damaged the integrity of any potential archaeological resources, the right-of-way (ROW) lands within the Brampton, MSF, 401, 403, DT Mississauga, QEW, and CPR study areas do not retain archaeological potential. These ROW lands do not require further archaeological assessment. The LRT alignment at the Brampton GO station does not require further archaeological assessment. A large area of the MSF study area beyond ROW lands was also documented to have deep and extensive land alterations and also does not retain archaeological potential;

3. Should the proposed work extend beyond the current study area then further Stage 1 assessment must be conducted to determine the archaeological potential of the surrounding lands.
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1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT

Archaeological Services Inc (ASI) was contracted by SNC-Lavalin Inc. (Toronto) to conduct a Stage 1 archaeological assessment (background study and property inspection) as part of the Hurontario-Main Street LRT Preliminary Design and Transit Project Assessment Process. The project involves the construction of an LRT from Port Credit GO Station to Brampton GO Station following the alignment of Hurontario Street, in the City of Mississauga and the City of Brampton. This assessment is addendum to a previous assessment completed Archeoworks Inc. (2010) and it only covered areas added to the project area since the original assessment. The following locations are included in this Stage 1 archaeological assessment:

- Brampton GO Station (Brampton study area; Figure 1)
- Maintenance/Storage Facility (MSF study area; Figure 2)
- Bridge over Highway 401 (401 study area; Figure 3)
- Bridge over Highway 403 and Duke of York ROW (403 and DT Mississauga study areas; Figure 4)
- Highway QEW underpass (QEW study area; Figure 5)
- CPR track underpass (CPR study area; Figure 6)

This assessment was conducted under the project management and project direction of Paul David Ritchie (P392-014-2013) and senior project management of Lisa Merritt, both of ASI.

The objectives of this report are:

- To provide information about the geography, history, previous archaeological fieldwork and current land condition of the study area;
- To evaluate in detail the archaeological potential of the study area which can be used, if necessary, to support recommendations for Stage 2 archaeological assessment (property assessment) for all or parts of the property; and
- To recommend appropriate strategies for Stage 2 archaeological assessment, if necessary.

This report describes the Stage 1 archaeological assessment that was conducted for this project and is organized as follows: Section 1.0 describes the project context and summarizes the background study that was conducted to provide the archaeological and historical context for the project study area; Section 2.0 describes the field methods used during the assessment and summarizes the results of the property inspection; Section 3.0 provides an analysis of the assessment results and evaluates the archaeological potential of the study area; Section 4.0 provides recommendations for the next assessment steps; and the remaining sections contain other report information that is required by the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (S & G), which is administered by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport.
(MTCS), e.g., advice on compliance with legislation, works cited, mapping and photo-documentation.

1.1 Development Context

This assessment was conducted under the Transit Project Assessment Process.

All work has been undertaken as required by the Environmental Assessment Act, RSO (1990) and regulations made under the Act, and are therefore subject to all associated legislation. This project is being conducted under the Transit Project Assessment Process in accordance with the Guide: Ontario’s Transit Project Assessment Process (2009).

All activities carried out during this assessment were completed in accordance with the terms of the Ontario Heritage Act (2005) and the S & G.

Permission to carry out all activities necessary for the completion of the assessment was granted by SNC Lavalin Inc. (Toronto) on February 6, 2012.

1.2 Historical Context

This section provides a brief summary of historic research for the study areas. A review of available primary and secondary source material was undertaken to produce a contextual overview, including a general description of settlement and historic land use. Historically, the study areas are located in the Former Township of Chinguacousy (Figure 7) and the Former Township of Toronto, Peel County (Figures 8 and 9). The Brampton study area is located in Lots 5 and 6, Concession 1 W of Centre Road and Concession 1 E of Centre Road. The MSF study area is located in Lot 12, Concession 1 E of Centre Road. The 401 study area is located in Lots 6 and 7, Concession 1 W of Centre Road. The 403 study area is located in Lot 16, Concession 2 N of Dundas Street. The DT Mississauga study area is located in Lots 17 and 18, Concession 2 N of Dundas Street. The QEW study area is located in Lot 1, Ranges 2 and 3 Credit River I.R. The CPR study area is located in Lots 2 and 3, Range 1 Credit River I.R. and Port Credit Town Plot.

1.2.1 Aboriginal Land Use

The northshore of Lake Ontario has been occupied by Aboriginal peoples since the glaciers began to retreat about 11,000 years B.P. Mobile hunter-gatherers have used the area for resource extraction for thousands of years. The study area is located within the Etobicoke-Mimico Creeks watershed and the Credit River watershed. The Credit River watershed has a well documented Aboriginal settlement sequences. The Etobicoke-Mimico Creeks watershed would also have been utilised by Aboriginal peoples for settlement and resource extraction however may have been a liminal territory between the Credit River Valley and Humber River Valley settlement sequences.

The Credit River watershed was used intensively by Woodland period populations and this is demonstrated in the archaeological record for the area. These sites include those from more recent ancestral Huron-Wendat settlements dating from at least the beginning of the fourteenth century (ASI 2010: Antrex site) until the mid-sixteenth century (Hawkins 2004: Emerson Springs site; Crawford 2003: Wallace site). By the turn of the seventeenth century the north shore of Lake
Ontario was devoid of permanent settlement and the Credit River and Etobicoke-Mimico Creeks populations are believed to have relocated to join either the Huron-Wendat Nation or perhaps more likely the Tionontaté (Petun) Nation (Birch and Williamson 2013).

The Petun were closely related to the Huron-Wendat and lived in the area west of Huronia near present day Collingwood (Ramsden 1990). They were called the Petun after their practice of growing large amounts of tobacco. It is speculated that the Huron-Wendat and the Petun may have formed a single group prior to the seventeenth century given the close similarities of their cultural traditions.

In 1616 Samuel de Champlain found eight villages occupied by the Petun and mentioned that two more were under construction (Garrad and Heidenreich 1978). By 1639 the Jesuits listed nine Petun villages in addition to a number of smaller settlements. While there is historic information regarding the number of Petun settlements, no information was gathered concerning the size of the Petun nation. It is now estimated that the Petun population neared 3000 by the time of European contact.

Despite waging “cruel wars” against each other, the Petun and the Huron-Wendat were at peace at the time of Champlain’s arrival. This alliance included friendship, trade, and mutual help against common enemies. Petun relations were particularly close with the Huron-Wendat Attignawantan group. In the second half of the seventeenth century some Petun and a large part of the Attignawantan combined to become the Wyandot tribe, whose territory is located west of Lake Huron. The Petun also maintained strong relationships with the Neutral and Ottawa Nations.

The first Europeans to arrive in the area were transient merchants and traders from France and England, who followed Aboriginal pathways and set up trading posts at strategic locations along the well-traveled river routes. All of these occupations occurred at sites that afforded both natural landfalls for Great Lakes traffic and convenient access, by means of the various waterways and overland trails, into the hinterlands. Chief among these was Fort Rouillé, a small, wooden trading post on the shore of Lake Ontario east of the Humber River, which was built for the purpose of intercepting Aboriginal traders before they could cross the lake to trade with the English on the south shore. Jean Baptiste Rousseau established another substantial trading post at the mouth of the Humber. Early transportation routes followed existing Aboriginal trails, both along the lakeshore and adjacent to various creeks and rivers with the primary North-South route being the Carrying Place Trail, which connected Lake Ontario, via the Humber River and other waterways and trails, to Georgian Bay (ASI 2006a).

The ancestral Huron-Wendat are thought to have been the main group who controlled the region and the presence of European trade goods is first evident in the mid-sixteenth century where European artifacts start to make an appearance at some ancestral Huron-Wendat sites. The occurrence of European artifacts on Huron-Wendat sites increases towards the end of the sixteenth century as the interaction between the Huron-Wendat and French explorers, traders, and missionaries continued to increase in frequency and intensity. The Huron were eventually dispersed by the Five Nations Iroquois in 1649 at which point the Seneca mainly took over control of the region (Ramsden 1990).

Beginning in the mid-seventeenth century, the Mississauga replaced the Seneca as the controlling Aboriginal group in the region since the Iroquois confederacy had overstretched their territory between the 1650s and 1670s (Williamson 2008). The Iroquois could not hold the region and
agreed to form an alliance with the Mississauga and share hunting territories with them. In the late 1690s, the Mississauga established their settlement of Teiaiagon on the Humber River, which sat astride the most important route of the Toronto Passage. This route connected Lake Ontario with waterways and trails to Georgian Bay and the north and gave the Mississauga a strategic trading position (Williamson 2008). The Mississauga traded with both the British and the French in order to have wider access to European materials at better prices, and used their strategic position on the Humber to act as trade intermediaries between the British and tribes in the north.

In 1805, Etobicoke Creek was briefly described by D’Arcy Boulton: “further to the westward (that is, between the Humber and the head of the lake Ontario) the Tobicoake, the Credit, and two other rivers, with a great many smaller streams, join the main waters of the lake; they all abound with fish, particularly salmon.” He further noted that “the tract between the Tobicoake and the head of the lake is frequented only by wandering tribes of Missassagues” (Boulton 1805:48).

The study area falls within the Chinguacousy Township, which is said to have been named by Sir Peregrine Maitland after the Mississauga word for the Credit River, and which signified “young pine.” Other scholars assert that it was named in honour of the Ottawa Chief Shinguaaco, which was corrupted to the present spelling of ‘Chinguacousy,’ “under whose leadership Fort Michilimacinac was captured from the Americans in the War of 1812” (Mika and Mika 1977; Rayburn 1997: 68). Part of the land which encompasses Chinguacousy Township was alienated by the British from the Mississauga through a provisional treaty dated October 28, 1818 (Canada 1891: 47).

The First Nations occupation in the study area overlapped with the influx of Euro-Canadian settlers. In 1825-26 the Credit Indian Village was established as an agricultural community and Methodist mission near present day Port Credit (Heritage Mississauga 2009; MNCFN n.d.). By 1840 the village was under significant pressure from Euro-Canadian settlement that plans begun to relocate the settlement. In 1847 the Credit Mississauga were made a land offer by the Six Nations Council to relocate at Grand River. In 1847, 266 Mississauga settled at New Credit, approximately 23 km southwest of Brantford. In 1848 a mission of the Methodist Church was established there by Rev. William Ryerson (WICEC 1985). Although the majority of the County of Peel had been surrendered from the Mississauga by 1856 (Gould 1981), this does not exclude the likelihood that the Mississauga continued to utilise the landscape at large during travel (Ambrose 1982).

### 1.2.2 Township Survey and Settlement

**Toronto Township**

The Township of Toronto was originally surveyed in 1806 by Mr. Wilmot, Deputy Surveyor. The first settler in this Township, and also the County of Peel, was Colonel Thomas Ingersoll. The whole population of the Township in 1808 consisted of seven families, scattered along Dundas Street. The number of inhabitants gradually increased until the war broke out in 1812, which gave considerable check to its progress. When the war was over, the Township’s growth revived and the rear part of the Township was surveyed and called the “New Survey”. The greater part of the New Survey was granted to a colony of Irish settlers from New York City, who suffered persecution during the war.
The Credit River runs through the western portion of the Township, and proved to be a great source of wealth to its inhabitants, as it was not only a good watering stream, but there were endless mill privileges along the entire length of the river.

Within the Township of Toronto, several villages of varying sizes had developed by the end of the nineteenth century, including Streetsville, Meadowvale, Churchville, and Malton. A number of crossroad communities also began to grow by the end of the nineteenth century. These included Britannia, Derry, Frasers Corners, Palestine, Mt Charles, and Grahamsville. The study areas are located within a historically well populated area. Below is a survey of some of the settlements historically local to the study areas as well as other important historical features.

**Chinguacousy Township**

The township is said to have been named by Sir Peregrine Maitland after the Mississauga word for the Credit River, and which signified “young pine.” Other scholars assert that it was named in honour of the Ottawa Chief Shinguacose, which was corrupted to the present spelling of ‘Chinguacousy,’ “under whose leadership Fort Michilimacinac was captured from the Americans in the War of 1812” (Mika and Mika 1977:416; Rayburn 1997: 68).

The township was formally surveyed in 1818, and the first “legal” settlers took up their lands later in that same year. The extant Survey Diaries indicated that the original timber stands within the township included oak, ash, maple, beech, elm, basswood, hemlock and pine. The survey crew working in the township in the summer of 1819 suffered under extreme conditions. One of the complaints noted by the surveyor was that of “musquetoes miserable thick.” Due to heavy rain, part of the crew became separated from the rest of the party, and they spent a wet, uncomfortable night alone in the woods. One of the men, named Montgomery, badly cut his foot and had to be sent home. The work within this township was summed up by the surveyor as “pretty tuff times.”

It was recorded that the first landowners in Chinguacousy were composed of settlers from New Brunswick, the United States, and also some United Empire Loyalists and their children (Armstrong 1985:142; Mika and Mika 1977:417; Pope 1877:65).

Chinguacousy was originally included within the limits of the Home District until 1849, when the old Upper Canadian Districts were abolished. It formed part of the United Counties of York, Ontario and Peel until 1851, when Peel was elevated to independent County status under the provisions of 14 & 15 Vic. ch. 5. A provisional council for Peel was not established until 1865, and the first official meeting of the Peel County council did not occur until January 1867. In 1974, part of the township was amalgamated with the City of Brampton, and the remainder was annexed to the Town of Caledon (Armstrong 1985:152; Mika and Mika 1977:417-418; Pope 1877:59; Rayburn 1997:68).

Due to the small population of the newly acquired tract, Chinguacousy was initially united with the Gore of Toronto Township for political and administrative purposes. In 1821, the population of the united townships numbered just 412. By 1837, the population of the township had reached an estimated 1,921. The numbers grew from 3,721 in 1842 to 7,469 in 1851. Thereafter the figures declined to 6,897 in 1861, and to 6,129 by 1871 (Pope 1877:59; Walton 1837:71).
The township was the largest in Peel County. Chinguacousy was described as one of the best settled townships in the Home District. It contained excellent, rolling land which was timbered mainly in hardwood with some pine intermixed. Excellent wheat was grown here. The township contained one grist mill and seven saw mills. By 1851, this number had increased to two grist mills and eight sawmills (Smith 1846:32; 1851:279).

The principal crops grown in Chinguacousy included wheat, oats, peas, potatoes and turnips. It was estimated that the only township in the province which rivalled Chinguacousy in terms of wheat production at that time was Whitby. Other farm products included maple sugar, wool, cheese and butter (Smith 1851:279).

In 1877, it was described as a “first class agricultural township and the farmers as a general thing have been very successful in their undertakings, many of them having amassed quite a fortune. The township is noted for its beautiful and substantial farm residences and commodious barns. The farms also are generally in the highest state of cultivation, while the grounds in front of the residences are for the most part tastefully arranged with beautiful flowers and shade trees, giving each place and the country generally a handsome appearance” (Pope 1877:65).

Brampton

The land of Brampton was originally owned by Samuel Kenny. Kenny sold this land to John Elliot who cleared the land, laid it out into village lots, and named it Brampton. By 1822 Brampton began to be populated but in 1845 the settlement gained a large influx of Irish immigrants leading to its incorporation as a village in 1852. At this point Brampton had spread across Etobicoke Creek with three bridges spanning it, had seven churches, five schools, a distillery, a cooperage, and a potashery. In 1858 Brampton was connected with the Grand Trunk Railway. This allowed the founding of two major industries in Brampton, the Haggert Foundry and the Dale Estate Nurseries; Dale Estate Nurseries remained the largest employer in the city until the 1940’s. By the 1860 Brampton had a population of 1627 and became the County Town. In 1867 a courthouse was constructed. In 1873 Brampton was incorporated as a town. Brampton’s population remained relative static until the 1940’s (Mika and Mika 1977: 250-251).

Palestine

Palestine, located at the intersection of Tomken Road and Derry Road East in the City of Mississauga, was founded in 1823 by Thomas Grafton who was granted a 100 acre lot for his work as a surveyor. In 1842 John Petch donated a quarter-acre of land at the southwest corner of the intersection of Derry Road and Tomken Road for the construction of a log school house. In 1863 the school was replaced on the same site by a brick schoolhouse. This school was subsequently replaced by another schoolhouse built at another location-site in 1886. In 1870 a Primitive Methodist Church was built on an eighth-acre lot next to the 1863 schoolhouse. The settlement was never more than a crossroads hamlet (Heritage Mississauga 2009).

Derry West

The hamlet of Derry West, located at the intersection of Hurontario Street and Derry Road in the City of Mississauga, was founded in 1819 by Irish immigrants from New York. In 1822, George Graham, one of the two original founders, established an Orange Lodge at Derry West. In 1826 the original post office was opened and the settlement was temporarily called “Toronto” however
this first post office was closed in 1827. Between 1827 and 1828 the first church was built at Derry West; a log construction Anglican church. There was supposedly a second Anglican church built at Derry West of mud-brick construction; a construction date is unknown but it is reported to have been dismantled in 1873. In 1840 the Presbyterian congregation built a church on the land of the Brown family, on the south side of Derry Road. This church was abandoned in 1886 when the congregation merged with the Brampton Presbyterian. Years later in 1851 a permanent post office was established. The first school at Derry West was a log construction of unknown date. The second school was also log construction and was built in 1856. In 1884 a third school was built; this was a brick structure. This latter building was demolished in 1982. Derry West was prosperous until 1865 when the settlement was ravaged by fire. It never returned to its former status (Heritage Mississauga 2009).

**Britannia**

The historic settlement of Britannia was located at the intersection of Hurontario Street and Britannia Road in the City of Mississauga. The first reference to Britannia dates to 1821 with the settlement being named “Gerdner’s Clearing.” Later that year a church and a school house, both of log construction, were built in the community. By 1830 the community had begun to grow considerably. The first recorded burial in the Methodist graveyard is dated 1837 and a brick construction church was built in 1843. In 1852 the original schoolhouse was replaced by one of brick construction. By 1863 the community had a wagon shop, a carpentry, a general store, a smithy, and a post office; this post office was closed in 1915 (Heritage Mississauga 2009).

**Streetsville**

The settlement of Streetsville began between 1819 and 1821 on the banks of the Credit River, just east of Queen Street South in the City of Mississauga. The original settlement probably focused around Timothy Street’s mills, after whom the community is named. In 1821 a general store and trading post was opened by John Barnhart. As early as 1823 a bridge was built over the Credit River, this made the community a key crossing point. By 1835 Streetsville had become a political and economic hub, attracting merchants and tradesmen. By 1850 Streetsville had a population of 1000 and was the most prosperous and populated village in Peel County. By 1858 its population had grown to 1500. Streetsville reached its apex by 1867 and while it continued to thrive after the construction of the Credit Valley Railway, it could not supplant Brampton as the centre of Peel County. By the early 20th century Streetsville’s mills began to close and by the 1940s the last of Streetsville’s many hotels also closed. By 1951 the population had receded to 1139 and in 1974 it was amalgamated into the City of Mississauga (Heritage Mississauga 2009).

**Meadowvale**

The historic settlement of Meadowvale is located within the northwest corner of the intersection of 2 Line West and old Derry Road West in the City of Mississauga. Meadowvale was settled in ca. 1819 by 29 families emigrating from New York State on account of anti-British sentiments there following the War of 1812. In the 1830’s the community prospered on the logging of white pine for the shipbuilding and canal construction industries. In 1836 the first sawmill was constructed by John Simpson as well as a small carding mill. At this time Meadowvale had a population of approximately 250 people and was granted the status of a village. In 1848 the settlement gained a blacksmith and a wagon shop and in 1852 a foundry was constructed. In 1854 a post office was built. Meadowvale’s prosperity began to wane in 1879 when it was by-passed
by the Credit Valley Railway. The sawmill industry declined through the 1880’s because of deforestation. By 1913 only a single mill remained and this was torn down in 1957. In 1980, Meadowvale Village was designated as Ontario’s first Heritage Conservation District (Heritage Mississauga 2009; Parks Canada n.d.)

**Cooksville**

The historic settlement of Cooksville is located at the intersection of Hurontarios Street and Dundas Street East in the City of Mississauga. The first settler of Cooksville was Daniel Harris who arrived from the United States of America in 1800. The settlement was originally named Harrisville. The name was changed in 1836 to Cooksville after Jacob Cook who was a local entrepreneur. Cooksville was a mail hub in the region and an important way-point on the journey between York and Niagara. Cooksville continued to prosper until 1852 when it was mostly razed by fire. The community rebounded in the late 1800’s with the expansion of the winemaking, oil refining, and brick making industries. In 1873 Cooksville was chosen as the seat for Toronto Township. By 1877 Cooksville had completely recovered. It continued on to the modern day to be an important civic, industrial, and commercial centre (Heritage Mississauga 2009).

**Dixie**

The settlement of Dixie located at the intersection of Tomken Road and Dundas Street East in the City of Mississauga and was first settled in 1806 by Phillip Cody who was a United Empire Loyalist from Massachusetts. Construction of the first chapel begun in 1808 but an accident put a hiatus on construction until 1812. The war of 1812 put another hiatus on its construction and it was not completed until 1816. In 1837 the original log chapel was replaced by a stone building which stands to the modern day. In 1844 a log schoolhouse was built in the community. The Anglican parish constructed a red-brick church in 1870. This building stood until 1924 when it burned down; it was replaced in 1925 by a new structure built in the High Victorian Gothic Church style. The proximity of Dixie to Cooksville prevented it from developing a unique character of its own and by the early 20th century the two communities along with the nearby community of Burhamthorpe were interwined (Heritage Mississauga 2009).

**Port Credit**

Port Credit Village was surveyed in 1834 by the Mississauga First Nation. The relocation of the Credit Mississauga to the New Credit Reserve near Brantford in 1847 left the settlement open to Euro-Canadian commercial expansion and went through a period of economic growth focused on the harbour until 1850 when the harbour was destroyed by fire. The construction of the Grand Trunk Railway and Great Western Railway diverted commerce away from Port Credit. The community survived on the stonehooking trade which brought about its slow recovery. Commercial investment in the port by the St. Lawrence Starch Co. and the Port Credit Brickyard led to the revitalization of Port Credit’s economy. In 1909 Port Credit became a police village and in 1914 it was incorporated as a village. Port Credit became amalgamated with the City of Mississauga in 1974 (Heritage Mississauga 2009).

**Toronto-Guelph Radial Railway**

The Toronto-Guelph Radial Railway line was proposed in 1916 by Adam Beck. The line first opened in 1917 with stations at Lambton, Sumerville, Cooksville, and Meadowvale Village. By
1927 the line was owned and operated by the Canadian National Electric Railway and operated 42 trains per day. The line was discontinued in 1931 on account of a number of accidents and competition with the automobile. The track was removed in 1936 (Heritage Mississauga 2009).

**Credit Valley Railway**

The Credit Valley Railway was constructed in between 1877 and 1879. The project was backed by George Laidlaw and was intended to connect Toronto with Orangeville via Streetsville. Construction began in 1874 and over several subsequent years several branches were added to the proposed line. The first section of track from Parkdale (Toronto) to Milton was opened in 1877. The line was completed in 1881 but nearly bankrupted the company. In 1883 the line was taken over by the Canadian Pacific Railway (Heritage Mississauga 2009).

**Great Western Railway**

The Great Western Railway Co. began construction in 1847 and by 1854 its first line connected between Hamilton, Niagara, and Windsor. In 1855 the railway connected a line from Hamilton to Toronto. The Great Western Railway was taken over by the Grand Trunk Railway in 1882. In 1923, Canadian National Railways took over the line following Grand Trunk Railway’s bankruptcy. Today the line is primarily used by both the Toronto Transit Commission and GO Transit (Heritage Mississauga 2009).

**Grand Trunk Railway**

The Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada was incorporated by the Canadian government in 1852 and was planned to connect Toronto to Montreal. It began in 1853 by purchasing five existing railways: the St. Lawrence and Atlantic Railroad Company, the Quebec and Richmond Railroad Company, the Toronto and Guelph Railroad Company, the Grand Junction Railroad Company, and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada East. By 1853, the Toronto and Guelph Railroad Company had already begun construction of its line. After its merge with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the line was redirected from its original route and extended to Sarnia to be a hub for Chicago bound traffic. By 1856 the line had been built from Montreal to Sarnia via Toronto. The company fell into great debt in 1861 and while it was saved from bankruptcy by the Canadian government, in 1919 the company was bankrupt following its expansion west in an attempt to compete with the Canadian Pacific and Canadian Northern Railways (Library and Archives Canada 2005).

As per Section 1.3.1 of the *S & G*, property listed on a municipal register or designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act* or that is a federal, provincial or municipal historic landmark or site are indicative of archaeological potential. A number of designated heritage properties are located in proximity to the Hurontario-Main Street LRT study area. Details are given below in Table 1.
Table 1: Listed/Designated Heritage Properties within 300 m radius of study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Designation Type</th>
<th>Designation Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPR Study Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lawrence Starch Ltd.</td>
<td>141 Lakeshore Road East</td>
<td>ca. 1932</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton-Hawksworth House</td>
<td>1234 Old River Road</td>
<td>ca. 1856</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Hamilton House</td>
<td>84 High Street East</td>
<td>ca. 1912</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.T. Gray House</td>
<td>90 High Street East</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Downtown Brampton Study Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel County Court House</td>
<td>1-3 Wellington Street East</td>
<td>ca. 1865-1867</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Peel Registry Office</td>
<td>7 Wellington Street East</td>
<td>ca. 1890</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Brampton Jail</td>
<td>9 Wellington Street East</td>
<td>ca. 1867</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominion Building</td>
<td>8 Queen Street East</td>
<td>pre-1914</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Old Fire Hall</td>
<td>2 Chapel Street</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Library</td>
<td>55 Queen Street East</td>
<td>ca. 1881-1917</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Castle</td>
<td>34 Church Street West</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Church Street East</td>
<td>27 Church Street East</td>
<td>ca. 1890-1892</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul’s United Church</td>
<td>30 Main Street South</td>
<td>ca. 1886</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace United Church</td>
<td>156 Main Street North</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Armoury</td>
<td>14 Chapel Street</td>
<td>pre-1914</td>
<td>Federal Heritage Building Register</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CNR Station</td>
<td>15-19 Church Street West</td>
<td>ca. 1900</td>
<td>Heritage Railway Stations Protections Act</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Boyle House</td>
<td>44 Main Street South</td>
<td>ca. 1855-1885</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Royal Apartment</td>
<td>8 Wellington Street West</td>
<td>ca. 1948</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Queen Street West</td>
<td>100 Queen Street West</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Designation Type</td>
<td>Designation Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blain’s Block</td>
<td>15 Main Street North</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blain’s Block</td>
<td>19-25 Main Street North</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis Lodge</td>
<td>21 Church Street East</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallis House</td>
<td>62 John Street</td>
<td>ca. 1880</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR Station</td>
<td>0 Commuter Drive</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderlea</td>
<td>40 Elizabeth Street South</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewetson Shoe Company</td>
<td>57 Mill Street North</td>
<td>ca. 1908</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>193 Main Street North</td>
<td>Late 19th century</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>195 Main Street North</td>
<td>Late 19th century</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>234 Main Street North</td>
<td>ca. 1882</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62 Union Street</td>
<td>Early 1870s</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: City of Brampton 2013; Parks Canada n.d.)

**Britannia United Church and Cemetery**

Britannia United Church and Cemetery is located at 5961 Hurontario Street in the City of Mississauga. The red-brick church was constructed in 1843 and the cemetery was established in 1830. The property was designated in 1981 under Part 4 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* on the heritage value of its association with the Wesleyan Methodist congregation, the historic nature of the property, and the church being a good representation of the rural interpretation of the High Victorian Gothic style (Parks Canada n.d.). A Stage 3 Cemetery Investigation was recommended for the Hurontario-Main Street LRT TPAP by Archeoworks (2010).

**Cheyne Cemetery**

The Cheyne Cemetery is a historic nineteenth century pioneer cemetery that was actively used between 1844 and 1906. A Wesleyan Methodist chapel of frame construction stood immediately south of the cemetery. According to the 1861 census the chapel could accommodate a congregation of 250 people (ASI 1992). The Cheyne Cemetery is pending Heritage Designation (Brampton 2013). The Cheyne Cemetery was subjected to a Stage 3 Cemetery Investigation by ASI (1991; 1992) which defined the western boundary of the cemetery.

**Derry West Cemetery**

The Derry West cemetery is located at the intersection of Derry Road West and Hurontario Street, in the City of Mississauga. The cemetery was established in ca. 1830 and was active until 1936. The cemetery was designated in 2007 under Part 4 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The cemetery was designated on the heritage value of being representative of nineteenth century cemetery
design, being characterised by a naturalistic setting, and to be utilised as a park-like public space (Parks Canada n.d.). The Derry West Cemetery was subjected to a Stage 3 Cemetery Investigation by ASI (2004; 2006b) which defined the eastern boundary of the cemetery.

### 1.2.3 Historic Map Review

The 1877 *Illustrated Historical Map of the County of Peel* was reviewed to determine the potential for the presence of historic features within the study area during the nineteenth century (Figures 7-9). It should be noted, however, that not all features of interest were mapped systematically in the Ontario series of historical atlases, given that they were financed by subscription, and subscribers were given preference with regard to the level of detail provided on the maps. Moreover, not every feature of interest would have been within the scope of the atlases.

For the Euro-Canadian period, the majority of early nineteenth century farmsteads (i.e., those which are arguably the most potentially significant resources and whose locations are rarely recorded on nineteenth century maps) are likely to be located in proximity to water.

The *S&G* (Section 1.3.1) stipulates that areas of early Euro-Canadian settlement (pioneer homesteads, isolated cabins, farmstead complexes), early wharf or dock complexes, pioneer churches and early cemeteries, are considered to have archaeological potential. Early historical transportation routes (trails, passes, roads, railways, portage routes), properties listed on a municipal register or designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act* or a federal, provincial, or municipal historic landmark or site are also considered to have archaeological potential.

Historically, the study area is located in the former Township of Toronto, Peel. Details of historic property owners and historic features in the study area are listed in Table 2.

Historic mapping was reviewed as part of historical research, and it was determined that the study area (except Brampton) was a rural, agricultural landscape in the early nineteenth century. The historic mapping demonstrates that the MSF study area includes the locations of the historic farmsteads of Josh Graham and Thos Graham. The CPR study area includes/abuts the location of the Jas. W. Cotton farm house and the Port Credit town plot. The QEW study area includes/abuts the locations of the Sir Henry Parker Toll Bar. The Brampton study area, however, is located in the centre of historic Brampton impacting on number historic town plots as well as the station grounds of the Grand Trunk Railway station.

The mapping also demonstrates that Hurontario Street is a historically surveyed road and that Highway QEW follows the alignment of a historically surveyed road. Nineteenth century historic mapping also depicts the names of owners/occupants of farms and properties adjacent to the study area, and the location and arrangement of residences and farmsteads.
### Table 2: Hurontario-Main Street LRT – Nineteenth century property owner(s) and historical features(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Con. #</th>
<th>Lot #</th>
<th>Property Owners (1877)</th>
<th>Historical Feature(s) (1877)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>1-East of Centre Rd.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Town Plots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-West of Centre Rd.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Town Plots; Station Grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-East of Centre Rd.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Town Plots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-West of Centre Rd.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Town Plots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSF</td>
<td>1-East of Centre Rd.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Josh Graham</td>
<td>Farm house; orchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thos Graham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>1 West of Centre Rd.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Thella Johnston</td>
<td>Orchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Gardner</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>2-North of Dundas St.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>J. Wesley Might</td>
<td>Orchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Wilcox</td>
<td>Stream-course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>2 North of Dundas St.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Robt McClelland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEW</td>
<td>Range 3 Credit River I.R.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Isaac Wilcox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range 1 Credit River I.R.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Henry Parker</td>
<td>Toll Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range 2 Credit River I.R.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Robt Cotton</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>Range 1 Credit River I.R.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jas W. Cotton</td>
<td>Stream-course; Orchard (2); Farm house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range 1 Credit River I.R.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jas W. Cotton</td>
<td>Orchard; Great Western Railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>Port Credit Town Plot</td>
<td>Town Plot 1 West of Huron Street</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A series of historic topographic maps from 1909 to 1960 were also reviewed to chart the development in the study area in the twentieth century. The 1909 map indicates that the Josh Graham historic farmstead was a stone/brick construction. It does not indicate the Sir Henry Parker Toll Bar or the Jas W. Cotton farm house, indicating that these structures were likely dismantled by 1909. The 1909 map also indicates that the Highway QEW follows the approximate alignment of the historic road, Middle Road (Department of Militia and Defence 1909).

The 1918 map indicates that the Guelph-Toronto Radial railway passes through the 403 study area. The map also indicates that Hurontario Street is now a hydroelectric corridor and is now a metalled road (Department of Militia and Defence 1918).

The 1931 map indicates that the Hydro Electric Power Commission transmission line crosses Hurontario Street at the QEW study area. It also indicates that Hurontario Street south of Cooksville is now much more developed (Department of National Defence 1931).
The 1942 map indicates that the Guelph-Toronto Radial railway line has been removed but that the path is still utilised as a hydroelectric power line on wooden poles. The 1942 map also indicates that Hurontario Street is now a paved main (wide) highway. It indicates that the Hydro Electric Power Commission transmission line is on steel towers and that the Highway QEW is now constructed (Department of National Defence 1942).

The 1960 map indicates that the Highway 401 is now constructed and is a three or more lane paved highway. The Highway QEW is also indicated as a paved three or more lane highway. The CPR line is indicated as a double tracked railway (Department of National Defence 1960).

Generally speaking these maps show that the study area has experienced a great deal of intensive urban development over the course of the twentieth century that has likely impacted archaeological potential.

1.2.4 Summary of Historical Context

The background research and historic mapping demonstrates that the study area exhibits archaeological potential due to the presence of historic features within and/or in immediate or close proximity to the study areas. The Brampton study area includes number town plots and the station grounds of the Grand Trunk Railway Station. The MSF study area includes the location of the historic Josh Graham farmstead and Thos Graham farmstead. The QEW study area includes/abuts the location of the historic Sir Henry Parker Toll Bar. The CPR study area includes/abuts the location of the historic Jas. W. Cotton farmhouse. Hurontario Street is indicated as a historically surveyed road and Highway QEW is aligned with the historic Middle Road. The study area also impacts on the town plot of the village of Port Credit. All these factors are indicative of archaeological potential.

Further, the background research demonstrated that the study area retains potential for the recovery of pre-contact and contact period archaeological resources on account of the pre-contact and historic occupation and utilisation of the region by Aboriginal peoples.

1.3 Archaeological Context

This section provides background research pertaining to previous archaeological fieldwork conducted within and in the vicinities of the Hurontario-Main Street LRT study areas, the environmental characteristics (including drainage, soils or surficial geology and topography, etc.), and current land use and field conditions. Three sources of information were consulted to provide information about previous archaeological research in the study area; the site record forms for registered sites housed at the MTCS; published and unpublished documentary sources; and the files of ASI.

1.3.1 Current Land Use and Field Conditions

The Stage 1 archaeological assessment property inspection was conducted by Peter Carruthers (P163) of ASI, on June 5, 2013. The study areas are located along Hurontario Street in the City of Brampton and the City of Mississauga. The Brampton study area is located in the centre of Brampton from the Brampton GO station south along Main Street until Wellington Street West. It is located within a heritage district of the City of Brampton and consists primarily of medium-
density commercial land-use as well as the GO transit train station parking lot. The MSF study area is located southeast of Highway 407 and is approximately the entire parcel of Lot 12, Concession 1 East of Centre Road, in the City of Brampton and City of Mississauga. The study area presently consists of the Topflight Drive and part of the Edwards Boulevard ROWs, a golfing driving range as well as actively cultivated agricultural fields both within and beyond the hydro-electric corridor and is sectioned by a tributary of Etobicoke Creek. The 401 study area is located at the intersection of Hurontario Street and Highway 401, in the City of Mississauga. The property is presently graded land and highway right-of-way (ROW). The 403 study area is located at the intersection of Hurontario Street and the northwest corner of Square One, in the City of Mississauga. The property currently consists of graded land, highway ROW, as well as public ROW. The DT Mississauga study area is located along Duke of York Boulevard from Rathburn Road West to Burnhamthorpe Road West along the western side of Square One. The study area consists of ROW. The QEW study area is located at the intersection of Highway QEW and Hurontario Street, in the City of Mississauga. The property consists of graded land and highway ROW. The CPR study area is located at the intersection of Hurontario Street and the CPR line, between Park Street and Eaglewood Boulevard. The property currently consists of the rail over pass, graded land, a parking lot of the Port Credit GO Station and the diverted and channelized stream course of Mary Fix Creek. Along Hurontario Street from Highway 407 to Highway 401 the landscape is generally dominated by low density industrial development with some agricultural land use. From Highway 401 to Matheson Boulevard, the landscape is dominated by mixed density residential, industrial, and commercial development with some agricultural land use. From Matheson Boulevard to Port Credit GO Station, the landscape is dominated by mixed density residential with some commercial development with isolated agricultural land use in the northern portion of the area.

1.3.2 Geography

In addition to the known archaeological sites, the state of the natural environment is an important predictor of archaeological potential. Accordingly, a description of the study area physiography and soils is provided below.

The S&G (Section 1.3.1) stipulates that primary water sources (lakes, rivers, streams, creeks, etc.), secondary water sources (intermittent streams and creeks, springs, marshes, swamps, etc.), ancient water sources (glacial lake shorelines indicated by the presence of raised sand or gravel beach ridges, relic river or stream channels indicated by clear dip or swale in the topography, shorelines of drained lakes or marshes, cobble beaches, etc.), as well as accessible or inaccessible shorelines (high bluffs, swamp or marsh fields by the edge of a lake, sandbars stretching into marsh, etc.) are characteristics that indicate archaeological potential.

Water has been identified as the major determinant of site selection and the presence of potable water is the single most important resource necessary for any extended human occupation or settlement. Since water sources have remained relatively stable in Ontario after the Pleistocene era, proximity to water can be regarded as a useful index for the evaluation of archaeological site potential. Indeed, distance from water has been one of the most commonly used variables for predictive modeling of site location.

The S&G (Section 1.3.1) also lists other geographic characteristics that can indicate archaeological potential including: elevated topography (eskers, drumlins, large knolls, plateaux), pockets of well-drained sandy soil, especially near areas of heavy soil or rocky ground, distinctive
land formations that might have been special or spiritual places, such as waterfalls, rock outcrops, caverns, mounds, and promontories and their bases. Physical indicators of use may be present, such as burials, structures, offerings, rock paintings or carvings. Resource areas, including: food or medicinal plants (migratory routes, spawning areas) are also considered characteristics that indicate archaeological potential.

A key plan to the surficial geology of the study areas is shown on Figure 10.

Brampton

The Brampton study area falls within the Peel Plain physiographic region of southern Ontario within bevelled till plain. Soils in the Brampton study area consist of Chinguacousy clay loam and Bottom Lands. The Brampton study area is located from the Brampton GO Station south along Main Street to Wellington Street West and is historically intersected by the main channel of Etobicoke Creek.

The Peel Plain is a level-to-undulating tract of clay soils that covers an area of over 775 km² across the central portions of the Regional Municipalities of York, Peel and Halton (Chapman and Putnam 1984:174). The Peel Plain features a gradual and generally uniform slope towards Lake Ontario. Deep valleys have been cut across the plain by the Credit, Humber, Don, and Rouge Rivers, as well as the Bronte, Oakville, and Etobicoke Creeks. The Peel Plain is generally deforested, but there is evidence that this region once featured a hardwood forest that hosted a variety of species such as sugar maple, beech, white oak, hickory, basswood, and some white pine (Chapman and Putnam 1984:175).

Chinguacousy clay loam is an imperfectly drained soil derived from a parent material that is fairly high in limestone however shale is also present. The topography is gently sloping and erosion is slight. The natural vegetation consists mainly of elm and soft maple as well as ash and oak. Chinguacousy clay loam is utilized predominantly for dairying (Hoffman and Richard 1953: 42-44).

Surficial geology is mapped on Figures 11.

Etobicoke Creek makes up half of the joint Etobicoke-Mimico Creeks watershed. Etobicoke Creek drains an area of approximately 211 km² (TRCA n.d.). Etobicoke Creek originates in the South Slope physiographic region and transits the Peel Plain and the South Slope before meeting its confluence with Lake Ontario in the Iroquois Plain physiographic region east of Dixie Road.

MSF

The MSF study area falls within the Peel Plain physiographic region of southern Ontario within bevelled till plain. Soils in the MSF study area consist of Peel clay and Malton clay. The MSF study area is located south of Highway 407 between Hurontario Street and Kennedy Road, sectioned by a tributary of Etobicoke Creek.

The Peel Plain is a level-to-undulating tract of clay soils that covers an area of over 775 km² across the central portions of the Regional Municipalities of York, Peel and Halton (Chapman and Putnam 1984:174). The Peel Plain features a gradual and generally uniform slope towards Lake Ontario. Deep valleys have been cut across the plain by the Credit, Humber, Don, and Rouge Rivers, as well as the Bronte, Oakville, and Etobicoke Creeks. The Peel Plain is generally...
deforested, but there is evidence that this region once featured a hardwood forest that hosted a variety of species such as sugar maple, beech, white oak, hickory, basswood, and some white pine (Chapman and Putnam 1984:175).

Peel clay is a imperfectly drained soil which has formed from stonefree lacustrine material. Peel clay is neutral to slightly acidic. The internal drainage is low with slow runoff except in areas of sufficient slope. The topography is smooth gently sloping and erosion is slight. The surface soil has a high organic content and is rich in plant nutrients. Natural vegetation in extant woodlots is primarily soft maple and elm (Hoffman and Richards 1953: 55).

Malton clay is a poorly drained soil developed upon similar material as Peel clay. Malton clay has a smooth very gently sloping topography. Malton clay is rich in plant nutrients and its main factor limiting fertility is drainage. Natural vegetation where extant on Malton clay consists of largely elm, ash, cedar and some soft maple. Malton clay is employed agriculturally for general farming and dairying. The soil is well suited for the production of hay and pasture however the drainage prohibits alfalfa. Provided with the appropriate climate this soil produces good yields of cereal crops (Hoffman and Richards 1953: 55-57).

Surficial geology is mapped on Figure 12.

Etobicoke Creek makes up half of the joint Etobicoke-Mimico Creeks watershed. Etobicoke Creek drains an area of approximately 211 km² (TRCA n.d.). Etobicoke Creek originates in the South Slope physiographic region and transits the Peel Plain and the South Slope before meeting its confluence with Lake Ontario in the Iroquois Plain physiographic region east of Dixie Road.

401

The 401 study area falls within the South Slope physiographic region of southern Ontario within drumlinized till plain. Soils in the 401 study area consist of Oneida clay loam, Jeddo clay loam, Bottom lands, and Chinguacousy clay loam. The 401 study area is located near a tributary of the Cooksville Creek.

The South Slope region comprises the southern slope of the Oak Ridges Moraine (Chapman and Putnam 1984:172-174). The South Slope meets the moraine at heights of approximately 300 m above sea level and descends southward toward Lake Ontario, ending at elevations below 150 m above sea level at some areas. The South Slope extends from the Niagara Escarpment to the Trent River and covers approximately 2435 km² (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 172). Numerous streams descend the South Slope, which have cut deep valleys into the till.

Jeddo clay loam occurs in small pockets in Peel County. This soil is poorly drained and has a smooth very gently sloping topography. Natural vegetation where extant on Jeddo clay loam consists primarily of elm, ash and cedar. Jeddo clay loam is best utilized for the production of hay. This soil has a medium phosphate content, good calcium content, and high organic and potash contents (Hoffman and Richards 1953: 44). Bottom lands are low lying soils along stream courses which are usually subject to flooding. They are immature soils. Drainage varies but is typically poor. Vegetation consists of willow, elm, and cedar and where flooded bulrushes, sedges, and marsh grasses. Bottom lands are utilized for pasture however can be cultivated when the timing and extent of flooding is considered (Hoffman and Richards 1953: 63).
Oneida clay loam occurs in the southern section of Peel County and is characterized by smooth moderately sloping topography. The smooth moderately rolling topography of Oneida clay loam is caused by dissection by stream courses. Percolation through the soil profile is slow but run-off is rapid and the soil is effectively well-drained; the soil is susceptible to erosion. Oak, sugar maple, pine, beech, and elm are commonly occurring tree species on Oneida clay loam with elm occurring particularly at the bottom of slopes. Oneida clay is predominantly deforested and is used for dairying and general farming. The soil is well adapted to growing cereal, grains, pasture, and hay (Hoffman and Richards 1953: 40-42).

Chinguacousy clay loam is an imperfectly drained soil derived from a parent material that is fairly high in limestone however shale is also present. The topography is gently sloping and erosion is slight. The natural vegetation consists mainly of elm and soft maple as well as ash and oak. Chinguacousy clay loam is utilized predominantly for dairying (Hoffman and Richard 1953: 42-44).

Surficial geology is mapped on Figures 13 and 14.

Cooksville Creek drains an area of approximately 33.9 km$^2$ (Aquafor Beech Ltd. 2012). Cooksville Creek originates in the South Slope physiographic region and flows south to meet its confluence with Lake Ontario in the Lake Iroquois Plain physiographic region west of Cawthra Road.

The 403 study area falls within the South Slope physiographic region of southern Ontario within drumlinized till plain. Soils in the 403 study area consist of Jeddo clay loam, Bottom lands, and Cooksville clay loam. The 403 study area as well is located near to Cooksville Creek.

The South Slope region comprises the southern slope of the Oak Ridges Moraine (Chapman and Putnam 1984:172-174). The South Slope meets the moraine at heights of approximately 300 m above sea level and descends southward toward Lake Ontario, ending at elevations below 150 m above sea level at some areas. The South Slope extends from the Niagara Escarpment to the Trent River and covers approximately 2435 km$^2$ (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 172). Numerous streams descend the South Slope, which have cut deep valleys into the till.

Jeddo clay loam occurs in small pockets in Peel County. This soil is poorly drained and has a smooth very gently sloping topography. Natural vegetation where extant on Jeddo clay loam consists primarily of elm, ash and cedar. Jeddo clay loam is best utilized for the production of hay. This soil has a medium phosphate content, good calcium content, and high organic and potash contents (Hoffman and Richards 1953: 44).

Bottom lands are low lying soils along stream courses which are usually subject to flooding. They are immature soils. Drainage varies but is typically poor. Vegetation consists of willow, elm, and cedar and where flooded bulrushes, sedges, and marsh grasses. Bottom lands are utilized for pasture however can be cultivated when the timing and extent of flooding is considered (Hoffman and Richards 1953: 63).
Cooksville clay loam occurs in southern Toronto Township and is characterized by shallow shale bedrock, and soil depths of two feet or less. It is an imperfectly drained soil and usually contains large shale fragments. The topography is smooth gently sloping. Cooksville clay loam is best used for grazing or forestry. The low fertility, shallowness and tendency for drought severely limit crop production. Fertilization can produce fair yields of cereals, hay or pasture, and dairying is typically practiced. This soil is low in organics, phosphorus, potassium, nitrogen and calcium. Areas of Cooksville clay loam are often utilized for shale quarrying (Hoffman and Richards 1953: 58-59).

Surficial geology is mapped on Figure 15.

Cooksville Creek drains an area of approximately 33.9 km² (Aquafor Beech Ltd. 2012). Cooksville Creek originates in the South Slope physiographic region and flows south to meet its confluence with Lake Ontario in the Lake Iroquois Plain physiographic region west of Cawthra Road.

DT Mississauga

The DT Mississauga study area falls within the South Slope physiographic region of southern Ontario within drumlinized till plain. Soils in the 403 study area consist of Jeddo clay loam, Bottom lands, and Cooksville clay loam. The 403 study area as well is located near to Cooksville Creek.

The South Slope region comprises the southern slope of the Oak Ridges Moraine (Chapman and Putnam 1984:172-174). The South Slope meets the moraine at heights of approximately 300 m above sea level and descends southward toward Lake Ontario, ending at elevations below 150 m above sea level at some areas. The South Slope extends from the Niagara Escarpment to the Trent River and covers approximately 2435 km² (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 172). Numerous streams descend the South Slope, which have cut deep valleys into the till.

Jeddo clay loam occurs in small pockets in Peel County. This soil is poorly drained and has a smooth very gently sloping topography. Natural vegetation where extant on Jeddo clay loam consists primarily of elm, ash and cedar. Jeddo clay loam is best utilized for the production of hay. This soil has a medium phosphate content, good calcium content, and high organic and potash contents (Hoffman and Richards 1953: 44).

Bottom lands are low lying soils along stream courses which are usually subject to flooding. They are immature soils. Drainage varies but is typically poor. Vegetation consists of willow, elm, and cedar and where flooded bulrushes, sedges, and marsh grasses. Bottom lands are utilized for pasture however can be cultivated when the timing and extent of flooding is considered (Hoffman and Richards 1953: 63).

Cooksville clay loam occurs in southern Toronto Township and is characterized by shallow shale bedrock, and soil depths of two feet or less. It is an imperfectly drained soil and usually contains large shale fragments. The topography is smooth gently sloping. Cooksville clay loam is best used for grazing or forestry. The low fertility, shallowness and tendency for drought severely limit crop production. Fertilization can produce fair yields of cereals, hay or pasture, and dairying is typically practiced. This soil is low in organics, phosphorus, potassium, nitrogen and calcium.
Areas of Cooksville clay loam are often utilized for shale quarrying (Hoffman and Richards 1953: 58-59).

Surficial geology is mapped on Figure 15.

Cooksville Creek drains an area of approximately 33.9 km² (Aquafor Beech Ltd. 2012). Cooksville Creek originates in the South Slope physiographic region and flows south to meet its confluence with Lake Ontario in the Lake Iroquois Plain physiographic region west of Cawthra Road.

**QEW**

The QEW study area falls within the Iroquois Plain physiographic region of southern Ontario within sand plain. Soil within the QEW study area consists of Fox sand. The QEW study area is located near Mary Fix Creek, which is part of the Credit River Valley watershed.

The Iroquois Plain region is a lowland region bordering Lake Ontario. This region is characteristically flat and formed by lacustrine deposits laid down by the inundation of Lake Iroquois, a body of water that existed during the late Pleistocene. This region extends from the Trent River, around the western part of Lake Ontario, to the Niagara River, spanning a distance of approximately 300 km (Chapman and Putnam 1984:190). The old shorelines of Lake Iroquois include cliffs, bars, beaches and boulder pavements.

Glacial Lake Iroquois came into existence by about 12,000 BP as the Ontario lobe of the Wisconsin glacier retreated from the Lake Ontario basin. Isostatic uplift and the blockage of subsequent lower outlets by glacial ice produced a water plain substantially higher than modern Lake Ontario. Beginning around 12,000 BP, water levels started to drop during the next few centuries in response to sill elevations at the changing outlet. By about 11,500 BP, when the St. Lawrence River outlet became established, the initial phase of Lake Ontario began and this low water phase appears to have lasted until at least 10,500 BP. At this time the waters stood as much as 100 m below current levels. At this time isostatic uplift had started to raise the outlet around Kingston so that by 10,000 BP the water level had risen to about 80 m below present. Uplift has continued to tilt Lake Ontario upward to the northeast, propagating a gradual and transgressive expansion throughout the basin (Anderson and Lewis 1985; Karrow 1967:49; Karrow and Warner 1988, 1990).

The old sandbars in this region are good aquifers that supply water to farms and villages. The gravel bars are quarried for road and building material, while the clays of the old lake bed have been used for the manufacture of bricks (Chapman and Putnam 1984:196). This narrow strip is the most densely inhabited area because of its proximity to Lake Ontario and its climatic influences, as well as its favourable soil conditions.

Fox sand occurs in large areas and is distinct from Fox sandy loam by its surface texture. Fox sand is prone is double profiles. Fox sand is well drained and has a smooth gently sloping topography (Hoffman and Richards 1953: 47-48).

Surficial geology is mapped on Figure 16.
The Credit River is approximately 90 km long and its watershed features both Carolinian and Deciduous forests (CVCA n.d.). The watershed drains approximately 1000 km² (CVCA 2006). The Credit River’s headwaters originate at the Niagara Escarpment. The river transits the South slope and Peel Plain physiographic regions until meeting its confluence with Lake Ontario at Port Credit in the Iroquois Plain physiographic region.

**CPR**

The CPR study area falls within the Iroquois Plain physiographic region of southern Ontario within sand plain. Soil within the CPR study area consists of Fox sand. The CPR study area is located near Mary Fix Creek, which is part of the Credit River Valley watershed.

The Iroquois Plain region is a lowland region bordering Lake Ontario. This region is characteristically flat and formed by lacustrine deposits laid down by the inundation of Lake Iroquois, a body of water that existed during the late Pleistocene. This region extends from the Trent River, around the western part of Lake Ontario, to the Niagara River, spanning a distance of approximately 300 km (Chapman and Putnam 1984:190). The old shorelines of Lake Iroquois include cliffs, bars, beaches and boulder pavements.

Glacial Lake Iroquois came into existence by about 12,000 BP as the Ontario lobe of the Wisconsin glacier retreated from the Lake Ontario basin. Isostatic uplift and the blockage of subsequent lower outlets by glacial ice produced a water plain substantially higher than modern Lake Ontario. Beginning around 12,000 BP, water levels started to drop during the next few centuries in response to silt elevations at the changing outlet. By about 11,500 BP, when the St. Lawrence River outlet became established, the initial phase of Lake Ontario began and this low water phase appears to have lasted until at least 10,500 BP. At this time the waters stood as much as 100 m below current levels. At this time isostatic uplift had started to raise the outlet around Kingston so that by 10,000 BP the water level had risen to about 80 m below present. Uplift has continued to tilt Lake Ontario upward to the northeast, propagating a gradual and transgressive expansion throughout the basin (Anderson and Lewis 1985; Karrow 1967:49; Karrow and Warner 1988, 1990).

The old sandbars in this region are good aquifers that supply water to farms and villages. The gravel bars are quarried for road and building material, while the clays of the old lake bed have been used for the manufacture of bricks (Chapman and Putnam 1984:196). This narrow strip is the most densely inhabited area because of its proximity to Lake Ontario and its climatic influences, as well as its favorable soil conditions.

Fox sand occurs in large areas and is distinct from Fox sandy loam by its surface texture. Fox sand is prone is double profiles. Fox sand is well drained and has a smooth gently sloping topography (Hoffman and Richards 1953: 47-48).

Surficial geology information is mapped and presented in Figure 17.

The Credit River is approximately 90 km long and its watershed features both Carolinian and Deciduous forests (CVCA n.d.). The watershed drains approximately 1000 km² (CVCA 2006). The Credit River’s headwaters originate at the Niagara Escarpment. The river transits the South slope and Peel Plain physiographic regions until meeting its confluence with Lake Ontario at Port Credit in the Iroquois Plain physiographic region.
Palaeontological evidence can provide some information on the past environment of the region of the study areas. In Woodbridge a molar fragment of woolly mammoth *Mammuthus primigenius* (Churcher 1968) was found. Peat deposited 2 m away and believed to have been the same deposit enclosing the molar yielded a normalized return of 45000 ± 900 (GSC-1181) (Canadian Museum of Civilization 2005). Using the program OxCal 4.2, this calibrates to a date of 44,592 cal BC. The deposit is believed to belong to the Port Talbot interstadial.

An antler was recovered from a deposit of channel sand, overlying glacial drift and underlying reredeposited glacial clay. The antler is either of extinct *Torontoceros hypogaeus* (Churcher and Peterson 1982) or of caribou *Rangifer tarandus* (Spiess et al. 1985). The specimen was found in association with pollen representing mixed hardwood-conifer forest (Churcher and Peterson 1982). The specimen was burned and yielded a normalized return of 11395 ± 325 (GX-4914) (Canadian Museum of Civilization 2005). Using the program OxCal 4.2, this calibrates to a date of 10,686 cal BC.

These two records help inform our view of the environment of southern Ontario in the distant past. During the glacial and epi-glacial period the environment of southern Ontario was a tundra-like environment and supported an ecosystem of megafauna. Only a few centuries after the final retreat of the glaciers, southern Ontario’s environment was more similar to the modern woodland environment, dominated by members of the deer family.

### 1.3.3 Previous Archaeological Research

In Ontario, information concerning archaeological sites is stored in the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database (OASD) maintained by the MTCS. This database contains archaeological sites registered within the Borden system. Under the Borden system, Canada has been divided into grid blocks based on latitude and longitude. A Borden block is approximately 13 km east to west, and approximately 18.5 km north to south. Each Borden block is referenced by a four-letter designator, and sites within a block are numbered sequentially as they are found. The Hurontario-Main Street LRT study areas are located in Borden blocks: *AjGw, AjGv, and AkGw*.

According to the OASD (email communication, Robert von Bitter, MTCS Data Coordinator, May 29, 2013), four identified archaeological sites are located within 1 km of the MSF and 403 study areas. According to the OASD (email communications, Robert von Bitter, MTCS Data Coordinator, June 10, 2013), three identified archaeological sites are located within 1 km of the 401 study area; no identified archaeological sites are located within 1 km of the QEW and CPR study areas. According to the OASD (email communication, Robert von Bitter, MTCS Data Coordinator, July 24, 2013), one identified archaeological site is located within 1 km of the Brampton study area. According to the background research, one additional site was also located within 1 km of the MSF study area (ASI 2007).
Table 3: Details of archaeological sites registered within 1 km of the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borden #</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Cultural Affiliation</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AjGv-26</td>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Spittal n.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGw-203</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Late Archaic</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Pearce 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGw-204</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Pearce 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGw-208</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Pearce 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGw-394</td>
<td>Fletcher's Creek</td>
<td>Undetermined pre-contact</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>ASI 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGw-489</td>
<td>De Zen</td>
<td>Undetermined Precontact</td>
<td>Lithic scatter</td>
<td>Cornies [AMICK] 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AkGw-456</td>
<td>Alderlea House</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Archeoworks Inc. (2010; CIF#: P029-2010) conducted a Stage 1 archaeological assessment of the Hurontario Higher Order Transit Development Class Environmental Assessment (EA) study area in the City of Brampton and the City of Mississauga, Regional Municipality of Peel under the project direction of Kim Slocki (CIF# P029-2010). The Stage 1 archaeological assessment determined that a several small areas in the study area retained archaeological potential. The study area was recommended to be subject to a Stage 2 archaeological assessment in areas identified to have archaeological potential. Stage 2 archaeological assessment was recommended for the following areas as described below.

In the Port Credit area the grass margins of Port Street as well as the former lawn bowling green along Hurontario Street north of High Street were recommended for Stage 2 archaeological assessment.

Between Port Credit and Highway QEW the grass margins on the west side of Hurontario Street north of Inglewood Drive and south of Highway QEW to Indian Valley Trail as well as on the east side of Hurontario Street south of North Service Road were recommended for Stage 2 archaeological assessment.

Between Highway QEW and Dundas Street Stage 2 archaeological assessment was recommended within an urban area along Hurontario Street from approximately 400 m north of Highway QEW to approximately 775 m north of Dundas Street.

Between Dundas Street and Burhamthorpe Road West Stage 2 archaeological assessment was recommended within an urban area along Hurontario Street from approximately 775 m north of Dundas Street to Highway 403.

In the Downtown Mississauga area Stage 2 archaeological assessment was recommended within a urban area along Burhamthorpe Road West from Hurontario Street to Living Arts Drive, north along Living Arts Drive to Rathburn Road West, along Rathburn Road West to a proposed alignment running parallel to the west of Hurontario Street over Highway 403 as well as along City Centre Drive south from Rathburn Road West to a distance of approximately 530 m until a proposed diversion southeast to Hurontario Street.
Between Highway 403 to Highway 401 Stage 2 archaeological assessment was recommended within an urban area along Hurontario Street from approximately 150 m south of Kingsbridge Garden Circle/Elia Avenue to approximately 90 m north of Britannia Road. Particularly the areas of impact in proximity to Britannia United Church require assessment on the basis that unmarked graves may exist within the alignment.

Between Highway 401 to Highway 407 Stage 2 archaeological assessment is required for an undisturbed fallow area at the southeast corner of the intersection of Hurontario Street and Highway 407.

In the Brampton Downtown area Stage 2 archaeological assessment is recommended within an urban area on the west side of Main Street north of Sir Lou Drive as well as on the west side of Main Street north of Charolais Boulevard.

Areas of the present study area overlapped with the Archeoworks Inc. (2010) study area. Based on observations, ASI presents different recommendations for these areas. These differences are outlined in Table 4. The rationale for these differences is presented in Section 3.2 of this report.

Table 4: Comparison of current ASI and Archeoworks Inc. (2010) recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QEW Study Area</td>
<td>QEW Study Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Potential</td>
<td>Figure 24; Plate 21</td>
<td>Portions require Stage 2 AA</td>
<td>Figures M2-3, M2-4 and M2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASI</td>
<td>Archeoworks Inc. (2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR Study Area</td>
<td>CPR Study Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Potential in portion</td>
<td>Figure 25; Plate 25</td>
<td>Portions require Stage 2 AA</td>
<td>Figure M1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASI</td>
<td>Archeoworks Inc. (2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403 Study Area</td>
<td>403 Study Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Potential</td>
<td>Figure 23; Plates 7, 9-11</td>
<td>Portions require Stage 2 AA</td>
<td>Figures M4-6, M4-7 and M6-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the background research, six other archaeological assessments have been conducted within 50 m of the Hurontario-Main Street LRT study areas (Ambrose 1982; AMICK 2003; Archeoworks Inc. 2007; 2011; ASI 2003a; 2008; Varley 2010). Due to access constraints only the Ambrose (1982) and ASI (2003a; 2008) reports were able to be reviewed for this Stage 1 archaeological assessment.

Mary T. Ambrose (1982) conducted an archaeological survey of Highway 407 from Highway 10 to Airport Road (W.P. 87-78-00). The report does not describe any background research or the survey methodology. The survey discovered one site (Davis AkGv-4) located in the southwest corner of Lot 13, Concession 4 east of Hurontario Street. The assemblage comprised of pottery, glass, bone, metal, and miscellaneous artifact classes and a total of 895 artifacts were recovered. The report recommended that the Davis site had very high scientific value and that a study be
undertaken of glass and ceramic sherd remains from historic homestead sites in Peel County to examine chipped glass tool use by the historic Mississauga First Nation people.

ASI (2003) conducted a Stage 1 archaeological assessment of the Fletcher’s Creek Pumping Station and Forcemain study area, in Lots 12 and 13, East Concession 1, 2, and 3 and Part of West Concession 1, in the City of Brampton, Regional Municipality of Peel under the project direction of Martin Cooper and Dr. Bruce Welsh (MCL PIF# P047-057). The study area was recommended to be subject to a Stage 2 archaeological assessment.

ASI (2008) conducted a Stage 2 archaeological assessment of the Sanitary Sewer Diversion Class EA study in the Regional Municipality of Peel under the project direction of Robert Pihl (MCL PIF# P057-185). The Stage 2 archaeological assessment was conducted on October 4 and 5 and November 8, 2005 by a combination of systematic test-pit and pedestrian survey. The Stage 2 archaeological assessment discovered one archaeological site (Fletcher’s Creek AjGw-394) and one findspot. The Fletcher’s Creek site consisted of a lithic scatter of 11 chert flakes covering an area of approximately 40 m by 25 m. The findspot consisted of an isolated chert flake. The Fletcher’s Creek site was recommended for Stage 3 archaeological assessment. The remainder of the study area was recommended to be considered free of future archaeological concern.

ASI also conducted Stage 3 Cemetery Investigations on the Cheyne Cemetery (1991; 1992) and on the Derry West Cemetery (2004; 2006b). ASI (1991) conducted an archaeological survey of Cheyne Cemetery in the City of Brampton, Regional Municipality of Peel. The survey employed mechanical stripping to expose a 10 m wide area eastward from Hurontario Street done to sterile subsoil. Three grave markers and 17 grave shafts were identified. The three grave markers were recommended to undergo consultation by a conservator prior to their relocation (see Maltby 1991). With regard to the 17 grave shafts it was recommended that the skeletal material be exhumed and relocated prior to the expansion of Hurontario Street.

ASI (1992) conducted an archaeological mitigation of the Cheyne Cemetery located in Part Lot 14, Concession 1, E.H.S. in the City of Brampton, Regional Municipality of Peel under the project direction of Dr. Ronald Williamson. The mitigation involved the removal of human remains from burial features 13, 14, and 15 only. After a brief osteological examination the remains were reburied in a secure portion of the cemetery. The remaining 14 identified grave shafts were determined to not be impacted by the intended expansion of Hurontario Street.

ASI (2004) conducted a Stage 1 archaeological resource assessment of the Derry West Cemetery located northwest of the intersection of Derry Road West and Hurontario Street, in Part Lot 11, Concession 1 West in the City of Mississauga, Regional Municipality of Peel under the project direction of Robert Pihl (MCL CIF# P057-043). The report determined that one existing grave and possibly additional unmarked graves were situated within the ROW of the proposed Derry Road West widening. The report recommended that the area be mechanically stripped down to the sterile subsoil under supervision of a licensed archaeologist to identify any burial shafts.

ASI (2006) conducted a Stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessment of the northwest corner of the intersection of Derry Road West and Hurontario Street in Part Lot 11, Concession 1 W.H.S. in the City of Mississauga, Regional Municipality of Peel under the project direction of Dr. Bruce Welsh (MCL CIF# P047-220-2006). The Stage 1 archaeological assessment determined that the study area exhibited potential for the presence of historic archaeological remains and recommended the study area be subject to a Stage 2 archaeological assessment including the
mechanical stripping of the western boundary in order to expose any unmarked burial shafts which may have been present. The Stage 2 archaeological assessment was conducted by test-pit survey on July 18, 2006. No archaeological resources were documented. The mechanical stripping exposed a 9 m wide, 33 m long area. A 20th century feature was observed beneath the soil. The report recommends that the study area be considered clear of any further archaeological concern.

### 1.3.4 Summary of Archaeological Context

The review of archaeological work conducted in the area demonstrated that eight archaeological sites have been registered within 1 km of the Hurontario-Main Street LRT study areas.

As discussed in Section 1.3.3 of this report, archaeological potential is associated with the presence of certain topographic features. All the Hurontario-Main Street study areas are located in proximity to watercourses as well as historic transportation routes. The Brampton, MSF, QEW, and CPR study areas also include/abut the locations of historically mapped features.

### 2.0 FIELD METHODS

A property inspection was conducted in order to gain first-hand knowledge of the geography, topography, and current conditions of the Hurontario-Main Street LRT study areas as per the S&G (Section 1.2). The property inspection was a visual inspection only and did not include excavation or collection of archaeological resources. Google Streets View (2013) was also utilised to document current conditions.

Where applicable, the requirements of the S&G (Section 1.2 Standards 1-5) were met as follows during the course of the property inspection:

- The Hurontario-Main Street LRT study areas were inspected systematically during optimal weather conditions which permitted good visibility of land features;
- Weather conditions were overcast to mix of sun and cloud with a temperature of 16°C;
- Coverage was sufficient to identify previously identified features of archaeological potential and additional features not visible on mapping; and,
- Additional features were documented as well as any features that will affect assessment strategies.

Field observations are compiled onto a map of the study area in Section 7.0 (Figures 19-25) and associated photography is presented in Section 8.0 (Plates 1-28).

### 3.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

The historical and archaeological contexts were analyzed to help determine the archaeological potential of the study area. A summary of the archaeological potential of the Hurontario-Main Street LRT study areas is presented in Section 3.1 of this report and an evaluation of the property inspection results is presented in Section 3.2.
3.1 Analysis of Archaeological Potential

Section 1.3.1 of the S&G lists characteristics that indicate where archaeological resources are most likely to be found, and archaeological potential is confirmed when one or more features of archaeological potential are present. Accordingly, the Hurontario-Main Street LRT study areas meet the following criteria used for determining archaeological potential:

- Water source: primary, secondary, or past water source (e.g. Cooksville Creek)
- Well-drained sandy soil (e.g. Fox sand)
- Early historical transportation routes (e.g. Hurontario Street)
- Areas of early Euro-Canadian settlement (e.g. homesteads)
- Property designated under Ontario Heritage Act (e.g. St. Lawrence Starch Ltd. Administration Building)
- Property that local history identifies with historic occupation (e.g. Credit River Mississauga at Port Credit)

These criteria characterize the study area as having potential for the identification of Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian archaeological resources.

3.2 Analysis of Property Inspection Results

The Hurontario-Main Street LRT study areas are mainly comprised of 400-series highway and regional highway ROW. Typically, the ROW can be divided into two areas: the disturbed ROW, and ROW lands beyond the disturbed ROW. The typically disturbed ROW extends outwards from either side of the centerline of the traveled lanes, and it includes the traveled lanes and shoulders and extends to the toe of the fill slope, the top of the cut slope, or the outside edge of the drainage ditch, whichever is furthest from the centerline. Subsurface disturbance within these lands may be considered extreme and pervasive, thereby negating any archaeological potential for such lands.

ROW construction disturbance may be found to extend beyond the typical disturbed ROW area, and this generally includes additional grading, cutting and filling, additional drainage ditching, watercourse alteration or channelization, servicing, removals, intensive landscaping, and heavy construction traffic. Areas beyond the typically disturbed ROW generally require archaeological assessment in order to determine archaeological potential relative to the type or scale of disturbances that may have occurred in these zones.

The property inspection revealed that the Hurontario-Main Street LRT study areas consist of existing ROW lands with associated grading/ditching. These lands have been subject to extensive and deep land alterations that have severely damaged the integrity of any archaeological resources. These ROW disturbances can be attributed to typical road construction activities including paving, utility installation, grading, and ditching. These areas do not retain archaeological potential and do not require further assessment (Figures 19-25: area marked in yellow). Portions of the QEW, 403 and CPR study areas were recommended by Archeoworks Inc. (2003; see Table 4 of this report) as possessing archaeological potential and requiring Stage 2 archaeological assessment. It is the recommendation of ASI based on the existing conditions documented by the 2013 property inspection that these lands no longer retain archaeological potential. These areas do not require further assessment.
Archaeological potential exists in the MSF study area. These lands include agricultural lands within and beyond the hydro-electric corridor south of Highway 407 between Hurontario Street and Kennedy Road that appear relatively undisturbed. These lands retain archaeological potential and will require Stage 2 archaeological assessment by pedestrian survey and test-pit survey strategies where appropriate (Figure 20: areas marked in green and purple).

### 3.3 Conclusions

The Stage 1 archaeological assessment was conducted to assist with the Hurontario-Main Street LRT Preliminary Design and Transit Project Assessment Process. The assessment determined that seven archaeological sites have been registered within 1 km of the study areas. A review of the geography and history of the study area suggested that the study areas have potential for the identification of Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian archaeological resources however the property inspection determined that the majority of the study areas have been previously disturbed by road construction but that the majority of the MSF study area east of Hurontario Street retains archaeological potential.

### 4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the results of the background research and property inspection undertaken for the Stage 1 archaeological assessment of the Hurontario-Main Street LRT Preliminary Design and Transit Project Assessment Process Additional Areas, ASI makes the following recommendations to be treated in tandem with those of Archeoworks Inc. (2010):

1. **Archaeological potential exists in the MSF study area (Figures 17: areas marked in green and purple).** These lands require a Stage 2 archaeological assessment which should be conducted by pedestrian survey and test pit survey strategies where appropriate;

2. Due to extensive and deep land alterations that have severely damaged the integrity of any potential archaeological resources, the right-of-way (ROW) lands within the Brampton, MSF, 401, 403, DT Mississauga, QEW, and CPR study areas do not retain archaeological potential. These ROW lands do not require further archaeological assessment. The property takings in the Brampton study area as well as the LRT alignment at the Brampton GO station do not require further archaeological assessment. A large area of the MSF study area beyond ROW lands was also documented to have deep and extensive land alterations and also does not retain archaeological potential (Figures 17-21: areas marked in yellow);

3. Should the proposed work extend beyond the current study area then further Stage 1 assessment must be conducted to determine the archaeological potential of the surrounding lands.
Notwithstanding the results and recommendations presented in this study, Archaeological Services Inc. notes that no archaeological assessment, no matter how thorough or carefully completed, can necessarily predict, account for, or identify every form of isolated or deeply buried archaeological deposit. In the event that archaeological remains are found during subsequent construction activities, the consultant archaeologist, approval authority, and the Cultural Programs Unit of the MTCS should be immediately notified.

5.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION

ASI advises compliance with the following legislation:

- This report is submitted to the MTCS as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c 0.18. The report is reviewed to ensure that it complies with the standards and guidelines that are issued by the Minister, and that the archaeological fieldwork and report recommendations ensure the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario. When all matters relating to archaeological sites within the project area of a development proposal have been addressed to the satisfaction of the MTCS, 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 archaeological fieldwork on the site, submitted a report to the Minister stating that the site has no further cultural heritage value or interest, and the report has been filed in the Ontario Public Register of Archaeology Reports referred to in Section 65.1 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

- 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*; and

- The *Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act*, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33 require that any person discovering human remains must notify the police or coroner and the Registrar of Cemeteries at the Ministry of Consumer Services.
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Plate 1: View north of level filled area south of Highway 407. No potential.

Plate 2: View north of agricultural field within hydro corridor with wet area. Potential. Requires Stage 2 pedestrian survey.


Plate 4: View northwest of Hurontario Street ROW and hydro-corridor. ROW disturbed. No potential.

Plate 5: View west of the Highway 401 ROW at Hurontario Street. Disturbed. No potential. (Google Earth Image)

Plate 6: View east of Highway 401 ROW, west of Hurontario Street. Disturbed. No potential. (Google Earth Image)
Plate 7: View southeast of Hurontario Street ROW. Disturbed. No potential.

Plate 8: View north-northwest of proposed 403 bridge crossing. Disturbed. No potential.

Plate 9: View southwest of graded area. Disturbed. No potential.

Plate 10: View northeast along Hurontario Street ROW. Disturbed. No potential.

Plate 11: View southeast along Hurontario ROW. Disturbed. No potential.

Plate 12: View south-southeast along City Centre Drive ROW. Disturbed. No potential.
Plate 13: View northeast along Square One Drive ROW. Disturbed. No potential.

Plate 14: View southwest along Rathburn Road ROW. Disturbed. No potential.

Plate 15: View northwest along Hurontario ROW from east side of QEW ramp. Disturbed. No potential.

Plate 16: View southeast of proposed QEW underpass crossing. Disturbed. No potential.

Plate 17: View south-southeast of proposed QEW underpass crossing corridor. Disturbed. No potential.

Plate 18: View north towards proposed east-bound on-ramp. Disturbed. No potential.
Plate 19: View north-northwest along proposed QEW underpass crossing corridor. Disturbed. No potential.

Plate 20: View north-northwest along Hurontario Street ROW. Disturbed. No potential.

Plate 21: View northwest along Hurontario Street ROW. Disturbed. No potential.

Plate 22: View southwest of proposed CPR underpass crossing, north of CPR. Disturbed. No potential. (Google Earth™ Image).

Plate 23: View north of proposed CPR underpass crossing, south of CPR from GO Station parking lot. Disturbed. No potential. (Google Earth™ Image).

Plate 24: View west of proposed CPR underpass crossing, south of CPR. Disturbed. No potential. (Google Earth™ Image).
Plate 25: View south of grassed margin along west side of Hurontario Street. Margin is disturbed. No potential. (Google Earth™ Image).

Plate 26: View south of proposed Brampton GO station alignment. Property is parking lot; disturbed. No potential. (Google Earth™ Image).

Plate 27: View southwest of proposed LRT alignment. Property is laneway to parking lot; disturbed. No potential. (Google Earth™ Image).

Plate 28: View north of proposed property taking in Brampton. Property is disturbed. No potential. (Google Earth™ Image).

Plate 29: View west of proposed Brampton frontage property taking. Property is disturbed. No potential. (Google Earth™ Image).

Plate 30: View southeast down Duke of York Boulevard. ROW is disturbed. No potential.
Plate 31: View northwest down Duke of York Boulevard. ROW is disturbed. No potential.
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This appendix includes extracts from the Archeoworks Inc. (2010) Stage 1 archaeological assessment, conducted for the Hurontario-Main Street LRT project, showing the areas recommended for Stage 2 archaeological assessment. As per Section 4.0 the recommendations of Archeoworks Inc. (2010) remain valid except where contradicted by the present report (Table 4).
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Executive Summary

The Region of Peel, specifically the Cities of Brampton and Mississauga, have experienced substantial growth over the years with a combined population in excess of 1.14 million people, and employment levels of approximately 610,000 combined. Due to these high numbers, the need to conduct a comprehensive higher-order transit, land use and urban design Feasibility/Master Plan study for the Hurontario/Main Street Corridor was identified.

To facilitate this study, conducted in accordance with a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment, Archeoworks Inc. was retained by the MMM Group to conduct a Stage 1 archaeological assessment of the Hurontario/Main Street Corridor, extending from Port Credit in the City of Mississauga to the Brampton GO Transit Station located just north of Queen Street in the City of Brampton. The assessment was confined mostly to lands falling within the existing road Right-of-Way (ROW) on both sides of the road.

Consultation of the Ontario Heritage Properties Database and the Mississauga and Brampton Heritage Registries has confirmed the presence of both listed and designated heritage properties and heritage landscapes within close proximity to study corridor. Additional background research has determined that nine archaeological sites have been found within a 500 metre radius of the corridor, of which six are located within 250 metres or less, indicating potential for locating additional sites within this region. Furthermore, with Etobicoke Creek bisecting the study corridor between Steeles Avenue and Queen Street; and the shores of Lake Ontario, the Credit River, and Cooksville Creek all within 300 metres of the study corridor, we find high potential for the location and recovery of Aboriginal archaeological resources within the boundaries of the study corridor limits. A review of the study corridor within the 1859 Tremaine’s Map of Peel County and the 1877 Illustrated Historical Atlas of York County illustrates many historical features including numerous homesteads, three churches, two cemeteries, two school houses, one mill, and four post offices as well as the historic villages of Brampton, Cooksville, and Port Credit to be located within close proximity of the study corridor. Therefore, the background research also supports potential for locating historical remains within undisturbed portions of the study corridor limits.

A detailed review of the study corridor was conducted in order to identify disturbances and physiographic conditions resulting in areas of low archaeological potential and those undisturbed areas warranting Stage 2 assessment. The overall study corridor falls within extensively urbanized portions of the Cities of Mississauga and Brampton, with the subject lands under investigation for the most part being confined to the existing, disturbed road ROW. Despite these disturbances and physiographic factors, select locations have been assessed to be potentially undisturbed. Due to the established high potential for the recovery of Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian remains within the study corridor limits, once a final design has been created, all identified undisturbed areas should be subjected to a Stage 2 archaeological field assessment, prior to the onset of construction activities.
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Introduction

The Region of Peel, specifically the Cities of Brampton and Mississauga, have experienced substantial growth over the years with a combined population in excess of 1.14 million people, and employment levels of approximately 610,000 combined. Due to these high numbers, the need to conduct a comprehensive higher-order transit, land use and urban design Feasibility/Master Plan study for the Hurontario/Main Street Corridor was identified (see Figure 1).

To facilitate this study, conducted in accordance with a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment, Archeoworks Inc. was retained by the MMM Group to conduct a Stage 1 archaeological assessment of the Hurontario/Main Street Corridor, extending from Port Credit in the City of Mississauga to the Brampton GO Transit Station located just north of Queen Street in Brampton.
the City of Brampton. The assessment was confined mostly to lands falling within the existing road Right-of-Way (ROW) on both sides of the road.

The purpose of this document is to determine what archaeological impacts might occur during construction the proposed Hurontario Higher Order Transit corridor and, thus, archaeological potential was identified by conducting background research and undertaking a non-intrusive field review of the subject lands. The Stage 1 research, reported herein, was conducted under the project direction of Ms. Kim Slocki, in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act (1990) under an archaeological consulting licence (P029) issued to Kim Slocki. Permission to review and assess the archaeological potential of the subject lands was granted on July 7th, 2008.

1.0 Determining Archaeological Potential

The Stage 1 background research is conducted to evaluate the study corridor’s potential to contain archaeological resources. Potential is assessed based on a combination of physical and historical features, as well as the proximity of previously identified archaeological sites. If potential is established anywhere within the study corridor limits, a Stage 2 assessment must be conducted to confirm the presence of archaeological resources. The Checklist for Determining Archaeological Potential, Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists final draft Unit 1C summarizes those features which are used to assess archaeological potential, as well as the integrity of any such resources and the impact of proposed development/construction activities.

1.1 Archaeological Significance

To establish the archaeological significance of the study corridor, Archeoworks Inc. conducted a comprehensive review of registered archaeological sites, listed and designated heritage properties, and cultural landscapes within close proximity to its limits. Furthermore, a review of the physiography of the overall area and its correlation to locating Aboriginal remains as well as consultation of the Tremaine’s Map and Illustrated Historical Atlases were undertaken. The results of this background research are documented below.

Consultation of the records for listed and designated heritage properties within the Cities of Mississauga and Brampton’s Inventory of Heritage properties and landscapes, as well as the Ministry of Culture’s database of designated heritage properties, confirmed the presences of both listed and designated heritage properties and cultural landscapes within close proximity to the study corridor (see Tables 1 & 2).

Table 1: Designated or Listed Historic Structures Landscapes within 100 metres of the Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Main Street N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Designation By-Law 62-2009 – March 11, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Main Street N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Designation By-Law 63-2009 – March 11, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Main Street North</td>
<td>Robson Block</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>ROLL: 10-01-0-002-13600-0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street S (East side of Hwy 10, south of County Court Boulevard)</td>
<td>Cheyne Cemetery</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Main Street S</td>
<td>Heggie Block</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 18, 20 Main Street S</td>
<td>Torrence Store</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-23 Main Street S</td>
<td>Capital Block</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Main Street S</td>
<td>Harmsworth Paints</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Main Street S</td>
<td>St. Paul’s United Church</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Designated by Ontario Heritage Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Main Street S</td>
<td>The Boyle House</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Designated by Ontario Heritage Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Main Street S</td>
<td>First Baptist Church</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Main Street S</td>
<td>Stork Family Home (John Elliott Homestead site)</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Main Street S</td>
<td>Robinson House</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Main Street S</td>
<td>James Fleming House</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Main Street S (fronting)</td>
<td>Remains of Etobicoke Creek Retaining Wall</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Main Street S</td>
<td>Brydon Mansion</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 Main Street S</td>
<td>C.V. Charters House</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 Main Street S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Designated by Ontario Heritage Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 Main Street S</td>
<td>Heggie House</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 Main Street S</td>
<td>Jackson/Wergast Home</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 Main Street S</td>
<td>Wergast Home</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Main Street S</td>
<td>Walter Young House</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>ROLL: 10-03-0-022-02000-0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 Main Street S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Main Street S</td>
<td>McMurchy-Duggan Mansion</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 Main Street S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 Main Street S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 Main Street S</td>
<td>Dawson House</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108 Main Street S</td>
<td>Loughead House</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 Main Street S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 Main Street S</td>
<td>Bull Family House</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 Main Street S</td>
<td>Chatterton House</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127 Main Street S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133 Main Street S</td>
<td>Kirkwood House</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>ROLL: 10-03-0-022-03200-0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144 Main Street S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 Main Street S</td>
<td>Modernist house</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street S</td>
<td>Gage Park</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 201 Main Street South</td>
<td>Archdekin Park Foot Bridge</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Queen Street E</td>
<td>The Dominion Building</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Designation By-law #26-79 – February 12, 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Wellington St East</td>
<td>Former Peel County Registry Building</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Listed ROLL: 10-02-0-008-15500-0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Wellington Street E</td>
<td>Peel County Court House</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Designation By-law #38-78 – February 20, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Wellington Street East</td>
<td>Old Peel Registry Office</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Designation By-law #38-78 – February 20, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Wellington Street E</td>
<td>Old Brampton Jail</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Designation By-law #38-78 – February 20, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Church Street W</td>
<td>The CNR Station</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Designated under the Heritage Railway Stations Protection Act in 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6650 Hurontario Street</td>
<td>Hansa House</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Constructed 1880; Designated by Ontario Heritage Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5961 Hurontario Street</td>
<td>Britannia United Church &amp; cemetery</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Constructed 1843; Designated by Ontario Heritage Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5576 Hurontario Street</td>
<td>Britannia School</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Designated by Ontario Heritage Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5520 Hurontario Street</td>
<td>Britannia Farm House</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Constructed 1840; Designated by Ontario Heritage Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4650 Hurontario Street</td>
<td>Wilcox House</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Constructed 1850; Designated by Ontario Heritage Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Hurontario Street</td>
<td>Heary House</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Constructed 1912; registered by Mississauga Heritage but not designated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hurontario Street</td>
<td>Gummerson House</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Constructed 1920; registered by</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 Registered Archaeological Sites

In order that an inventory of archaeological resources could be compiled for this study corridor, the site record forms for registered sites housed at the Ministry of Culture (MCL) were consulted. Each site is registered according to the Borden System, which is an archaeological numbering system used throughout Canada to track archaeological sites and the artifacts that come from them. The specific study corridor under review is located within Borden Blocks AkGw, AjGw, and AjGv. According to the Ministry of Culture site registry files, a total of nine archaeological sites have been registered within 500 metres of the subject lands (see Table 3). Based on mapping received from the Ministry of Culture, we can confirm that six sites of these sites are located within 250 metres of the study corridor. Therefore, based on the proximity of these sites, we find high potential for the recovery of additional archaeological remains within undisturbed portions of the study corridor limits (see Table 5).

**Table 3: Sites within 500 metres of the Study Corridor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borden #</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Cultural Affiliation</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AjGv-12</td>
<td>Pinewood Trail</td>
<td>Aboriginal Undetermined</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGv-2</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>Aboriginal Undetermined</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGv-37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19th C., Middle to Late</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGv-5</td>
<td>Glenburny</td>
<td>Aceramic</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGv-8</td>
<td>Eley</td>
<td>Archaic, Laurentian</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGv-9</td>
<td>Avonbridge</td>
<td>Archaic, Laurentian</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGw-201</td>
<td>Britannia Schoolhouse</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Schoolhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGw-204</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Aboriginal Undetermined</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Having noted the presence of these sites in relation to the study corridor, it might be useful to place them in the proper context by reviewing the cultural history of occupation in Southern Ontario provided in Table 4 below.

**Table 4: History of Occupation in Southern Ontario**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Archaeological Culture</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PALEO-INDIAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Gainey, Barnes, Crowfield</td>
<td>11,000 - 10,400 BP</td>
<td>Small nomadic hunter-gatherer bands. Fluted projectile points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Holcombe, Hi-Lo, Lanceolate</td>
<td>10,400 - 9,500 BP</td>
<td>Small nomadic hunter-gatherer bands. Lanceolate projectile points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARCHAIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Side-notched, corner notched, bifurcate-base</td>
<td>9,500 – 8,000 BP</td>
<td>Small nomadic hunter-gatherer bands; first notched and stemmed points, and ground stone cells.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Otter Creek, Brewerton</td>
<td>8,000 – 4,500 BP</td>
<td>Small territorial hunter-gatherer bands; wider variety of ground stone tools; first copper tools; bone tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Narrow, Broad and Small Points</td>
<td>4,500 – 2,800 BP</td>
<td>More numerous territorial hunter-gatherer bands; increasing use of exotic materials and artistic items for grave offerings; regional trade networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOODLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Meadowood, Middlesex</td>
<td>2,800 – 2,000 BP</td>
<td>Introduction of pottery, burial ceremonialism; panregional trade networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Point Peninsula</td>
<td>2,000 – 1,200 BP</td>
<td>Cultural and ideological influences from Ohio Valley complex societies; incipient horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Algonquian, Iroquoian</td>
<td>1,200 - 700 BP</td>
<td>Transition to larger settlements and agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Algonquian, Iroquoian</td>
<td>700 – 600 BP</td>
<td>Establishment of large palisaded villages (Iroquoian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Algonquian, Iroquoian</td>
<td>600 – 400 BP</td>
<td>Tribal differentiation and warfare (Iroquoian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HISTORIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Huron, Odawa, Algonquin</td>
<td>AD 1600 – 1650</td>
<td>Tribal displacements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Six Nations Iroquois, Ojibway, Algonquin</td>
<td>AD 1650 – 1800s</td>
<td>Migrations and resettlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>AD 1800 - present</td>
<td>European immigrant settlements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Physical Features
The study corridor is situated within three distinct physiographical regions of southern Ontario: the Peel Plain, which extends from the northernmost end of the corridor to Bristol Road East/West; the South Slope, which stretches from Bristol Road East/West to Central Parkway East/West; and the Iroquois Plain, which extends from Central Parkway East/West to Lakeshore Road East/West.
Across the Peel Plain physiographic region of Southern Ontario, the Credit, Humber, Don, and Rouge River have cut deep valleys, as have other streams such as the Bronte, Oakville, and Etobicoke Creeks. The underlying geological material of the plain is a till containing large amounts of shale and limestone. Although now almost completely deforested, there is evidence that this plain carried a hardwood forest of high quality and great wealth of species (Chapman & Putnam, 1984). Settled during the early part of the 19th century, the fertile clay soils were cleared rapidly. Until 1940 practically all of the land was used for agriculture. Now a good deal of this land has been bought for urban development and either lies neglected or is rented and used for cash crops (Chapman & Putnam, 1984).

The South Slope physiographic region of southern Ontario, extends from the Niagara Escarpment to the Trent River it covers approximately 940 square miles. The western portion of the South Slope of the Oak Ridges Moraine lies north of the Peel Plain, but the Trafalgar Moraine and adjacent till plain to the south of the Peel Plain is also included. The South Slope lies across the limestones of the Verulam and Lindsay Formations, the grey shales of the Georgian Bay Formation, and the reddish shales of the Queenston Formation, and contains a variety of soils, some of which have proved to be excellent through more than a century of agricultural use (Chapman & Putnam, 1984). Lying behind the lakeshore areas of first settlement in Upper Canada, the South Slope was colonized by the “second wave” composed largely of British immigrants after the close of the Napoleonic wars (Chapman & Putnam, 1984).

The southernmost portion of the study corridor is situated within the Iroquois Plain physiographic region of southern Ontario, the lowland bordering Lake Ontario which was inundated by a body of water known as Lake Iroquois, when the last glacier was receding. Its old shorelines, including cliffs, bars, beaches, and boulder pavements are easily identifiable features, while the undulating till plains above stand in strong contrast to the lake bottom which has been smoothed by wave action or lacustrine deposits. The latter area is the Iroquois plain. The Iroquois plain extends around the western part of Lake Ontario, from the Niagara River to the Trent River, before extending inward to include a large area in the Trent River valley. Our study corridor falls between the Hamilton and Toronto zone; there, the distance between the old and current shorelines averages approximately two miles in width. This area and its good soils became an important horticultural area as it was protected from frost damage by its proximity to the lake and was accessible to the city by direct road and rail routes. Rapid urban, industrial and commercial development of this area has since engulfed the earlier horticultural activities (Chapman & Putnam, 1984).

In terms of archaeological potential, potable water is arguably the single most important resource necessary for any extended human occupation or settlement. As water sources have remained relatively stable in southern Ontario since post-glacial times, proximity to water can be regarded as a useful index for the evaluation of archaeological site potential. Indeed, distance from water has been one of the most commonly used variables for predictive modeling of site location. In fact, the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation (now the Ministry of Culture) primer on archaeology, land use planning and development in Ontario stipulates that undisturbed lands within 300 metres of a primary water source, and undisturbed lands within 200 metres of a secondary water source, are considered to be of high archaeological potential (1997: pp.12-13). As such, with two tributaries of the Credit River – Mary Fix Creek and Fletcher’s Creek, and an
unnamed tributary of Etobicoke flowing less than 300 meters west and east of the study corridor, respectively, we find high potential for the location and recovery of prehistoric Aboriginal archaeological resources within undisturbed portions of the study corridor boundaries. Furthermore, with the Etobicoke Creek bisecting the study corridor between Steeles Avenue and Queen Street; and the shores of Lake Ontario, the Credit River, and Cooksville Creek within 300 metres of the study corridor, we find further support for the location and recovery of Aboriginal archaeological resources within undisturbed portions of the study corridor boundaries, as all four aforementioned water resources are known to have inspired nearby settlement and human activities (see Table 5).

1.4 Historical Features
To assess a study corridor’s potential for the recovery of historic remains, several documents are reviewed in order to gain an understanding of the land-use history. These specifically include the Tremaine’s Map and Illustrated Historical Atlases for the Counties of Ontario. A review of the Tremaine’s Map of Peel County, 1859 and Illustrated Historical Atlas of Peel County, 1877 has indicated that the study corridor is located within parts of Lots 1-6, Concessions 1 East and West of Main Street (EMS and WMS), in the former Township of Chinguacousy South; Lots 1-15, Concessions 1 East and West of Hurontario Street (EHS and WHS), in the former Township of Toronto North; Lots 15-16, Concessions 1-2 North of Dundas Street (NDS), Lots 2-3, Concession 3 South of Dundas Street (SDS), Lots 1-2, Concession 2 SDS, and Lots 15-16, Concession 1 SDS, in the former Township of Toronto South; in the County of Peel (now the City of Mississauga in the Region Municipality of Peel) (see Figures 2-3). The proposed study corridor run adjacent to many historical features including numerous homesteads, three churches, two cemeteries, two school houses, one mill, and four post offices as well as the historic villages of Brampton, Cooksville, and Port Credit. As such, a review of the Historical Atlas indicates that there is high potential for the location of historical remains within the study corridor limits, within 100 metres of these historic features (see Table 5).
Figure 2: 1859 Tremaine’s Map of the Study Corridor
Figure 3: 1877 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the Study Corridor
1.4 Confirmation of Archaeological Potential
Based on the proximity of previously identified archaeological sites as well as certain physical and historical features within proximity to the study corridor, we have confirmed that there is high potential for the recovery of archaeological resources within undisturbed portions of its limits (see Table 5).

Table 5: Checklist for Determining Archaeological Potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature of Archaeological Potential</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Known archaeological sites within 250 m?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Features</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Is there water on or near the property?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a Presence of primary watercourse within 300 metres of the study corridor (lakes, rivers, streams, creeks)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b Presence of secondary watercourse within 200 metres of the study corridor (springs, marshes, swamps, intermittent streams)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c Features indicating past presence of water source within 300 metres (former shorelines, relic water channels, beach ridges)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Elevated topography (knolls, drumlins, eskers, plateaus, etc)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes to two or more of 3-5 or 7-10, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Pockets of sandy soil in clay or rocky area</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes to two or more of 3-5 or 7-10, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Distinctive land formations (mounds, caverns, waterfalls, peninsulas, etc)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes to two or more of 3-5 or 7-10, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Is there a known burial site or cemetery that is registered with the Cemeteries Regulation Unit directly adjacent to the property?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cultural Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Features</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Associated with food or scarce resource harvest areas (traditional fishing locations, agricultural/ berry extraction areas, etc)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes to two or more of 3-5 or 7-10, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Indications of early Euro-Canadian settlement (monuments, cemeteries, structures, etc) within 100 metres</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes to two or more of 3-5 or 7-10, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Associated with historic transportation route (historic road, trail, portage, rail corridor, etc)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes to two or more of 3-5 or 7-10, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Property-specific Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property-specific Information</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Contains property designated under the Ontario Heritage Act</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes to two or more of 3-5 or 7-10, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Local knowledge (aboriginal)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, potential confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Archeoworks Inc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>communities, heritage organizations, etc)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>If Yes, low archaeological potential is determined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recent disturbance, not including agricultural cultivation (post-1960, extensive and intensive)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>If Yes, low archaeological potential is determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.0 Field Review

A non-intrusive field review of the proposed study corridor was conducted to identify and describe areas of high potential requiring additional archaeological research and low potential areas not warranting further archaeological concern.

The Stage 1 archaeological assessment illustrated in Appendix A, was confined to the existing road Right-of-Way (ROW) limits; the surveyed area varying in width from 6.75 to 17 metres from the centreline of the roadway. The study corridor is located along an urbanized strip within the Cities of Mississauga and Brampton, primarily encompassing the disturbed road ROW. The results of the field assessment are discussed below on base maps provided by the MMM Group.

Mississauga 1 Port Credit (see Appendix A – Figures M1-1 through M1-4)
The Mississauga 1 Port Credit segment is located within an urbanized portion of Port Credit in the City of Mississauga; extending along Port Street from Stavebank Road South east to St. Lawrence Drive, and north along St. Lawrence Drive and Hurontario Street to the Port Credit GO Corridor; with three station platforms being proposed within this segment. While the majority of the corridor is confined to the disturbed existing roadway and road Right-of-Way (ROW), Stage 2 archaeological concerns are still outstanding for the manicured grassed margin along Port Street and for the undisturbed former lawn bowling field along Hurontario Street (see Plate 1-6). Although, the manicured grassed margin may appear disturbed, a Stage 2 assessment is necessary to confirm ground conditions. Furthermore, due to the established high potential for recovery of both Euro-Canadian and Aboriginal archaeological remains, should changes to the design occur, further Stage 2 investigation should be undertaken prior to any intrusive activity.

Mississauga 2 Port Credit to QEW (see Appendix A – Figures M2-1 through M2-5)
The Mississauga 2 Port Credit to QEW segment is located within an urbanized portion of City of Mississauga; extending along Hurontario Street from the Port Credit GO Corridor to approximately 400 metres north of the QEW; with four station platforms being proposed within this segment. While the majority of the corridor is confined to the disturbed existing road ROW, Stage 2 archaeological concerns are still outstanding for the apparent undisturbed manicured grassed margins on the west side of Hurontario Street north of Inglewood Drive, as well as, south of the QEW to Indian Valley Trail on the west side of Hurontario, and south of North Service Road on the east side of Hurontario Street (see Plate 7-9); the Stage 2 assessment necessary to confirm ground conditions. Furthermore, due to the established high potential for recovery of both Euro-Canadian and Aboriginal archaeological remains, should changes to the design occur, further Stage 2 investigation should be undertaken prior to any intrusive activity.

Mississauga 3 QEW to Dundas (see Appendix A – Figures M3-1 through M3-6)
The Mississauga 3 QEW to Dundas segment is located within an urbanized portion of City of Mississauga; extending along Hurontario Street from approximately 400 metres north of the...
QEW to approximately 775 metres north of Dundas Street; with six station platforms being proposed within this segment. The entirety of the corridor is confined to the disturbed existing road ROW, as such, no further archaeological concerns are warranted (see Plate 10). However, due to the established high potential for recovery of both Euro-Canadian and Aboriginal archaeological remains, should changes to the design occur, further Stage 2 investigation should be undertaken prior to any intrusive activity.

**Mississauga 4 Dundas to Burhamthorpe (see Appendix A – Figures M3-1 through M3-6)**

The Mississauga 4 Dundas to Burnhamthorpe segment is located within an urbanized portion of City of Mississauga; extending along Hurontario Street from approximately 775 metres north of Dundas Street to the 403 Highway; with five station platforms being proposed within this segment. While the majority of the corridor is confined to the disturbed existing road ROW, Stage 2 archaeological concerns are still outstanding for the undisturbed manicured grassed margins on the west side of Hurontario Street north of Absolute Avenue, and the fallow margins and manicured grassed areas on the west side of Hurontario Street north of Square One Drive to approximately 450 metres north of Rathburn Road West (see Plate 11); the Stage 2 assessment necessary to confirm ground conditions. Furthermore, due to the established high potential for recovery of both Euro-Canadian and Aboriginal archaeological remains, should changes to the design occur, further Stage 2 investigation should be undertaken prior to any intrusive activity.

**Mississauga 5 Downtown (see Appendix A – Figures M3-1 through M3-6)**

The Mississauga 5 Downtown segment is located within an urbanized downtown portion of City of Mississauga; extending along Burnhamthorpe Road West from Hurontario Street to Living Arts Drive, north along Living Arts Drive to Rathburn Road West, and then along Rathburn Road West to a proposed alignment running parallel to the west Hurontario Street over the 403 overpass to approximately 150 metres south of Kingsbridge Garden Circle/Elia Avenue. As well, the alignment will extend along City View Drive south from Rathburn Road West for approximately 530 metres where it will be diverted southeast through a paved easement back onto Hurontario Street. A total of nine station platforms are proposed within this segment of the study corridor. While the majority of the corridor is confined to the disturbed existing road ROW, Stage 2 archaeological concerns are still outstanding for the undisturbed manicured grassed margin on the west side of Hurontario Street at Absolute Avenue, the fallow area dotted with trees at the southeast and southwest corner of Rathburn Road West and Living Arts Drive, the manicured grass and fallow area bounding and northwest of Centre View Drive and Rathburn Road West, and the fallow margins located west of Hurontario Street immediately adjacent to the 403 Highway (see Plates 12-16); the Stage 2 assessment necessary to confirm ground conditions. Furthermore, due to the established high potential for recovery of both Euro-Canadian and Aboriginal archaeological remains, should changes to the design occur, further Stage 2 investigation should be undertaken prior to any intrusive activity.

**Mississauga 6 Hwy 403 to Hwy 401 (see Appendix A – Figures M3-1 through M3-6)**

The Mississauga 6 Hwy 403 to Hwy 401 segment is located within an urbanized portion of City of Mississauga; extending along Hurontario Street from approximately 150 metres south of Kingsbridge Garden Circle/Elia Avenue to approximately 90 metres north of Britannia Road; with eight station platforms being proposed within this segment. The entirety of the corridor is confined to the disturbed existing road ROW, however, the alignment is proposed to be installed
in close proximity to the Britannia United Church and cemetery, located at 5961 Hurontario Street (see Plates 17-18, Table 1). It is important to note, burials in nineteenth century historic cemeteries were not highly regulated; these burial often employing markers of little substance that have since disappeared. As such, it is recommended a 10 metre no construction buffer be employed from the limits of the cemetery. Should construction occur within the aforementioned 10 metre buffer, monitoring by a licenced archaeologist, who can properly identify grave shafts, should occur. Furthermore, due to the established high potential for recovery of both Euro-Canadian and Aboriginal archaeological remains, should changes to the design occur, further Stage 2 investigation should be undertaken prior to any intrusive activity.

**Mississauga 7 Hwy401 to Hwy 407 (see Appendix A – Figures M3-1 through M3-6)**

The Mississauga 7 Hwy 401 to Hwy 401 segment is located within an urbanized portion of City of Mississauga; extending along Hurontario Street from approximately 90 metres north of Britannia Road to the 407 ETR; with five station platforms being proposed within this segment. While the majority of the corridor is confined to the disturbed existing road ROW, Stage 2 archaeological concerns are still outstanding for the undisturbed fallow area at the southeast corner of Hurontario Street and the 407 ETR, where a maintenance storage facility is proposed to be installed (see Plate 19). Furthermore, due to the established high potential for recovery of both Euro-Canadian and Aboriginal archaeological remains, should changes to the design occur, further Stage 2 investigation should be undertaken prior to any intrusive activity.

**Brampton Downtown (see Appendix A – Figures M3-1 through M3-6)**

The Brampton Downtown segment is located within an urbanized portion of City of Brampton; extending along Main Street from the 407 ETR to the Brampton GO Station along a one-way loop from Main Street; with eleven station platforms being proposed within this segment. While the majority of the corridor is confined to the disturbed existing road ROW, Stage 2 archaeological concerns are still outstanding for the undisturbed a small manicured grassed margin on the west side of Main Street north of Sir Lou Drive, as well, on the west side of Main Street north of Charolais Boulevard, and on the north side of Wellington Street between Main Street and George Street North (see Plates 20-21); the Stage 2 assessment necessary to confirm ground conditions. Furthermore, due to the established high potential for recovery of both Euro-Canadian and Aboriginal archaeological remains, should changes to the design occur, further Stage 2 investigation should be undertaken prior to any intrusive activity.
3.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

The Stage 1 archaeological assessment of the proposed Mississauga Higher Order Transit study corridor, located in the Cities of Mississauga and Brampton, has indicated that, based on historical documentation, the visual documentation of suitable topography and proximity of water sources, there is high potential for the recovery of sub-surface Aboriginal and historic, Euro-Canadian sites within undisturbed areas of the study corridor. In light of these results, the following recommendations are presented:

1. Due to the assessed undisturbed condition of specified sections of the study corridor; in addition to the established high potential for the recovery of Aboriginal and/or Euro-Canadian remains within these alignments, a Stage 2 archaeological field assessment of these areas should be undertaken, prior to any construction activities, to minimize impacts to heritage resources. Should significant archaeological resources be encountered, additional background research or fieldwork may be required by the Ministry of Culture.

2. Should excavation remain outside the recommended 10-metre no construction buffer for Britannia United Church & Cemetery, no further archaeological assessment will be required.

3. However, should construction occur within the 10-metre no construction buffer, a licenced archaeologist should be on site to monitor any excavation/construction activities, to ensure there are no impacts to unidentified human remains.

4. No excavation activities shall take place within the limits of the study corridor prior to the Ministry of Culture (Heritage Operations Unit) confirming in writing that all archaeological licensing and technical review requirements have been satisfied.

5. Archaeological site(s) recommended for further archaeological fieldwork or protection remain subject to Section 48 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act and may not be altered or artifacts removed except by a person holding an archaeological licence. Construction must not proceed until additional fieldwork has been completed.

6. Should previously unknown or unassessed deeply buried archaeological resources be uncovered during development, there may be a new archaeological site investigation 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 archaeologist to carry out archaeological fieldwork, in compliance with Section 48 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act. The office of the Heritage Operations Unit, Ministry of Culture (416-314-7146) should be contacted immediately.

7. Any person discovering human remains must immediately notify the office of the Heritage Operations Unit, Ministry of Culture (416-314-7146), the police or coroner, and the Registrar of Cemeteries, Cemeteries Regulation Unit, Ministry of Government Services (416-326-8404).
Under Section 6 of Regulation 881 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, *Archeoworks Inc.* will, “keep in safekeeping all objects of archaeological significance that are found and all field records that are made.”
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APPENDIX A:
STAGE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT FIGURES
1 NOTE: Only recently disturbed grassed areas, areas requiring Stage 2 assessment and areas that were photo documented have been highlighted in these figures. It can be assumed that all other unmarked sections are disturbed and contain no archaeological potential.
Figure M1-3: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 1 – Port Credit
Figure M1-4: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 1 – Port Credit
Figure M2-1: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 2 – Port Credit to QEWT
Figure M2-2: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 2 – Port Credit to QEW
Figure M2-3: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 2 – Port Credit to QEW
Figure M2-4: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 2 – Port Credit to QEW
Figure M2-5: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 2 – Port Credit to QEW
Figure M3-1: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 3 – QEW to Dundas
Figure M3-21: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 3 – QEW to Dundas
Figure M3-3: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 3 – QEW to Dundas
Figure M3-4: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 3 – QEW to Dundas
Figure M3-5: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 3 – QEW to Dundas
Figure M3-6: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 3 – QEW to Dundas
Figure M4-1: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 4 – Dundas to Burnhamthorpe
Figure M4-2: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 4 – Dundas to Burnhamthorpe
Figure M4-3: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 4 – Dundas to Burnhamthorpe
Figure M4-4: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 4 – Dundas to Burnhamthorpe
Figure M4-5: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 4 – Dundas to Burnhamthorpe
Figure M4-6: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 4 – Dundas to Burnhamthorpe
Figure M4-7: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 4 – Dundas to Burnhamthorpe
Figure M5-1: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 5 – Downtown
Figure M5-2: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 5 – Downtown
Figure M5-3: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 5 – Downtown
Figure M5-4: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 5 – Downtown
Figure M5-5: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 5 – Downtown
Figure M6-1: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 6 – Hwy 403 to Hwy 401
Figure M6-2: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 6 – Hwy 403 to Hwy 401
Figure M6-3: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 6 – Hwy 403 to Hwy 401
Figure M6-4: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 6 – Hwy 403 to Hwy 401
Figure M6-5: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 6 – Hwy 403 to Hwy 401
Figure M6-6: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 6 – Hwy 403 to Hwy 401
Figure M6-7: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 6 – Hwy 403 to Hwy 401
Figure M6-8: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 6 – Hwy 403 to Hwy 401
Figure M6-9: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 6 – Hwy 403 to Hwy 401
Figure M6-10: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 6 – Hwy 403 to Hwy 401
Figure M7-1: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga – Hwy 401 to Hwy 407
Figure M7-2: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 7 – Hwy 401 to Hwy 407
Figure M7-3: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 7 – Hwy 401 to Hwy 407
Figure M7-4: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 7 – Hwy 401 to Hwy 407
Figure M7-5: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 7 – Hwy 401 to Hwy 407
Figure M7-6: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 7 – Hwy 401 to Hwy 407
Figure M7-7: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 7 – Hwy 401 to Hwy 407
Figure M7-8: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 7 – Hwy 401 to Hwy 407
Figure M7-9: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Mississauga 7 – Hwy 401 to Hwy 407
Figure BD-1: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Brampton Downtown
Figure BD-2: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Brampton Downtown
Figure BD-3: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Brampton Downtown
Figure BD-4: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Brampton Downtown
Figure BD-5: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Brampton Downtown
Figure BD-6: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Brampton Downtown
Figure BD-7: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Brampton Downtown
Figure BD-8: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Brampton Downtown
Figure BD-9: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Brampton Downtown
Figure BD-10: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Brampton Downtown
Figure BD-11: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Brampton Downtown
Figure BD-12: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Brampton Downtown
Figure BD-13: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Brampton Downtown
APPENDIX B:
PHOTOS
Plate 1: Looking east along Port Street East at potentially undisturbed manicured grass and disturbed roadway

Plate 2: Looking north along St. Lawrence Street at Port Street at disturbed roadway
Plate 3: Looking north along Hurontario Street at High Street East at potentially undisturbed manicured grass to be subjected to Stage 2 investigation

Plate 4: Looking west along Hurontario Street at undisturbed lands of former lawn bowling site
Plate 5: Looking north along Hurontario Street at Park Street East at potentially undisturbed manicured grass

Plate 6: Looking northwest along Hurontario at sloping terrain along which the alignment is to follow
Plate 7: Looking north along Hurontario Street, north of Inglewood Drive at potentially undisturbed manicured grass

Plate 8: Looking northwest along Hurontario, north of Hampshire Crescent at potentially undisturbed manicured grass
Plate 9: Looking northeast at construction of the area surrounding the QEW, and the already constructed South Service Road

Plate 10: Looking south along Hurontario Street, approximately 100 metres south of Dundas Street at disturbed roadway and road ROW
Plate 11: Looking north along Hurontario Street, just north of Absolute Avenue at potentially undisturbed manicured grass

Plate 12: Looking west along Hurontario Street at Absolute Avenue at potentially undisturbed manicured grass
Plate 13: Looking south at undisturbed fallow area dotted with trees at the intersection of Rathburn Road West and Living Art Drive

Plate 14: Looking south at undisturbed fallow area dotted with trees at the intersection of Rathburn Road West and Living Art Drive
Plate 15: Looking south at the 403 off-ramp to Hurontario Street and undisturbed manicured grass

Plate 16: Looking north from the westbound lane of the 403 Highway at potentially undisturbed fallow area
Plate 17: Looking north along Hurontario, just north of Bristol Road West at disturbed roadway to which the alignment is confined.

Plate 18: Looking southeast at proximity of Britannia United Church and cemetery to the study corridor limits.
Plate 19: Looking north along Hurontario Street, just north of Courtneypark Drive at disturbed roadway to which the alignment is confined

Plate 20: Looking northwest along Main Street at potentially undisturbed manicured grassed margin
Plate 21: Looking west along Wellington Street West at potentially undisturbed manicured grass