

Appendix **B-7**

Stage 1 Archaeology Assessment and Cultural Heritage Memorandum

*Appendix **B-7a***

Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment

STAGE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT

Scarborough Subway Extension City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission Various Lots and Concessions Geographic Township of Scarboro (now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario Transit Project Assessment Process

Contract No. FE85-1

Prepared for:

Toronto Transit Commission
City Planning Division
Transportation Planning Section
C/O James Perttula
City Hall, 21st Floor, East Tower
100 Queen Street West
Toronto, ON M5H 2N2
Tel: 416-392-4744
Email: jperttu@toronto.ca

Prepared by:

AECOM (Legacy URS Canada, Inc)
Consulting Engineers & Geoscientists
30 Leek Crescent, 4th Floor
Richmond Hill, ON
L4B 4N4
Tel: 905-882-4401
www.aecom.ca

Licensee:
Glenn Kearsley
[Licence #P123]

PIF# P123-0274-2015

April 30, 2015

Project No.: 33017684

Report Type: Original



Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension
City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township
of Scarboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

AECOM was retained by the City of Toronto (City) and Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) to conduct a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment for the proposed Scarborough Subway Extension on various lots and concessions in the Geographic Township of Scarboro (now Scarborough), County of York (now the City of Toronto), Ontario. The study area spans 2681 ha and is roughly bounded by Eglinton Avenue East to the south, just beyond Markham Road to the east, Sheppard Avenue East to the north and Kennedy Road to the west. The assessment was conducted on behalf of the City and TTC under Ontario Regulation 231/08 Transit Project Assessment Process in preparation for the future expansion of the Bloor-Danforth Subway north from Kennedy Station to Sheppard Avenue. There are a total of nine possible corridor alternatives (**Supplementary Documentation, Figures 2-10**).

This Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment documents the geographic, archaeological and land use history of lands identified within the study area in order to assess their potential to contain archaeological resources. No optional property inspection was undertaken due to the snow covered ground conditions at the time of the assessment. Instead, detailed mapping, satellite imagery and recommendations made in the *Master Plan of Archaeological Resources for the City of Toronto* (ASI 2011) were used in order to evaluate the study area's archaeological potential. The results of the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment indicate that, while most of the lands within the existing study area appear to have been disturbed by past development, some of the study area still retains archaeological potential. This is based on the presence of historic homesteads, the proximity of historic transportation routes, certain physiographic features and previously registered archaeological sites within the study area. Therefore, AECOM makes the following recommendations:

1. Once a preferred corridor is selected, a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment should be conducted by a licensed consultant archaeologist using the test pit survey method at 5m intervals. This should be done in areas where ploughing is not possible or viable at the time of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (areas of archaeological potential marked in green in **Appendix A, Figure 2** and any other areas determined to have archaeological potential based on visual inspection during the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment of the preferred corridor).
2. Once a preferred corridor is selected, any lands adjacent to cemeteries that will be impacted must be subject to a Stage 2 test pit survey, followed by topsoil stripping of the corridor as part of a Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment under the supervision of a licensed consultant archaeologist to determine the extent of the cemetery and to ensure no graves will be disturbed. Any previously registered archaeological sites located within the preferred corridor will require further Stage 2, 3 or 4 archaeological assessments. This must be done in accordance with the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (MTCS 2011).
3. Once a preferred corridor is selected, all additional lands within the project limits must be visually assessed in order to confirm areas of low archaeological potential, (pockets of disturbance, slope and wet). In addition, areas that have been previously



	<div>Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario</div>
	<div>subject to an archaeological assessment (marked in orange in Appendix A, Figure 2) do not require further assessment.</div> <div>4. The Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment will follow the requirements set out in the 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTCS 2011).</div>
April 2015	<div>ii</div> <div>AECOM</div>

	<div>Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario</div>
	<div><div>AECOM</div><div>PROJECT PERSONNEL</div><div><div>Project Director:</div><div>Charlton Carscallen, M.A. [P088]</div></div><div><div>Project Administrator:</div><div>Glenn Kearsley, M.A [P123]</div></div><div><div>Report Preparation:</div><div>Rebecca Gray, Hon. B.A. [R452]</div></div><div><div>Graphics:</div><div>Michael Collins, B.sc.</div></div><div><div>Report Reviewer:</div><div>Emily Game, B.A. Glenn Kearsley Melissa Wallace, M.A. [R496]</div></div></div>
April 2015	<div>iii</div> <div>AECOM</div>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT..... 1

1.1 DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT 1

1.2 HISTORICAL CONTEXT 1

1.3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT 12

2.0 SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS 20

3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS 22

4.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION 23

5.0 REFERENCES CITED 24

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: FIGURES..... 26

LIST OF TABLES:

Table 1: Historic Land Use of Corridor Alternatives from the Tremaine Map County York, 1860 (Tremaine, 1860) and the 1878 Belden York Historic Atlas Map (Miles&Co. 1878)..... 4

Table 2: Registered Archaeological Sites within One Kilometre of the Study Area (MTCS, 2015)..... 15

Table 3: Previous Archaeological Reports for Fieldwork Conducted Within One Kilometre of the Scarborough Subway Extension Study Area 18

LIST OF FIGURES:

Figure 1: Location of Study Area on a Topographic Map 27

Figure 2: Location of Study Area on a Topographic Map 28

Figure 3: Location of Study Area in Relation to the Historic Atlas Map of The Township of Scarboro (Miles & Co. 1878). 29

Figure 4: Location of Study Area in Relation to the Tremaine Map, County York (1860) 30

SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION (UNDER SEPARATE COVER):

Figure 1: Location of the Corridor Alternatives, Previously Registered Sites (MTCS) and Cemeteries Found Within the Scarborough Subway Extension Study Area

Figure 2: Location of Corridor 1 Line 3-1 (to Markham Road / Progress Avenue) and Previously Registered Sites (MTCS) and Cemeteries Found Within the Scarborough Subway Extension Study Area

Figure 3: Location of Corridor 2 Lie 3-2 (to McCowan Road) and Previously Registered Sites (MTCS) and Cemeteries Found Within the Scarborough Subway Extension Study Area

Figure 4: Location of Corridor 3 Midland 1 (to Markham Road / Progress Avenue) and Previously Registered Sites (MTCS) and Cemeteries Found Within the Scarborough Subway Extension Study Area

Figure 5: Location of Corridor 4 Midland 2 (to McCowan Road) and Previously Registered Sites (MTCS) and Cemeteries Found Within the Scarborough Subway Extension Study Area

Figure 6: Location of Corridor 5 Hydro (to McCowan Road) and Previously Registered Sites (MTCS) and Cemeteries Found Within the Scarborough Subway Extension Study Area

Figure 7: Location of Corridor 6 Brimley (to McCowan Road) and Previously Registered Sites (MTCS) and Cemeteries Found Within the Scarborough Subway Extension Study Area

Figure 8: Location of Corridor 7 McCowan and Previously Registered Sites (MTCS) and Cemeteries Found Within the Scarborough Subway Extension Study Area

Figure 9: Location of Corridor 9 Bellamy (to McCowan Road) and Previously Registered Sites (MTCS) and Cemeteries Found within the Scarborough Subway Extension Study Area

Figure 10: Location of Corridor 10 Markham (to McCowan Road) and Previously Registered Sites (MTCS) and Cemeteries Found within the Scarborough Subway Extension Study Area

	<div>Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario</div>
	<div><div>1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT</div><div><div>1.1 DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT</div><div><p>In 2015, AECOM conducted a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of the proposed extension of the Bloor-Danforth Subway north from Kennedy Station to Sheppard Avenue on various lots and concessions (Table 1) in the Geographic Township of Scarboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario. The study area spans 2681 ha with main streets representing approximate cardinal borders; Eglinton Avenue East to the south, Markham Road to the east, Sheppard Avenue East to the north and Kennedy Road to the west (Appendix A: Figures 2-4).</p><p>The assessment was conducted on behalf of the City of Toronto (City) and Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) under Ontario Regulation 231/08 Transit Project Assessment Process in preparation for the future construction of the Scarborough Subway Extension. There are nine possible corridor alternatives.</p><p>This Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment involves background research to describe the geography, land use history, previous archaeological fieldwork and current condition of the lands within the study area in order to evaluate their archaeological potential and to support recommendations for Stage 2 survey for all or parts of these parcels. While a field review was not conducted on this property due to snow cover preventing ground visibility, satellite imagery, aerial photographs, thematic and historic maps and past archaeological reports were analyzed in order to evaluate the archaeological potential of study area for the Scarborough Subway Extension study area.</p><p>The Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment was carried out under the project direction of Charlton Carscallen [professional archaeological licence #P088] and the archaeological licence of Glenn Kearsley [P123] (AECOM) in accordance with the provisions of the <i>Ontario Heritage Act (2005)</i> and with the <i>Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (2011a)</i>, formulated by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS). This report presents the results of the Stage 1 background research and makes several recommendations.</p></div><div><div>1.2 HISTORICAL CONTEXT</div><div><div>Pre-Contact Period</div><div><p>A detailed discussion of the pre-contact temporal and cultural affiliations that are represented in the City of Toronto is provided in the archaeological master plan for the region (ASI 2004). A brief summary is provided here in order to incorporate some updated archaeological findings that have occurred since that report.</p><p>Although glaciers retreated from southeastern Ontario some 13,000 years ago the massive weight of these ice sheets left the earth's crust compressed, lowering the area below sea level and allowing sea water to flow inland forming the Champlain</p></div></div></div></div><div><div>April 2015</div><div>1</div><div>AECOM</div></div></div>

	<div>Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario</div>
	<div><div><p>Sea. Over the next 3000 years, the Champlain Sea gradually receded as the earth's crust rebounded, eventually permitting the first inhabitants to move into the region after 10,000 years ago. The barrier presented by the Champlain Sea explains why sites of Ontario's first occupants, Paleo-Indians, (ca. 11,000 – 9,500 B.P.) are largely absent from the area. Instead, Paleo-Indian sites in the larger region are concentrated in southwestern Ontario and southern New York State. Paleo-Indians were widely scattered, nomadic groups that occupied the sub-tundra-like environment that prevailed in southwestern Ontario at the end of the Pleistocene. Past research indicates that these groups likely followed big game (such as Caribou) across the landscape, preferring to camp on high ground, immediately adjacent to water sources, such as glacial lakes or spillways, where smaller game and plant foods would have been harvested. Relatively large 'fluted' projectile points are the hallmark of the Paleo-Indian chipped stone toolkit.</p><p>The subsequent Archaic period (9,500 – 2,800 B.P.) in Ontario is characterized by a warming climate and a temperate forest environment. An abundance of streams and rivers intersected the landscape and along with surrounding large fresh water lakes, would have supported many species of fish, shorebirds and mammals. Small hunting and gathering bands (20-50 people) utilized the lake shores during the spring and summer months, then broke into family groups and moved inland for the fall and winter to hunt and trap. Archaic tool assemblages consisted of both chipped and ground/polished stone implements indicating that a wider variety of activities, such as fishing, woodworking and food preparation / grinding, were now taking place.</p><p>The Archaic period is followed by the Woodland period (ca. 2,800 B.P. to A.D. 1,650) which is subdivided into three phases. The Early Woodland period (ca. 2,800 – 2,400 B.P.) is characterized by the introduction of pottery for storage and an increase in regional trade networks. Trading of exotic goods, such as obsidian, silver, copper and sea shells persists into the Middle Woodland period (ca. 2,300 B.P. to A.D. 900) when horticulture was introduced to southern Ontario. The adoption of food production brought on a more sedentary lifestyle in seasonal villages, and more elaborate burial ceremonies – including the construction of large, earthen mounds. The Late Woodland period (ca. A.D. 900 – 1,650) is marked by the establishment of palisaded villages (often containing dozens of longhouse structures), intensified agriculture and an increase in regional warfare.</p><p>Prior to European settlement, this area located around the northwestern edge of Lake Ontario would have been a junction point of land and water routes (ASI 2004). Trails would have extended from the shoreline of Lake Ontario along the rivers, moving northward to the Upper Great Lakes. While it is unclear which Aboriginal societies inhabited this area of Ontario prior to the arrival of European settlers, it can be assumed that the area has probably attracted Aboriginal peoples, beginning approximately 11,000 years ago. For example, the Scarborough Bluffs, a relict shoreline formed from the Lake Iroquois strandline, are known to contain Paleo-Indian sites. By the mid-sixteenth century, roughly 25,000 Iroquoian-speaking peoples inhabited the area north of Lake Ontario, including those that later formed the Huron or Wendat Confederacy (Trigger 1994:41). Post European contact, the Five Nations Iroquois established several settlements, although due to conflict with the French, they were abandoned by 1680. At this time, several Algonquian-speaking groups from the Upper Great Lakes, including the Mississauga, Ojibwa (or</p></div></div> <div><div>April 2015</div><div>2</div><div>AECOM</div></div>

Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension
City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario

Chippewa) and Odawa arrived. In *History of the Township of Scarboro*, William Briggs describes several lots and concessions that had “indian relics” present (1896: 23). Relics were found on Lot 25 Concessions II and III. He describes a number of graves found on Lot 25, Concession I and old camping grounds on Lot 23, Concession III (Briggs 1896: 23).

Post-Contact / Historical Overview of the Township of Scarboro

As noted, the study area is located on several lots and concessions (**Table 2**) in the Geographic Township of Scarboro (now Scarborough), Ontario. Making up the eastern portion of Toronto, Scarboro was named after the English town of the same name, by Elizabeth Simcoe. It is presently bordered on the east by Pickering and the Rouge River, to the south by Lake Ontario, to the north by Steeles Avenue and to the west by Victoria Park Avenue.

When originally surveyed by Augustus Jones in 1793, the Townships of Pickering, Scarboro and York were respectively named Edinburgh, Glasgow and Dublin (Boyle 1896:26). The Township of Scarboro’s concessions were laid out east to west, rather than the more frequently encountered north to south. Some of the early Euro-Canadian settlers included United Empire Loyalists. The Canada Company purchased several hundred acres, the Legislature was granted 384 acres, and King’s College purchased approximately 2000 acres. In the early 1800’s the Township consisted mostly of scattered villages. The Township of Scarboro was declared a borough when it joined the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto (now the City of Toronto) in 1954. It was declared a city in 1983, due to its rapid growth and large population size.

Several historic roads are found within Scarborough, and include Danforth and Kingston Roads. These early transportation routes followed established Aboriginal trails along the higher ground bordering Lake Ontario. Danforth Road (which runs north-south through the central section of the Scarborough Subway Extension study area) was completed in this part of the County in 1799, originally contracted to Mr. Danforth from York to the Bay of Quinte (Boyle 1896:112). Kingston Road, initially Kingston Street, was first built in 1800, connecting Kingston and York. It follows the north shore of Lake Ontario and is southeast of the Scarborough Subway Extension study area.

With the clearing of land for farming and the vast variety and quantity of lumber materials, the lumber industry thrived in this area. As a result, saw mills began to emerge as early as 1804 and eventually dozens could be found along the Highland Creek and the Rouge River. This continued until the depletion of the forests in the area. Grist and Flour-mills were also found along the watercourses, but a flood in 1850 carried away the last of the old dams (Briggs 1896:131). Other common trades found in the township included blacksmiths, wagon makers, shoemakers, and ship builders. Several 19th century churches, cemeteries and school houses can found be in the immediate vicinity of the study area. The population of the Township was 89 in 1802, with a total of 477 inhabitants by 1820, and 3,821 by 1850.

April 2015

3

AECOM

Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension
City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario

Study Area Specific Land Use

Both illustrated historic atlases as well as textual documentary sources were consulted when researching the history of the Township of Scarboro and compiling the specific land use history for the study area. This was done to determine the general locations of any historic buildings and areas with archaeological potential that may intersect with any corridors proposed by the project. Due to the fact that the 1851 census for Scarborough did not survive, additional sources were drawn upon when compiling the land use history for lots and concessions in these areas. *The Township of Scarboro, 1796-1896* by William Briggs (1896), and *History of Toronto and County of York Ontario; Containing an Outline of the History of the Dominion of Canada, A history of the City of Toronto and the County of York, with the Townships, Towns, Villages, Churches, Schools, General and Local Statistics, Biographical Sketches Etc.* (Mercer and Pelham 1885) were both examined to gain a broader picture of the land use history of this County in the 19th Century. Briggs describes Scarboro Township in the 1890’s in the following way,

“The area now embraced by Scarboro Township was undoubtedly a desirable one for the Indian. The lake-shore cliffs formed an admirable defence against attack from the south, so that enemies from that quarter must needs have approached the villages by a circuitous route; there could not be better soil for their extremely simple method of cultivation; extensive forests of magnificent pine, with here and there clumps and ranges of hard-wood trees in great variety, afford ideal places of domicile; small fruits were plentiful, and numerous streams supplied fish of different kinds in abundance, while game, we may presume, was not difficult to procure” (1896: 22-23).

Presently, Scarborough is part of the City of Toronto in the Greater Toronto Area. The landscape consists primarily of residential areas, commercial areas, busy streets and highways. There are some areas of vegetation, primarily around Highland Creek and its tributaries.

Table 1, below, illustrates the land use history of each lot in the study area for York County, according to these 19th Century sources. The Historic County Atlas from the 1878 and the Tremaine Map from 1860 indicate that the study area was largely used for agricultural purposes at that time (**Appendix A, Figures 3-4**). Documentary sources corroborate that farming and lumber extraction / saw mills were the professions of the majority of inhabitants in the Township of Scarboro from the time of settlement of the area in the early 19th into the 20th Century (Miles & Co. 1878 and Census of Canada 1861, 1871).

TABLE 1: HISTORIC LAND USE OF CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVES FROM THE TREMAINE MAP COUNTY YORK, 1860 (TREMAINE, 1860) AND THE 1878 BELDEN YORK HISTORIC ATLAS MAP (MILES&Co. 1878)

Planned Corridor Alternative	Area Intersecting with Archaeological Potential	Lot	Concession	1860 Tremaine Map (1860)	1878 Atlas Map Owner(s) (Miles & Co. 1878)	Noted Buildings on Property
Corridor 1	51.86	29	C	Joseph Sewell	William W. Walton	Farm House
		28	C	W. Walton	Robert Martin	Church

April 2015

4

AECOM

Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario						
Planned Corridor Alternative	Area (Ha.) Intersecting with Archaeological Potential	Lot	Concession	1860 Tremaine Map (1860)	1878 Atlas Map Owner(s) (Miles & Co. 1878)	Noted Buildings on Property
Line 3-1 (to Markham Road / Progress Avenue)		28	D	J. Torrence	Simon Beaty (South ½)	Orchard
				J. Thomson	Anthony Ionson (North ½)	Farmhouse
				John Hockridge		
		27	D	J. Fitzgibbon	David McMichael	Farmhouse/Toronto & Nipissing Railway
					David McMichael	
		28	I	Archibald Glendinning	Archibald Glendinning	Farmhouse/Toronto & Nipissing Railway
		27	I	Seneca Thomson (South ¼)	Seneca Thomson (South ¼)	Farmhouse/Toronto & Nipissing Railway
				Charles Thomson (South Middle ¼)	Charles Thomson (South Middle ¼)	Toronto & Nipissing Railway
				David Thomson (North Middle ¼)	David Thomson (North Middle ¼)	Farmhouse/Toronto & Nipissing Railway
				Amos Thomson (North ¼)	Amos Thomson (North ¼)	Farmhouse/Toronto & Nipissing Railway
		28	II	Archibald Forfar	Archibald Fofar	Toronto & Nipissing Railway
		27	II	J.D. Thomson	John D. Thomson	Farmhouse/Toronto & Nipissing Railway
		26	II	J. Holmes	John Holmes (South Portion)	Farmhouse
				A. Forfar	Mrs. Fofar (widow) (South ½)	Farmhouse
		25	II	W. Forfar	Alex M. Secor	Farmhouse
		24	II	D. Elliot	Guy Walton	Farmhouse
		23	II	George Scott	F&J Scott	Farmhouse
		22	II	William A. Thomson	William Green	
		21	II	David Johnston (West ½)	David Johnston (West ½)	Farmhouse
				Mrs. J. Johnston	John Johnston (East ½)	Farmhouse
		20	II	William Johnston	Mrs. C. Hall (West ½)	Farmhouse
				Mrs. C. Hall	David Johnston (East ½)	Farmhouse
		19	II	J. Harrington	Richard Thomson Jr.	
				Mrs. C. Hall	Unknown Name	Lake
				Richard Thomson		
		18	II	Joseph Purvis	James Purvis	Farmhouse
				William Purdie	William Purdie	Farmhouse, Orchard and Post Office
		18	III	David Reesor	Unknown	Post Office, Saw Mill, Church, Schoolhouse
		17	II	John Malcolm	William Purdie	Farmhouse
		17	III	E. Gooderham	Lafayette Badgerow	Farmhouse
		29	C	Joseph Sewell	William W. Walton	Farmhouse
		28	C	William Walton	Robert Martin	Church
		27	C		Robert Martin	Toronto & Nipissing Railway
		28	D	J. Torrance	Simon Beaty (South ½)	Orchard
				Joseph Thomson	Anthony Ionson (North ½)	Farmhouse
					John Hockridge	
				J. Fitzgibbon	John Fitzgibbon (South	Farmhouse
		Corridor 2 Line 3-2 (to McCowan Road)	25.91			

April 2015


5

AECOM

Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario								
Planned Corridor Alternative	Area (Ha.) Intersecting with Archaeological Potential	Lot	Concession	1860 Tremaine Map (1860)	1878 Atlas Map Owner(s) (Miles & Co. 1878)	Noted Buildings on Property		
					½)			
				David McMichael	David McMichael (North ½)	Farmhouse/Toronto & Nipissing Railway		
		26	D	James McLaren	John McLaren	Farmhouse		
		28	I	Archibald Glendinning	Archibald Glendinning	Farmhouse/Toronto & Nipissing Railway		
		27	I	Seneca Thomson (South ¼)	Seneca Thomson (South ¼)	Farmhouse/Toronto & Nipissing Railway		
				Charles Thomson (South Middle ¼)	Charles Thomson (South Middle ¼)	Toronto & Nipissing Railway		
				David Thomson (North Middle ¼)	David Thomson (North Middle ¼)	Farmhouse/Toronto & Nipissing Railway		
				Amos Thomson (North ¼)	Amos Thomson (North ¼)	Farmhouse/Toronto & Nipissing Railway		
		28	II	Archibald Forfar	Archibald Forfar	Farmhouse/Toronto & Nipissing Railway		
		27	II	John D. Thomson	John D. Thomson	Farmhouse		
		26	II	J. Holmes	John Holmes (South Portion)	Farmhouse		
					Mrs. Fofar (widow) (South ½)	Farmhouse		
		25	II	W. Fofar	Alex M. Secor	Farmhouse		
		24	II	D. Elliott	Guy Walton	Farmhouse		
		23	II	George Scott	F&J Scott	Farmhouse		
		22	II	William A. Thomson	William Green			
				Francis Bell	Adam Bell	Farmhouse		
		23	III	Hugh Elliott	Hugh Elliott	Farmhouse		
		22	III	Francis Bell	Adam Bell (South ¼)			
					John Bushby (South Middle ¼)			
		Corridor 3 Midland 1 (to Markham Road / Progress Avenue)	41.06	29	C	Joseph Sewell	William W. Walton	Farmhouse
				27	D	J. Fitzgibbon	John Fitzgibbon (South ½)	Farmhouse
						David McMichael	David McMichael (North ½)	Farmhouse
				26	D	James McLaren	John McLaren (South ½)	Farmhouse
						David McMichael	David McMichael (North ½)	Farmhouse
				27	I	Seneca Thomson (South ¼)	Seneca Thomson (South ¼)	Farmhouse
						Charles Thomson (South Middle ¼)	Charles Thomson (South Middle ¼)	Farmhouse
David Thomson (North Middle ¼)	David Thomson (North Middle ¼)					Farmhouse		
Amos Thomson (North ¼)	Amos Thomson (North ¼)					Farmhouse		
26	I			Archibald D. Thomson	David A. Thomson (South ½)	Farmhouse		
				Richard Thomson	James Thomson (North ½)	Farmhouse		
26	II			J. Holmes	John Holmes (South Portion)	Farmhouse		
				A.Forfar	Mrs. Fofar (widow) (South ½)	Farmhouse		

April 2015

6



Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension
City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township
of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario

Planned Corridor Alternative	Area (Ha.) Intersecting with Archaeological Potential	Lot	Concession	1860 Tremaine Map (1860)	1878 Atlas Map Owner(s) (Miles & Co. 1878)	Noted Buildings on Property
		25	II	W. Forfar	Alexander M. Secor	Farmhouse
		24	II	D. Elliott	Guy Walton	Farmhouse
		23	II	George Scott	F&J Scott	Farmhouse
		22	II	William A. Thomson	William Green	
		21	II	David Johnston	David Johnston (East ½)	Farmhouse
				Mrs. J. Johnston	John Johnston (West ½)	Farmhouse
		20	II	William Johnston	Mrs. C Hall (West ½)	Farmhouse
				Mrs. C. Hall	David Johnston (East ½)	Farmhouse
		19	II	J. Harrington	Richard Thomson Jr.	
				Mrs. C. Hall	Unknown Name	Lake
				Richard Thomson		
		18	II	James Purvis	James Purvis	Farmhouse
				William Purdie	William Purdie	Farmhouse, Orchard and Post Office
		17	II	John Malcolm	William Purdie	
		18	III	David Reesor	Unknown	Post Office, Saw Mill, Church, Schoolhouse
		17	III	E. Gooderham	Lafayette Badgerow	Farmhouse
Corridor 4 Midland 2 (to McCowan Road)	16.34	29	C	Joseph Sewell		
		27	D	John Fitzgibbon (South ½)	John Fitzgibbon (South ½)	Farmhouse
				David McMichael (North ½)	David McMichael (North ½)	Farmhouse
		26	D	James McLaren	John McLaren (South ½)	Farmhouse
				David McMichael	David McMichael (North ½)	Farmhouse
		27	I	Seneca Thomson (South ¼)	Seneca Thomson (South ¼)	Farmhouse
				Charles Thomson (South Middle ¼)	Charles Thomson (South Middle ¼)	Farmhouse
				David Thomson (North Middle ¼)	David Thomson (North Middle ¼)	Farmhouse
				Amos Thomson (North ¼)	Amos Thomson (North ¼)	Farmhouse
		26	I	Archibald Thomson	David A. Thomson (South ½)	Farmhouse
				R. Thomson	James Thomson (North ½)	Farmhouse
		26	II	A.Forfar	John Holmes (South Portion)	Farmhouse
				J. Holmes	Mrs. Fofar (widow) (South ½)	Farmhouse
		25	II	W. Forfar	Alexander M. Secor	Farmhouse
		24	II	D. Elliott	Guy Walton	Farmhouse
		23	II	George Scott	F&J Scott	Farmhouse
		22	II	William A. Thomson	William Green	
				Frances Bell		
		23	III	Hugh Elliott	Hugh Elliott	Farmhouse
		22	III	Francis Bell	Adam Bell	

Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension
City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township
of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario

Planned Corridor Alternative	Area (Ha.) Intersecting with Archaeological Potential	Lot	Concession	1860 Tremaine Map (1860)	1878 Atlas Map Owner(s) (Miles & Co. 1878)	Noted Buildings on Property
					John Bushby	
Corridor 5 Hydro (to McCowan Road)	23.61	29	C	Joseph Sewell	William W. Walton	Farmhouse
		27	D	John Fitzgibbon (South ½)	John Fitzgibbon (South ½)	Farmhouse
				David McMichael (North ½)	David McMichael (North ½)	Farmhouse
		26	D	James McLaren	John McLaren (South ½)	Farmhouse
				David McMichael	David McMichael (North ½)	Farmhouse
		25	D	J. Taber	John Tabor	
		25	I	Richard Thomson	Richard Thomson	
		24	I	William D. Thomson	Archibald Thomson (West ½)	Farmhouse
				J.D. Thomson	John Thomson (East ½)	Farmhouse
		23	I	Joseph A. Thomson	John Thomson	Farmhouse, Church
				William A. Thomson		
		22	I	D. Whitesides	James Green (North ½)	Farmhouse
					Richard Thomson (South ½)	Farmhouse
		23	II	George Scott	F&J Scott	Farmhouse
		22	II	William A. Thomson	William Green	
					Francis Bell	Farmhouse
		22	III	Francis Bell	Adam Bell	Farmhouse
		23	III	Hugh Elliott	Hugh Elliott	
Corridor 6 Brimley (to McCowan Road)	21.47	29	C	Joseph Sewell		
		26	D	James McLaren		
		25	D	I.Chester	Isaac Chester (South ½)	Farmhouse
				James A Thomson	Richard Thomson (North ¼)	Farmhouse
				J. Tabor	John Tabor (North ¼)	Farmhouse
		25	I	Richard Thomson	Richard Thomson (South ½)	Farmhouse
				W.D. Thomson	David Thomson (North ½)	Farmhouse
					Unknown	Saw Mill
		24	I	William D. Thomson	Robert Thomson	Farmhouse
		25	II	W. Fofar	Alex M. Secor	Farmhouse
		24	II	D. Elliott	Guy Walton	Farmhouse
		23	II	George Scott	F&J Scott	Farmhouse
		22	II	William A. Thomson	William Green (South ½)	
					Adam Bell (North ½)	Farmhouse
		23	III	Hugh Elliott	Hugh Elliott	Farmhouse
		22	III	Francis Bell	Adam Bell	Farmhouse
Corridor 7 McCowan	17.99	29	C	Joseph Sewell		
		24	D	A.Taylor	Andrew Taylor	Farmhouse/Orchard
					John Young	Farmhouse
		23	D	J. Torrance	John Young	
		22	D		James Chester	Farmhouse
		22	D	Archibald	Archibald Thompson	Farmhouse

Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension
City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township
of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario

Planned Corridor Alternative	Area (Ha.) Intersecting with Archaeological Potential	Lot	Concession	1860 Tremaine Map (1860)	1878 Atlas Map Owner(s) (Miles & Co. 1878)	Noted Buildings on Property
				Thomson		
		22	I	A.Thomson	Richard Thompson	Farmhouse
				D. Whitesides	James Green	Farmhouse
		23	I	J. Thomson		
				William A. Thomson		
		22	II	William A. Thomson	William Green	Farmhouse
				Francis Bell	Adam Bell	Farmhouse
		23	II	George Scott	F&J Scott	
		23	III	Hugh Elliott	Hugh Elliott	
		22	III	Francis Bell	Adam Bell	
		29	C	Joseph Sewell		
		29	C	James Sewell	William Walton	Farmhouse and orchard
		23	C	T.W. Wilson	Davis Wilson	
Corridor 9 Bellamy (to Mccowan Road)	17.59	22	C	John Stobe	Isaac Stobe	
		21	C	John Stobe	Robert Stobe	
				Archibald Muir	Alex Muir	
		20	D	Archibald Muir	Alex Muir	
				George Chester	David Annis	
				P. Secor		
		21	D	I.T. Secor	Isaac Secor	
				Thomas Wilson	J.P. Wheeler	
				John P. Wheeler		
		20	I	James Morgan	James Morgan	
				C.H	William McMurray	Farmhouse
				C. Ridout	Mrs. Hall	Farmhouse
					James Greens	
		21	I	John P. Wheelen	J.P. Wheeler	Farmhouse
				James Greens	James Greens	
		21	II	David Johnston	David Johnston	
		22	II	William A. Thomson	William Green	
				Francis Bell	Adam Bell	
		23	II	George Scott	F&J Scott	Farmhouse
		23	III	Hugh Elliott	David Elliott	
		22	III	Francis Bell	Adam Bell	
Corridor 10 Markham (to McCowan Road)	43.03	29	C	James Bell	William Walton	
		23	C	T. Wilson	David Wilson	
		22	C	John Johnston	Isaac Sloba	
		21	C	John Johnston	Robert Sloba	
				Archibald Muir	Alex Muir	
		20	C	Nelson Gates	Nelson Gates	
		19	C	G. Cornell	Nelson Gates	
		20	D	Archibald Muir	Alex Muir	
		19	D	Unknown	Unknown	School house, 7 Houses, Grand Trunk Railway

Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension
City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township
of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario


Planned Corridor Alternative	Area (Ha.) Intersecting with Archaeological Potential	Lot	Concession	1860 Tremaine Map (1860)	1878 Atlas Map Owner(s) (Miles & Co. 1878)	Noted Buildings on Property
				P. Secor	Jona Baird	Farmhouse
					David Annis	Farmhouse
		18	D	P. Secor	Unknown	3 houses, Grand trunk railway
					David Annis	
					George Secor	
		18	I	A.M. Secor	Alex Secor	
				John Atkinson	Jonathan Baird	
				William McMurray		
		19	I	John Henderson	W.R.	
				W. Rolph	M.B.	
				Thomas Dowsell	Isaac Fawcett	
				C. Ridout		
		20	I	C. Ridout	James Greens	
				Mrs. Hall	Mrs. Hall	
		21	I	James Greens	James Greens	
		21	II	David Johnston	John Johnston	
					David Johnston	
		22	II	William A. Thomson	William Green	
				Francis Bell	Adam Bell	
		23	II	George Scott	F&J Scott	
		22	III	Francis Bell	Adam Bell	
		23	III	Hugh Elliott	Hugh Elliott	


There are several historic villages located near the study area, including the historic villages of Malvern, Woburn and Scarboro, found inside of the study area. Also found in the township are the village of Ellesmere and the village of Agincourt, which are immediately west of the study area. Often the building of a post office initiated the naming and establishment of a town or village. All of the villages in and around the study area were established with small post offices and then expanded as resources and industry developed.


Ellesmere Village Post Office, located west of the study area was opened in June of 1853 under the management of Post Master Archibald Glendinning (Briggs 1896: 227). This part of the Scarboro Township was so small at the time that a post office made up a large portion of the business brought to the area (Briggs 1896: 226). Other smaller businesses included a blacksmith shop and a small store.


Malvern Village Post Office was located on Lot 18, Concession III and was opened in October of 1856 under the management of Post Master David Brown (**Table 1**) (Library and Archives Canada 2015). At the time the post office was built, Malvern had the largest public hall in the township and also boasted to have blacksmith, wagon and harness shops (Briggs 1896: 226). Later in 1878, there was a saw mill, a church, and a tavern located on the southern portion of Lot 18, Concession III (Miles & Co. 1878).

Agincourt Village Post Office, located north-west of the study area, was officially opened in June of 1858 under the management of Post Master John Hill. There were, however, four post master's prior to John Hill that do not have a date assigned to their service; J.E. Rowe, L.D.O. Ceddes, T. Outram, W.J. Donnelly (Library and

	<p>Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario</p>
	<p>Archives Canada 2015). John Hill wanted to have a post office connected to his general store and lobbied a parliamentary constituent in Ottawa (presumably while on business there), to approve one for him. The constituent agreed under the condition that he give the office a name (Briggs, 1896: 226); and thus Agincourt was appointed.</p> <p>Woburn Village (formerly named Elderslie), opened its post office in July of 1852. The postmaster was Thomas Dowsell (who owned property on Lot 21, Concession I) at the time (Briggs, 1896: 227). Woburn Village was the initial location of the Town Hall in 1896 (Briggs, 224) but not much more as it was too small in population.</p> <p>Scarboro village post office, located in the south east portion of the study area, was officially opened in July of 1830 under the charge of Peter Secor (Briggs, 1896: 225). Scarboro village had the highest level of seniority being the oldest of all of the villages in the area and was comprised of approximately 40 acres (Briggs, 1896: 227) It was the first post office in the township (on Lot 19, Concession D) also an initial location of a Grand Trunk Railway Station (Briggs, 1896: 224).</p> <p>With the building of the railway lines beginning in 1856, several communities were created at junction stops. The Grand Trunk Railway (GTR) runs along the southern portion of the Township. The historic Toronto and Nipissing Railway diverges from the GTR begins at the Scarborough Junction and crosses the township to the north for approximately two miles (3.2 km) (Robinson 1885). The Toronto Nipissing Railway runs along the western portion of the study area and is intersected by all nine of the corridor alternatives relating to the Scarborough Subway Extension project; two of which run north along its existing pathway (Corridor 1 3-1 (to Markham Road / Progress Avenue) and Corridor 2 Line 3-2 (to McCowan Road)) (Lot 28, Concession C, D, I, and II and Lot 27, Concession C, D, I and II) (Tremaine 1860).</p> <p>The pioneers of the Scarboro area settled primarily within the study area. The Thomson family was the very first family to settle and clear land in the area in 1796 and did so by following the Aboriginal trail which subsequently opened as Danforth Road (Briggs 1896: 28). David Thomson was a stone mason and brought his wife Mary Glendinning (another prominent name in the settlement history of the area), and four children with him to settle Lot 24 Concession I. The patent was taken out on this property in May 17th, 1802.</p> <p>Two historic cemeteries appear within the study area on the 1878 Historic Atlas Map (Miles & Co. 1878) and both are still in existence today. They are the Bethel Pioneer Memorial Cemetery (found south east of Kennedy Road and Eglinton Avenue East) and the Malvern Primitive Methodist Church Cemetery (located at Sheppard Avenue and Markham Road) (Miles & Co. 1878) (Figure 1 in Supplementary Documentation).</p> <p>Bethel Pioneer Cemetery</p> <p>Originally the Bethel Pioneer Cemetery was associated with the Sewell’s Primitive Methodist Church (also known as Bethel) and was built on a site presented by Thomas Walton in 1842 (Briggs, 1896: 168). The church was located on Lot 28,</p>
April 2015	11
	

	<p>Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario</p>
	<p>Concession C and was built of brick for a sum of £100 (Briggs, 1896: 168). The church closed in 1890 and its congregation moved to the Scarborough Junction Church (scarboroughhistorical.ca 2015). The cemetery continued to operate and became the final resting place for many Scarborough pioneers and settlers of all denominations (scarboroughhistorical.ca 2015). Presently, the Bethel Pioneer Cemetery is still in use and has available plots.</p> <p>Malvern Primitive Methodist Church Cemetery</p> <p>Located on Lot 18 Concession III, Malvern had one church in operation and it was built in 1864 (Briggs, 1896: 169). It was a Primitive Methodist Church that was demolished in 1975 (scarboroughhistorical.ca, 2015). In 1998 the Malvern Primitive Methodist Cemetery was designated under the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> as being of historical and architectural value (By-Law No. 301-1998). City of Toronto By-Law No. 301-1998 states that “the stone memorials located in the church cemetery remain as reminders of those who lived and worked in what was once a thriving community of Malvern” (page 3). The cemetery is currently closed to future interments and even though only a small number of graves are present, it represents a significant historic site due to the lack of remaining “Old Malvern village” sites (By-Law No. 301-1998).</p> <p>1.3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT</p> <p><i>Determining Archaeological Potential</i></p> <p>Based on past archaeological findings in the province, MTCS has identified criteria that can be used to evaluate a property’s archaeological potential. These criteria are related to various geographic and cultural-historic features which would have influenced land / resource use and settlement by past peoples (MTCS 1997, 2011), and include such characteristics as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• previously known archaeological sites within 300m of the subject property• water sources within 300m of the subject property, including primary (lakes, rivers, streams, creeks), secondary (springs, marshes, seasonal creeks and streams) and past (glacial shorelines or relic stream channels) water sources• elevated topography (drumlins, knolls, plateaux)• areas of well-drained, sandy soils• distinctive land formations that might have been special or spiritual places (waterfalls, rock outcrops, caves, mounds and promontories and their bases)• resource areas (animal migratory routes, spawning areas, raw material or plant procurement locations) and early Euro-Canadian industry (fur trade, logging and mining)• areas of early Euro-Canadian pioneer settlement and / or transportation routes (trails, roads, railways, portage routes, wharf or dock complexes)
April 2015	12
	

	<p>Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">properties that local histories or informants have identified with possible archaeological sites, historical events, activities, or occupations <p>By determining if one (or any) of these criteria are present, archaeologists are able to estimate whether a property has low, moderate or high potential for containing archaeological remains.</p> <p>Physiography of the Study Area</p> <p>The Scarborough Subway Extension study area is located in the South Slope physiographic region of southern Ontario. The South Slope itself extends from the Niagara Escarpment to the Trent River, between Lake Ontario and the Oak Ridges Moraine (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 172). This physiographic region is underlain by carbonate rich Palaeozoic rock with a variety of overlying glacial deposits. In the study area, the slope is smoothed, faintly drumlinized, and intersected by tributaries to the Humber, Rouge and Don Rivers (Chapman and Putman 1984).</p> <p>A number of South Slope soil types are well-suited to agricultural use. Generally, soils vary in an east-west direction according to till content. Clay and shale content in soils increases moving west from the Regional Municipality of Durham. In the study area, soils include a small amount of black and grey shales and are slightly acidic. Scarborough's Woburn loam is considered the best agricultural soil in the South Slope region and prior to urbanization this area was farmland (Chapman and Putman 1984).</p> <p>As noted, the study area extends over an area of 2681 ha and is approximately bordered by Eglinton Avenue East to the south, just beyond Markham Road to the east, Sheppard Avenue East to the north and Kennedy Road to the west. The City of Toronto's Archaeological Master Plan (ASI 2011) previously evaluated this area as having some archaeological potential but the extent of that potential was not clearly defined. However, most of the study area itself consists of a variety of landscapes including residential and commercial infrastructure, highways and roadways interspaced by, Highland Creek and its tributaries and some forested areas. Highland Creek runs northwest to southeast across the northern portion of the study area, while the West Highland and Southwest Highland Creeks are found within the central and southern portions of the study area, respectively.</p> <p>Potable water is the single most important resource necessary for any extended human occupation or settlement. Since water sources have remained relatively stable in south-central 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 proximity to Lake Ontario provided a solid transportation network which attracted early settlement and Aboriginal peoples.</p> <p>MTCS' Standards and Guidelines (2011) require that undisturbed lands within 300m of a primary water source and within 200m of a secondary water source are considered to have archaeological site potential. As the study area is located in relatively close proximity to a primary body of water (the modern and glacial shores</p>
April 2015	13
	

	<p>Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario</p>
	<p>of Lake Ontario), as well smaller modern and historic watercourses, it should be considered to have high potential for archaeological sites.</p> <p>For the Euro-Canadian period, the majority of early 19th century farmsteads are likely to be captured by the basic proximity to the water model outlined above, since these occupations were subject to similar environmental constraints. An added factor, however, is the development of the network of concession roads and rail lines through the course of the 19th century. These transportation routes frequently influenced the siting of farmsteads.</p> <p>In summary, the vicinity of the Scarborough Subway Extension study area possesses a number of environmental characteristics which would have made it attractive to both pre-contact and historic Euro-Canadian populations. The rich deciduous forest and the plentiful nearby waterways would have attracted a wide variety of game animals, and consequently, early hunters. The relatively well-drained soils would have been ideal for the maize horticulture of Middle to Late Woodland peoples and the mixed agriculture practiced by later Euro-Canadians. Finally, the proximity of the study area to Highland Creek and Lake Ontario would also have influenced its settlement and land-use history. Such major waterways functioned as principal transportation routes in both pre-contact and post-contact times.</p> <p>Based on the background research into the archaeological and land use history and its physiographic characteristics, the study area was deemed to have areas of high potential for containing archaeological resources in areas that have not already been disturbed. The presence of 19th century Euro-Canadian industry in combination with the immediate access to potable water indicates that human occupancy could and would have been ideal in the study area.</p> <p>Existing Conditions</p> <p>The Scarborough Subway Extension study area consists primarily of commercially and privately owned lands separated by present-day and historic roadways as well as the major 401 series Highway that travels through the Greater Toronto Area (GTA). The population is relatively dense within the limits of the study area and is dispersed over large areas of development. The majority of modern settlement is concentrated centrally within the study area and surrounds Highland Creek and its tributaries, similar to the earliest settlements in the area. The Scarborough Subway Extension study area is primarily an urban setting east of the densely populated Toronto core within the GTA along major roads. Agriculture appears to be the primary activity historically as the soil conditions were ideal for growing and sustaining crops, which has likely continued, albeit at a larger scale, from the advent of initial Euro-Canadian settlement in the 1800's. Now, however the primary activity is industry and commercial/residential livelihood as most of the study area is built up and developed.</p> <p>Major east to west running roads in the study area include Sheppard Avenue East and Highway 401 within the northern portion, Ellesmere Road in the central portion and Lawrence Avenue East and Eglinton Avenue East in the southern portion. Major roads running north to south include Nantucket Boulevard to the west, Brimley Road, Danforth Road and McCowan Road located centrally, and Markham Road to the east. Modern highways do not always follow the same route as historic roads, which</p>
April 2015	14
	

tended to be laid out along historic Concession Lines. The existing Canadian Pacific Rail line directly borders the northern portion of the Scarborough Subway Extension study area

Unfortunately, due to seasonal weather limitations (snow covered ground), a property inspection could not be carried out by AECOM at this time. Instead, detailed mapping, satellite imagery and recommendations made in the *Master Plan of Archaeological Resources for the City of Toronto* (ASI 2011) were used in order to evaluate areas containing moderate to high archaeological potential (marked in green in **Appendix A, Figures 2-4**) and areas containing low archaeological potential (disturbance, wet and slope represented by all other unmarked areas in **Appendix A, Figures 2-4**). Once a preferred corridor is chosen, areas of moderate to high potential and low potential will have to be confirmed by visual inspection or by survey techniques during the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment.

Registered Archaeological Sites

In order to compile an inventory of archaeology resources for the study area, three sources of information were accessed: the site record forms for registered sites housed at the MTCS, as well as published and unpublished documentary sources.

In Ontario, information concerning archaeological sites is stored in the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database (OASD) maintained by MTCS. This database contains archaeological registered sites within the Borden system. Under the Borden system, Canada has been divided into grid blocks based on longitude and latitude. A Borden block is approximately 13km east to west, and approximately 18.5km north to south. Each Borden block is referred by a four letter designation and sites located within the block are numbered sequentially as they are found. The Scarborough Subway Extension study area is located in Borden Block AkGt.

According to the OASD (MTCS 2015), there are 13 sites previously registered within one kilometre of the study area.

TABLE 2: REGISTERED ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES WITHIN ONE KILOMETRE OF THE STUDY AREA (MTCS, 2015)

Borden Number	Site Name	Cultural Affiliation	Site Type	Further Work Recommended	Researcher	Date
AkGt-12	Wallace Site	Undetermined	Campsite	Site destroyed	David Boyle, Victor Konrad	1896, 1971
AkGt-14	Brookes Site	Aboriginal	Campsite?	Large middens were still visible in 1946. The site has now been destroyed.	David Boyle, Victor Konrad	1896, 1971
*AkGt-16	Jenkinson Site	Undetermined	Campsite	Site destroyed	Victor Konrad	1950
AkGt-2	Elliot Site	Woodland, Iroquoian	Campsite	Since excavation, the site has been badly looted and is nearing final destruction by developers.	William Donaldson, Martha Latta, Victor Konrad	1960, 1971, 1972
*AkGt-20	Thompson	Woodland	Village	Observed and Recorded	J. Norman	1971,

Borden Number	Site Name	Cultural Affiliation	Site Type	Further Work Recommended	Researcher	Date
	Site	Iroquoian			Emerson, William A. Fox	1977
AkGt-3	Sterling Site	Undetermined	Campsite	Observed, Recorded and Surface Collected. Material should be examined and remainder of site tested. Railroad has destroyed part of it.	William Sterling, Victor Konrad	1960, 1971
AkGt-37	McCowan Site	Archaic, Woodland, Late Iroquoian?	Undetermined	Collected by McCowan family. Includes Iroquoian ceramics. Not clear whether the ceramics were found at this site or at the neighbouring Ayre Point Site, Cudia Park, part of the McCowan Farm (AkGt-32)	Mima Kapches, ROM	1987
AkGt-9	Squaw Village	Historic, Mississauga	Village? Campsite?	Site has been completely destroyed by developments	Victor Konrad	1950
AkGt-13	Brimley Site	Archaic, Laurentian	Campsite	Site completely destroyed in 1956	Walter Kenyon	1971
AkGt-15	Heinze Site	Undetermined	Campsite	Site destroyed	Victor Konrad	1950
AkGt-35	Jacques Site	Undetermined	Findspot	To be developed, no further action recommended. Site insignificant.	Robert G. Mayer and Dana R. Poulton	1986-1987
*AkGt-5	Tabor Hill Ossuary	Woodland Iroquoian	Burial	Unavailable	Walter Kenyon, Victor Konrad	1960, 1972
AkGt-60	Forfar Site	Euro-Canadian	Mid-Late 19 th century homestead	No further work recommended	Kim Slocki	2006

The 13 registered archaeological sites consist of seven pre-contact Aboriginal sites, one Euro-Canadian, and five with undetermined cultural affiliation. All the undetermined sites are described as campsites with the exception of one findspot. The single Euro-Canadian site (Forfar Site; AkGt-60) was a mid to late 19th century homestead and is located outside of the project study area. Three sites (AkGt-20, AkGt-16, AkGt-5) as indicated by an asterisk in **Table 2**, are not only located within the project area, but also along one or more of the corridor alternatives. (**Supplementary Documentation: Figures 1-10**). These are described here.

The Tabor Hill Ossuary (AkGt-5) was first discovered in 1956 during construction of a planned subdivision in Scarborough (Toronto Historical Association, 2015). The site contains two ossuary (burial pits) from the Late Woodland Period (ca. A.D. 1300-1350). In total, approximately 472 individual skeletons were purportedly buried in the two ossuary pits (based on Kenyon’s (1960) analysis of the 38% deposit removed); however no grave goods were found (Toronto Historical Association, 2015). The remains were reinterred at the Tabor Hill Park designation site in the presence of 250 Six Nations representatives two months after the initial discovery (The Brantford Expositor, 1956). According to the Richmond Hill Official Plan for Archaeology and

Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension
City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario

First Nations Policy Study (ASI, 2009: 49) the Tabor Hill site is *tentatively accepted* as being associated with another site that intersects with a potential corridor of the project; the Thompson site (AkGt-20, described below). Kenyon (1960: 6) states in his report on the Tabor Hill Ossuary that

“in the absence of written records, there is...no method of proving conclusively that a village and a distant burial ground are related, and hence of the same age. But a careful search of the area with a radius of a mile and a half from the ossuary located nothing but early Iroquois artifacts about 700 years old. And a large concentration of this material, about one and a quarter miles up Highland Creek [Thompson Site] from the ossuaries, almost certainly marks the site of the main village of the area. With reasonable certainty, then, we can say that the bone deposits on Taber’s Hill were placed there around 1250 A.D. “

Both the Tabor Hill Ossuary and the Thompson site date to the same time period and are 1800m apart. The Tabor Hill burials are protected from further disturbance and are acknowledged with a plaque and stone in Tabor Hill Park on the north east corner of Bellamy Road North and Lawrence Avenue East. Mapping and repatriation information in Kenyon’s 1960 report *History of the Tabor Hill Ossuaries in Scarborough and a Proposal for an Authentic Iroquois Indian Village* indicate that the ossuaries were reburied in a single communal pit over the original excavation (Page 21). Therefore, if Corridor 10 (Markham Corridor to McCowan Road) **(Supplementary Documentation, Figure 10)** is chosen as the preferred alternative for the project, several measures would have to be taken to protect and avoid the site entirely.

The Thompson site (AkGt-20) is an Iroquoian village site from the Late Woodland Period (ca. A.D. 1300-1350) that, as noted above, may be associated with the Tabor Hill Ossuary (ASI, 2009: 49). It is located on a hill north of West Highland Creek on the west side of Brimley Road where the creek crosses the road in Thompson Memorial Park (MTCS, 2015). In 1956, the Thompson site was partially excavated by the University of Toronto’s fall student excavation (Kenyon, 1960: 7). Approximately 5,000 ft² was excavated (464m²). Given the average size associated with village sites from this time period (approximately 1 ha), the Thompson site still contains moderate to high archaeological potential as only 4.6% of its potential area has been excavated. During excavations, a search for longhouse remains was conducted, however none were recovered. The potential outcomes of this lack of information may mean that people were not living in longhouses yet or that the area tested was insufficient (Kenyon, 1960: 7). According to J. Norman Emerson of the University of Toronto, further excavation would be required to gain additional insight into the living habits of this particular village (Kenyon, 1960: 7). The site lies in close proximity to, if not on, the proposed Brimley to McCowan Corridor **(Supplementary Documentation, Figure 7)**.

The Jenkinson site (AkGt-16) intersects with the proposed Line 3-1 to Markham Road / Progress Avenue and Line 3-2 to McCowan Road corridors **(Figures 2 and 3 in the Supplementary Documentation)**. According to the MTCS (2015) the site was a campsite documented by Victor Konrad in 1950. However, it is not clear what cultural affiliation the site has, or whether or not it was fully excavated.

Additionally, according to the Ontario Archeological Site Database (OASD) 13 instances of previous archaeological fieldwork have been recorded within one

April 201517AECOM

Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension
City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario

kilometre of the study area or within the study area itself (MTCS 2015). The reports are outlined as follows:

TABLE 3: PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORTS FOR FIELDWORK CONDUCTED WITHIN ONE KILOMETRE OF THE SCARBOROUGH SUBWAY EXTENSION STUDY AREA

Year	Title	Author	Project Information Form (P.I.F.)†
2005	Stage 1 & 2 A. A. of 17 Frith Road, Part of Lot 5, Registered Plan M-584, Part of Lot 17, Conc. 5 W.Y.S., Geographic Township of York, County of York (Formerly City of North York) Now in the City of Toronto	Archaeological Services Inc.	P047-092
2006	Stage 1 and 2 AA, 1795 Markham Road, Part of Lot 18, Conc. 3, Geo. Twp of Scarborough, County of York, former City of Scarborough, now the City of Toronto	Archaeological Services Inc.	P047-214-2006
2006	Stage 1 and 2 AA 4770 Sheppard Ave. East Part of Lot 21, Concession 3 Geo. Twp of Scarborough, County of York, former City of Scarborough	Archaeological Services Inc.	P046-033-2006
2007	Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of 2225 Dundas Street East, Part of Lot A, Concession 1 North of Dundas Street East, Geographic Township of Toronto, Now in the City of Mississauga, Regional Municipality of Peel, Ontario	Archaeological Services Inc.	P265-031-2007
2010	Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment, 24 Massie Street, Lot 25, Registered Plan 3354, (formerly City of Scarborough), City of Toronto, Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto	AMICK	P058-621-2010
2010	Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment, 675 Progress Avenue, Part of Lot 22, Concession 2, Geographic township of Scarborough, City of Toronto	AMICK	P039-368-2010
2010	Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (Background Research and Property Inspection), Highway 401 and Brimley Road Interchange Modifications, City of Toronto, Ontario	Archaeological Services Inc.	P057-628-2010
2011	Stage 1 and 2 A. A. of a Proposed Townhouse Site, Brimley Road, Part of Lot 25, Concession 1, Geographic Township of Scarborough Now in the City of Toronto	Archaeological Services Inc.	P358-347-2011
2011	Stage 1 Archaeological Background research, 1740-1744 Ellesmere Road, Lot 28 & 29, Registrar’s Compiled Plan 10152, Part of Lot 22, Concession 2, Geographic Township of Scarborough, City of Toronto	AMICK	P058-653-2010
2012	Archaeological Assessment of TRCA Property in the City of Toronto (Stage 1 and 2), Scarborough Rapid Transit, Lot 19, Concession II, Historic Scarborough Township, York County (HCW-10-001)	TRCA	P303-081-2010
2012	Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of Lots 38, 39, 40, 41, 42 and 43, Registered Plan 337, Part of Lot 6, Concession 3, Geographic Township of King, County of York, Now in the Town of King City, Regional Municipality of York	Archaeological Services Inc.	P047-361-2012
2012	Archaeological Assessment of TRCA Property in the City of Toronto (Stage 1 and 2), Scarborough Rapid Transit, Lot 19, Concession II, Historic Scarborough Township, York County (HCW-10-001)	Archaeological Services Inc.	P303-081-2010
2013	Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 1325 Danforth Road, Part Of Lot 23 and 24, Concession D, Geographic Township Of Scarborough, Part Of Lot 2 Registered Plan 3345, City Of Toronto	Archaeological Assessments Ltd.	P361-0070-2013
2014	Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of Sheppard Avenue East and Markham Road Condominium Development, Part of Lot 18, Concession 3, Geographic Township of Scarborough, County of York Now in the City of Toronto	Archaeological Services Inc.	

A brief description of those reports that were available is provided below.

1. Archaeological Services Inc.’s Stage 1/2 assessment for 1795 Markham Road was completed in 2006. Along with background research, fieldwork was

April 201518AECOM

	<p>Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario</p>
	<p>completed involving test pitting at five metre intervals and the topsoil stripping of the area adjacent to a cemetery. No archaeological materials were recovered.</p> <p>2. Archaeological Services Inc.'s Stage 1/2 assessment of the proposed townhouse site was completed in 2011. The Stage 2 fieldwork consisted of a test pit survey at five metre intervals. No archaeological resources were recovered during this assessment.</p> <p>3. Archaeological Services Inc.'s Stage 1/2 assessment of 1325 Danford Road was completed in 2013. The stage 2 fieldwork included the test pit at five metre intervals over an area of 5.6 hectares. Much of the study area was considered disturbed and no archaeological materials were recovered.</p> <p>4. The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) completed a Stage 1/2 assessment of Lot 19, Concession II in 2011. This assessment consisted of test pitting at five metre intervals in an area measuring approximately 1.2 hectares, although some of the study area was recorded as sloped (0.48 hecatres). No archaeological resources were recovered during this assessment.</p>
April 2015	<div>19</div> <div>AECOM</div>

	<p>Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario</p>
	<p>2.0 SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS</p> <p>There are several factors that must be examined in the analysis of archaeological potential within the Scarborough Subway Extension study area. These include but are not limited to known archaeological sites, natural environmental features, areas of early Euro-Canadian settlement and industry and archaeological management plans (ASI 2006, 2011, 2012, 2014). A total of 13 previously registered sites have been identified within one kilometre of the Scarborough Subway Extension study area and archaeological potential is elevated in proximity to these sites. In accordance with Section 1.4 Standard 1.c.i. of the Standards and Guidelines all land within 300m of a registered archaeological site must be subject to Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (MTCS 2011). It is important to note that additional undiscovered archaeological sites and resources may still be present within the study area as there have been limited development activities that would have triggered previous archaeological assessments.</p> <p>As well, areas of early Euro-Canadian settlement are indicated on the 19th century maps and from archival research conducted during the course of the study. A number of historic roads are present within the study area, including Sheppard Avenue East, Ellesmere Road, Lawrence Avenue East, Danforth Road and Eglinton Avenue East. These routes were essential to the development of communities in each of the Counties. Several post offices, churches, and schoolhouses are also illustrated on the 19th century historic maps for the County of York, as well as the Grand Trunk, Toronto & Nipissing Railways (Miles and Co. 1878). Each of these historic features contributes further to the archaeological potential within the Scarborough Subway Extension study area.</p> <p>Archaeological site locations and types are also affected in varying degrees by proximity to different types of water sources and shorelines. Primary sources of water such as lakes, rivers, streams and creeks are reliable sources of drinking water and transportation routes, while secondary water sources such as seasonal streams and creeks, springs, marshes and swamps are intermittent sources of potable water and archaeological potential is elevated in proximity to these features. Similarly, features indicating past water sources, for example glacial lake shorelines, relic river or stream channels, and shorelines of drained lakes or marshes are archaeologically significant features that also indicate archaeological potential. In the Scarborough Subway Extension study area there is an abundance of water sources, as attested by the presence of Highland Creek and its respective watersheds and Lake Ontario to the south, which provide extensive access to relatively large creeks and smaller streams. The Scarborough Subway Extension study area is situated on the South Slope physiographic region of southern Ontario, with gently sloping topography between the various watercourses that transect the land.</p> <p>The most common disturbances that have removed archaeological potential in the Scarborough Subway Extension study area are associated with heavy commercial and residential development, roads and related infrastructure such as storm drains, sewer and utility installation highways that are present. These developed areas, do not require Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (MTCS 2011; Section 1.3.2) as these areas have been subject to extensive and deep land alterations that have</p>
April 2015	<div>20</div> <div>AECOM</div>


	<div>Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario</div>
	<div>severely damaged the integrity of any archaeological resources that may have been present.</div> <div>In summary, the vicinity of the Scarborough Subway Extension study area possesses a number of environmental characteristics which would have made it attractive to both pre-contact and historic Euro-Canadian populations. The rich deciduous forest and the plentiful nearby waterways would have attracted a wide variety of game animals, and consequently, early hunters. The relatively well-drained soils would have been ideal for the maize horticulture of Middle to Late Woodland peoples and the mixed agriculture practiced by later Euro-Canadians. Finally, the proximity of the study area to Highland Creek and Lake Ontario would also have influenced its settlement and land-use history. Such major waterways functioned as principal transportation routes in both pre-contact and post-contact times.</div> <div>Therefore, the results of the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment indicate that, while a large portion of the lands within the existing study area have been disturbed by past development (ASI, 2011), some of the study area has archaeological potential for both historic Euro-Canadian and pre-contact archaeological resources. These areas require Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment consisting of test pitting (indicated in green in Appendix A: Figure 2, ranging from 16.34 ha to 51.86 ha based on preliminary estimates).</div> <div>Current areas of archaeological potential were determined in 2011 by Archaeological Services Inc., via <i>A Master Plan of Archaeological Resources for the City of Toronto</i> and will require subsequent Stage 2 property inspections in order to verify once the preferred corridor is established.</div>
April 2015	<div>21</div> <div>AECOM</div>

	<div>Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario</div>
	<div>3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS</div> <div>For lands within the study area that will be impacted by the proposed Scarborough Subway Extension AECOM makes the following recommendations:</div> <div><div>1. Once a preferred corridor is selected, a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment should be conducted by a licensed consultant archaeologist using the test pit survey method at 5m intervals. This should be done in areas where ploughing is not possible or viable at the time of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (areas of archaeological potential marked in green in Appendix A, Figure 2 and any other areas determined to have archaeological potential based on visual inspection during the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment of the preferred corridor).</div><div>2. Once a preferred corridor is selected, any lands adjacent to cemeteries that will be impacted must be subject to a Stage 2 test pit survey, followed by topsoil stripping of the corridor as part of a Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment under the supervision of a licensed consultant archaeologist to determine the extent of the cemetery and to ensure no graves will be disturbed. Any previously registered archaeological sites located within the preferred corridor will require further Stage 2, 3 or 4 archaeological assessments as applicable. This must be done in accordance with the <i>Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists</i> (MTCS 2011).</div><div>3. Once a preferred corridor is selected, all additional lands within the project limits must be visually assessed in order to confirm areas of low archaeological potential, (pockets of disturbance, slope and wet). In addition, areas that have been previously subject to an archaeological assessment (marked in orange in Appendix A, Figure 2) do not require further assessment.</div><div>4. The Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment will follow the requirements set out in the 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTCS 2011).</div></div> <div><i>The above recommendations are subject to Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport approval, and it is an offence to alter any archaeological site without MTCS concurrence. No grading or other activities that may result in the destruction or disturbance of an archaeological site are permitted until notice of MTCS approval has been received.</i></div>
April 2015	<div>22</div> <div>AECOM</div>

	<div>Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario</div>
	<div>4.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION</div> <div><p>a) This report is submitted to the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport as a condition of licencing in accordance with Part IV of the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>, R.S.O. 1990, c 0.18. The report is reviewed to ensure that it complies with the standards and guidelines that are issued by the Minister, and that the archaeological fieldwork and report recommendations ensure the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario. When all matters relating to archaeological sites within the project area of a development proposal have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, a letter will be issued by the ministry stating that there are no further concerns with regard to alterations to archaeological sites by the proposed development.</p><p>b) It is an offence under Sections 48 and 69 of the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> 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 a 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 Archaeological Reports referred to in Section 65.1 of the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>.</p><p>c) Should previously undocumented archaeological resources be discovered, they may be a new archaeological site and therefore subject to Section 48 (1) of the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>. The proponent or person discovering the archaeological resources must cease alteration of the site immediately and engage a licensed consultant archaeologist to carry out archaeological fieldwork, in compliance with Section 48 (1) of the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>.</p><p>d) The <i>Cemeteries Act</i>, R.S.O. 1990, c.C.4 and the <i>Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act</i>, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33 (when proclaimed in force) require that any person discovering human remains must notify the police or coroner and the Registrar of Cemeteries at the Ministry of Consumer Services.</p><p>e) Archaeological sites recommended for further archaeological fieldwork or protection remain subject to Section 48 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act and may not be altered, or have artifacts removed from them, except by a person holding an archaeological licence.</p><p>Documentation related to the archaeological assessment of this project will be curated by AECOM until such a time that arrangements for their ultimate transfer to Her Majesty the Queen in right of Ontario, or other public institution, can be made to the satisfaction of the project owner, the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport any other legitimate interest groups.</p></div> <div><div>April 2015</div><div>23</div><div>AECOM</div></div>

	<div>Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario</div>
	<div>5.0 REFERENCES CITED</div> <div><p>AMICK 2010 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment, 24 Massie Street, Lot 25, Registered Plan 3354, (formerly City of Scarborough), City of Toronto, Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto 2010 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment, 675 Progress Avenue, Part of Lot 22, Concession 2, Geographic township of Scarborough, City of Toronto</p><p>Archaeological Assessments Ltd 2013 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 1325 Danforth Road, Part Of Lot 23 and 24, Concession D, Geographic Township Of Scarborough, Part Of Lot 2 Registered Plan 3345, City Of Toronto</p><p>Archaeological Services Inc, 2008 Town of Richmond Hill Official Plan: Archaeology and First Nations Policy Study. ASI File O8sp-60. 2006 Stage 1 and 2 AA, 1795 Markham Road, Part of Lot 18, Conc. 3, Geo. Twp of Scarborough, County of York, former City of Scarborough, now the City of Toronto 2011 <i>A Master Plan of Archaeological Resources for the City of Toronto</i>. Prepared by Archaeological Services Inc. in association with Cuesta Systems Inc., Commonwealth Historic Resources Management Limited, Golder Associates, and Historical Research Limited. Available at www.toronto.ca/culture. 2013 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 1325 Danforth Road, Part Of Lot 23 and 24, Concession D, Geographic Township Of Scarborough, Part Of Lot 2 Registered Plan 3345, City Of Toronto 2014 Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of Sheppard Avenue East and Markham Road Condominium Development, Part of Lot 18, Concession 3, Geographic Township of Scarborough, County of York Now in the City of Toronto</p><p>Briggs, William 1896 <i>The Township of Scarboro, 1796-1896</i>. Edited by David Boyle, Toronto, Ontario.</p><p>City of Toronto 1998 By-Law No. 301-1998. To Designate the Malvern Primitive Methodist Cemetery Plan 217, Lot 21 & 23.</p><p>Chapman, L.J. and F. Putnam 1984 <i>The Physiography of Southern Ontario</i>. Ontario Geological Survey, Special Volume 2. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Toronto.</p><p>Kenyon, W.A. 1960 History of the Tabor Hill Ossuaries in Scarborough and a Proposal for an Authentic Iroquois Indian Village. Royal Ontario Museum. 100 Queens Park, Toronto 5 Canada. Accessed from MTCS, February 18th, 2015.</p><p>Mercer and Pelham 1885 <i>History of Toronto and County of York Ontario; Containing an Outline of the History of the Dominion of Canada, A history of the City of Toronto and the County of York, with the Townships, Towns, Villages, Churches, Schools, General and Local Statistics, Biographical Sketches Etc. Volume II. C. Blackett Robinson, Toronto, Ontario.</i></p></div> <div><div>April 2015</div><div>24</div><div>AECOM</div></div>

	<p>Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario</p>
	<p>Miles & Co. 1878 <i>Illustrated historical atlas of the county of York and the township of West Gwillimbury & town of Bradford in the county of Simcoe, Ont. Toronto, Ontario.</i></p> <p>Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport 2011 <i>Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists.</i> Cultural Programs Branch, Archaeology and Planning Unit, Toronto. 2015 Sites within a one Kilometre Radius of the Study Area Provided from the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database, January 14, 2015. 2015 Archaeological Reports within 50 metres of the Study Area Provided from the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database, January 14, 2015</p> <p>Library and Archives Canada. 2015 Post Office and Post Masters Database. Taken from http://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/discover/postal-heritage-philately/post-offices-postmasters/Pages/search.aspx, January 21st, 2015 1871 Census of Canada. Library and Archive Canada, "Discover the Collection: Census of Canada," Page 3 (Ontario).</p> <p>Scarborough Historical Society 2015 Bethel Pioneer Memorial Cemetery – Board of Trustees http://scarboroughhistorical.ca/ Accessed February 19th, 2015 2015 Malvern - http://scarboroughhistorical.ca/ Accessed February 19th, 2015</p> <p>The Brantford Expositor 1956 Ancient Longhouse Rites: Indian Remains Reinterred. October 22. 1956. SHarlene Bomberry, David Thomas, Jacob Skye. Electronic Resource: vitacollections.ca/sixnationsarchive/2696175. Accessed: February 17th, 2015.</p> <p>Toronto Historical Association 2015 Tabor Hills Ossuary. 1998 to present. Electronic Resource: http://torontohistory.net/tabor-hills-ossuary.html Accessed: February 17th, 2015.</p> <p>TRCA 2012 Archaeological Assessment of TRCA Property in the City of Toronto (Stage 1 and 2), Scarborough Rapid Transit, Lot 19, Concession II, Historic Scarborough Township, York County (HCW-10-001)</p> <p>Trigger, Bruce 1994 The Huron, Farmers of the North. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Toronto, Ontario</p>
April 2015	<div>25</div> <div></div>

	<p>Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Subway Extension City of Toronto / Toronto Transit Commission, Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scaroboro (Now Scarborough), County of York (Now the City of Toronto), Ontario</p>
	<p>APPENDIX A: FIGURES</p>
April 2015	<div>26</div> <div></div>