

06/02/2018

Archaeology Program Unit Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport Culture Division, Programs and Services Branch 401 Bay Street, Suite 1700 Toronto, ON M7A 0A7 Fax: (416) 212-1802

Record of Indigenous Engagement for report entitled "Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, Picton Terminals Expansion, 62 White Chapel Road, Part 1, Plan 47R-2991(P1), Part of Lots 125, 130, 131, Land Registrar's Compiled Plan No. 28, City of Prince Edward County, Lot 11, Concession 1 Southwest of Green Point, Geographic Township of Sophiasburgh, Part of Lots 9–10, Concession 1 Northwest of Carrying Place, Geographic Township of Hallowell, Former Prince Edward County, Ontario".

The Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte (MBQ) were engaged over the course of the Stage 1 archaeological assessment for the expansion of Picton Terminals in the City of Prince Edward County. In keeping with the requirements set out in Section 7.6.2 of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*, a description of Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.'s (ARA) involvement in the process of engagement appears below. The draft technical bulletin on *Engaging Aboriginal Communities in Archaeology* was also consulted for guidance on reporting on the engagement process.

The MBQ were already involved in discussions with the proponent regarding the project when they requested that the client arrange to have an archaeological assessment for the study area. The initial engagement with MBQ was completed by Doornekamp Construction Ltd., and ARA's role in the engagement process took place in November 2017 (during fieldwork). ARA arrived at the study area and signed in to the terminal when the Field Director was told by the client contact that an MBQ monitor had requested to be present during the site visit. At this time, the client contact advised the Field Director that they would attempt to reach the MBQ contact.

ARA's Field Director began the assessment with the assumption that they would be joined by an MBQ representative that day. The Field Director wrapped up for the day and had not been joined or contacted by anyone from MBQ; accordingly, she contacted ARA's Team Lead of Indigenous Engagement and Accommodation (IEA) and explained the situation. ARA's Team Lead of IEA immediately attempted to discuss the matter with the MBQ contact via telephone and email, but it was after hours and no one could be reached.

The following morning, ARA's Team Lead of IEA reached out to MBQ via telephone again and was able to arrange for a monitor to join the Field Director for the remainder of the site visit. The day after the site visit was completed the MBQ contact, Amy Cowie, requested a teleconference to review ARA's findings, which was arranged. A summary of engagement events appears in Table 1, and a breakdown of monitor participation is presented in Table 2.

**Table 1: Summary of Engagement Events** 

First Nation	Date	Engagement Event	Nature
Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte (MBQ) Contact: Amy Cowie	22-Nov-17	V. Cafik emailed A. Cowie to let her know we were onsite for our Stage 1 assessment and would be happy for MBQ to join us in the field and share background knowledge of the property.	Email/ Telephone
	23-Nov-17	V. Cafik followed up with a phone call to the MBQ office. A. Cowie was unavailable to speak with, so I was forwarded to C. Brant, the Lands Manager, who was able to arrange for a Monitor to attend the site.	Telephone
		V. Cafik followed up with A. Cowie via email to let her know that a Monitor was able to attend the site. A. Cowie responded to request a meeting with the Field Director to review the results of the Stage 1 potential modeling. V. Cafik and A. Cowie scheduled a teleconference for the following day.	Email
	24-Nov-17	A. Mykytey had a phone discussion with A. Cowie and Monitor, L. Jeffries to discuss the results of the Stage 1, MBQ requested a copy of our draft report.	Telephone

**Table 2: Summary of Monitor Participation** 

First Nation	Monitor	Participation
Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte (MBQ)	Luke Jeffries	23-Nov-2017

In his capacity as an Indigenous Monitor, Mr. Jeffries concurred with the strategies, methods and results of the assessment. As noted in the assessment report, Mr. Jeffries requested that the isolated sherd found on the beach be collected for laboratory analysis. During the subsequent teleconference, both Ms. Cowie and Mr. Jeffries noted their concerns with the amount of land disturbance which appears to have taken place since the 2016 Google Earth imagery.

Best regards,

Paul J. Racher, M.A., CAHP, Licence #P007

Principal – Management and Senior Review (MSR) Team

Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.

Tel: (519) 804-2291 ext. 100 | Cell: (519) 835-4427 | Fax: (519) 286-0493

pracher@arch-research.com