

APPENDIX H – CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE ASSESSMENT REPORT

Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Report

Three proposed rest stop areas, Highway 17, within the Corporation of the Township of White River, District of Algoma, Ontario (GWP 5134-22-00)

CHRAR Report
April, 2026

Prepared for:

eGIS Group

3240 Drummond Concession 5A, RR 7,
Perth, ON K7H 3C9

Attn: Nathan Farrell, Senior Environmental Planner
Nathan.FARRELL@egis-group.com

Prepared by:

Andrew Hinshelwood, PhD, CAHP

Northwest Archaeological Assessments Ltd.

Table of Contents

Purpose of the Report	2
<i>Objectives of the report</i>	<i>2</i>
Environmental Assessment Requirements and Cultural Heritage Resources.....	3
<i>Environmental Assessment Act.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Ministry of Transportation</i>	<i>6</i>
Assessment Methodology.....	7
<i>Heritage Recognition.....</i>	<i>7</i>
Historical Summary	7
Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes and Built Heritage Resources	8
<i>Description of the Existing Environment.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Description of Identified Cultural Heritage Resources.....</i>	<i>8</i>
Historic plaques	8
<i>Description of Individual Properties.....</i>	<i>9</i>
Option 7: Discussion	9
Option 8: Discussion	9
Option 9: Discussion	10
Potential Effects of the Undertaking on Cultural Heritage Resources.....	14
<i>Direct Impacts</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Indirect Impacts.....</i>	<i>14</i>
Mitigation Recommendations	15

Purpose of the Report

Egis Group Ltd. has been engaged by Ministry of Transportation Ontario (MTO) to provide Total Project Management for Preliminary Design, Detail Design and Class Environmental Assessment for five new Highway Rest Centres in northeastern Ontario. The five rest centres proposed will be located near five communities, specifically:

GWP 5133-22-00	Highway 11 Opasatika/Kapuskasung
GWP 5134-22-00	Highway 17 White River
GWP 5135-22-00	Highway 17 Wawa
GWP 5136-22-00	Highway 17/519 Dubreuilville
GWP 5137-22-00	Highway 101/17 Chapleau

As part of this work, Egis Group are responsible to prepare Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Reports (CHRARs) for each of the proposed sites to fulfil the technical requirements of the *Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (S&Gs)*. For this, Egis Group has retained Northwest Archaeological Assessments (Andrew Hinshelwood, PhD, CAHP) to complete the CHRARs. Each report identifies and documents known or potential Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes within and adjacent to the study areas and provides a preliminary impact assessment for each preliminary rest area design.

This report concerns **GWP 5134-22-00 Highway 17 White River**. Three potential rest stop areas have been identified. These have been numbered Option 7, Option 8, and Option 9 for the purpose of this report.

Two of the optional areas under consideration are Option 7, located on the west side of Highway 17 south of the town site, and Option 8, situated across the highway to the east. Currently, these proposed rest stop areas are in an area of second growth forest. Option 9 is a location within the Municipality of White River at the junction of Highway 17 and Highway 631 and incorporates an existing bar and grill, an associated gravel parking lot, and an adjacent greenfield area.

Objectives of the report

Built heritage resources and/or cultural heritage landscapes may experience adverse impact if they conflict with development. Impacts to heritage resources arise through alteration of one or more key heritage attributes, especially alterations that compromise or diminish heritage value. There may also be indirect impacts to heritage resources resulting from the introduction of physical, visual, audible, or atmospheric elements that are not in keeping with their character and/or setting. In addition, development outcomes may include isolating the cultural heritage resources when development changes conditions such as road access, viewscape, ambient noise levels, and so forth. For built heritage, isolation arising from revised access can lead to demolition due to neglect and/or vandalism.

The principal objectives of this CHRAR are to:

- provide a historical summary of the development and land use of the study area

- conduct a field survey of the study area
- identify known or potential cultural heritage landscapes and built heritage resources
- relate known or potential cultural heritage landscapes and built heritage resources to major historical themes
- identify potential impacts from development to known or potential cultural heritage landscapes and built heritage resources
- make general mitigation recommendations respecting the proposed endeavour.

A field review of the study area was completed in October, 2024. The review included a “windshield” survey of the study area, and limited pedestrian survey of the proposed rest stop locations, to confirm observations of ground conditions and heritage resources.

Environmental Assessment Requirements and Cultural Heritage Resources

Cultural heritage is an essential component of the environment. Environmental assessment policy acknowledges the need to identify, evaluate, manage, and conserve Ontario’s cultural heritage in assessment and planning. Detailed direction on the protection of cultural heritage resources in planning is set out in the Planning Act (RSO 1990, c. P13) and the Provincial Planning Statement, 2024.¹

Built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes are distinct from archaeological resources, in the distinction that built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes generally concern above-ground resources over 40 years of age. The resources are visible, or exist to some degree, above the surface of the ground. In contrast, the *Ontario Heritage Act* (RSO 1990, c. O.18) defines archaeological resources to not include buildings or structures other than ruins, burial mounds, petroglyphs, and earthworks (RSO 1990, c. O.18, s. 47). The rolling 40-year principle is accepted in provincial and federal heritage policy. It does not mean that all built heritage resources or cultural heritage landscapes over 40 years-old are worthy of the same levels of protection or preservation, and also allows for the consideration of more recent resources that may hold cultural heritage value or interest.

Three main categories of cultural heritage resource are considered in cultural heritage resource management. *Built heritage resources* means a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured or constructed part or remnant that contributes to a property’s cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Indigenous community.

Cultural heritage landscapes are a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Indigenous community. The area may include features such as buildings, structures, spaces, views, archaeological sites, or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association.

Archaeological resources include artifacts, archaeological sites, and marine archaeological sites, as defined

¹ <https://www.ontario.ca/files/2024-10/mmah-provincial-planning-statement-en-2024-10-23.pdf>

under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The identification and evaluation of such resources are based upon archaeological assessments carried out by archaeologists licensed under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Environmental Assessment Act

The environmental assessment process is, in part, a decision-making process used to promote consideration of the potential effects of certain activities may have on the environment. In Ontario, the ***Environmental Assessment Act*** (RSO 1990, c. E.18) promotes the protection, conservation, and wise management of Ontario's environment through planning and mitigation. The Act applies to all public activities, including projects being undertaken by, or on behalf of Ontario ministries and agencies, and typically covers infrastructure developments such as highways, transit, waste management and electrical generation and transmission. Under the Act, the environment is defined to include:

the social, economic, and cultural conditions that influence the life of humans or a community, and, any building, structure, machine or other device or thing made by humans (RSO 1990, c. E.18, s. 1)

Planning under the Environmental Assessment Act requires the consideration of potential impacts to cultural heritage resources, and proposals for the mitigation of these impacts. The Act acknowledges that impacts resulting from an undertaking may be direct or indirect. Direct impacts may include displacement, demolition or removal, while indirect impacts may introduce physical, visual, audible, or atmospheric elements that are not in keeping with the character of the cultural heritage resources.

Ontario Heritage Act

The Ontario Heritage Act (OHA) and the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (S&Gs) provide the framework for provincial and municipal rights and responsibilities in the conservation of cultural heritage resources. The Act grants the Minister of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) responsibility for the administration of this Act, and the right to determine policies, priorities and programs for the conservation, protection, and preservation of the heritage of Ontario (R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18, s. 2). In carrying out this responsibility, the ministry considers and advises proponents on the potential adverse impacts of development on heritage buildings and structures, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources. Also, since cultural heritage resources may be impacted adversely by both public and private land development, planning and approval authorities are directed to consider heritage resources when making planning decisions. This extends, in the case of municipalities, the ability to designate individual properties, under Part IV, or heritage conservation districts, under Part V of the OHA. Designation includes specific restrictions to development impacts, and inclusion on a municipal register. Much of this direction is described in the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit.²

Part III.1 of the OHA enables the Minister to prepare standards and guidelines setting out the criteria and process for identifying *provincial* heritage properties and the standards for their protection, maintenance, use, and disposal. The ***Standards and Guidelines for Provincial Heritage Properties*** (April 28, 2010) apply to

² <https://www.ontario.ca/page/ontario-heritage-tool-kit>

properties owned or controlled by the province and have cultural heritage value or interest (provincial heritage properties). The S&Gs define provincial heritage properties as:

real property, including buildings and structures on the property, that has cultural heritage value or interest and that is owned by the Crown in right of Ontario or by a prescribed public body.

The responsibilities extend to properties leased or occupied by the province if the terms of the lease permit alterations to the property. The evaluation process to be followed to identify and evaluate provincial heritage properties is set out in the S&Gs, Part B. The evaluation process includes a description of the property, historical information particular to the property, determination of the cultural heritage value or interest of the property, including consideration of whether the property may hold provincial significance. The evaluation of the property is to be completed by a qualified individual, with input from local community members.

Identification and evaluation are linked to the criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest found in Ontario Regulations 9/06 and 10/06. Criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest set out in the Ontario Regulation 9/06 determine the cultural heritage value or interest of a property. property meets the criteria in Ontario Regulation 9/06, it is a provincial heritage property. Each provincial heritage property should also be considered relative to the "Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value of Provincial Significance" in Ontario Regulation 10/06 to determine if the property holds provincial significance. Properties that meet the criteria in Ontario Regulation 10/06 are provincial heritage properties of provincial significance.

Reports prepared to address the S&Gs are subject to review and comment by MCM.

Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism

Additional policy direction on conserving, protecting, and preserving the province's cultural heritage resources have been prepared by the ministry responsible for the Ontario Heritage Act. Currently, this is the Ministry of Citizenship, and Multiculturalism (MCM). The ministry has produced a number of guidance documents of value in producing the cultural heritage component of an environmental assessment, including:

Guideline for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (October 1992)

Guidelines on the Man-Made [sic] Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (1980)

These guidelines provide additional insight into cultural heritage resources. The concept of a cultural heritage landscape is described as defined geographically as collections of heritage resources set into a landscape in such a way that historic development and the interrelationship of these components can be seen and comprehended. They demonstrate the relationship of people to their environment and convey information about the processes and activities that have shaped a community.

Cultural heritage landscapes may be organically evolved landscapes as opposed to designed landscapes. Some are 'continuing landscapes', which maintain the historic use and continue to evolve, while others are 'relict landscapes', where the evolutionary process has come to an end but important landscape or built heritage resources from its historic use are still visible. Built heritage comprises individual, person-made or modified, parts of a cultural heritage landscape such as buildings or structures of various types including, but not limited to, residences, commercial, religious, institutional, industrial, or agricultural buildings, bridges, etc.

Ministry of Transportation

A significant portion of the Ministry of Transportation Ontario (MTO) mandate is responsibility for the provincial transportation infrastructure. Operating primarily under the provisions of the Environmental Assessment Act, and specifically the *Class Environmental Assessment for Provincial Transportation Facilities and Municipal Expressways (2024)*, and subsequent amendments.³ In support of the implementation of the provisions of the Class EA, MTO has developed a number of guidance documents. These include:

Environmental Reference for Highway Design, Section 3.7: Cultural Heritage – Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes. October 2006

Environmental Standards and Practices User Guide, Section 10: Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes, December 2006

Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes, February 2007

Environmental Protection Requirements for Transportation Planning and Highway Design, Construction, Operation and Maintenance, April 2014

Additional guidance documents have been prepared for Archaeological resources, as well as bridges and culverts. MTO is subject to the *Standards and Guidelines of the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* and must comply in the management of properties in their ownership or under their control.

³ <https://ero.ontario.ca/public/2024-02/Class%20EA%20for%20Provincial%20Transportation%20Facilities%20and%20Municipal%20Expressways.pdf>

Assessment Methodology

Northwest Archaeological Assessments Ltd. was retained to undertake a cultural heritage resource survey of the built heritage and cultural heritage landscapes within proposed rest stop areas in or proximate to White River, Ontario. The project is proceeding under the direction of the *Class EA for Provincial Transportation Facilities*.

To support the assessment, the following tasks were completed or are underway:

- Review available historical information to determine major historical themes for the study area.
- Review available topographic mapping to determine potential cultural heritage landscape features.
- Survey of lands associated with the potential rest stops, including a review of adjacent lands
- Identify cultural heritage landscapes and built heritage resources within the study area through analysis of historical themes, mapping, and site review
- Identify the sensitivity of heritage resources to changes introduced by the proposed work
- Develop mitigation recommendations.

Pedestrian survey was completed for each of the proposed Optional areas. Survey included a detailed examination of the property along regular transects set approximately 10 metres apart, where conditions allowed. For open areas with good visibility of the ground surface the interval was reduced. The landscape was examined for evidence of former or ongoing use, presence of structures or other constructed indicators of use (such as mining claim posts). In combination with available aerial imagery, distinct changes in vegetation were examined specifically to determine if these were related to indicators of past use. Field notes and a series of representative photographs were acquired as part of this work.

Heritage Recognition

Identified built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes will be reviewed against existing municipal heritage designations to determine if the properties have designations in place or pending.

Identified built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes will also be reviewed with the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) to ensure that no cultural heritage resources designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act are present on the subject properties.

Historical Summary

The development of White River originated with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The section of the CPR running through White River was constructed in the period 1883 to 1885. As with any railway serviced by steam locomotives, frequent water and fuel stops were required. The distance between stops could be as much as 150 to 250 kilometres, and division points were established where conditions supported the construction of "division points". These conditions included enough flat land to support development of freight yards where trains could be received and freight cars switched, as well as the associated infrastructure of water towers, fuel storage, and station, office and staff housing facilities could be

constructed. Within the Lake Superior Division, the main stations were located at Port Arthur (Thunder Bay), Schreiber, White River, Chapleau, and Cartier, near Sudbury. Initially, rail operations for the central part of the division were headquartered at White River, but by the 1920s this function was being carried out from Schreiber. A station serving the railway is understood to have been initially constructed in 1886 and expanded in 1907. The current brick-clad railway station, comprised of a two-storey telegraph building (built 1926-7, expanded 1930); with a one-storey passenger facility built in 1957. The White River station was formally designated as a federally recognized historic place in 1995. While White River continues to serve as the western terminus of the Sudbury to White River VIA Rail passenger service, the station is not in use as a passenger terminal.

White River also supports a range of natural resource industries. White River Forest Products occupies a site west of the town along Highway 17. Several mining developments are also located in the vicinity of White River. The town is also known as the location where a bear was purchased in 1914 and taken as a regimental mascot, which gave rise to the popular "Winnie the Pooh" character. White River is also notable for having achieved a winter temperature of "72° below zero" (-55.5° C), and being declared "the coldest spot in Canada" at the time. A sign celebrating this event was erected in the 1960s to attract attention to the town among automotive tourists travelling the newly completed Trans-Canada highway. This sign is currently located south of the Option 9 property in the parking lot of a restaurant and gas station, adjacent to the tourist information centre.

Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes and Built Heritage Resources

Description of the Existing Environment

The area surrounding White River is primarily bedrock, with some minor areas of glacial outwash sediments providing for a ready source of aggregate. Terrain characteristically shows moderate relief, with some sections of highway showing fairly steep grades.

The existing built form and landscape conditions of the Wawa area are typical of smaller northern Ontario communities. The landscape is primarily natural, with extensive forest areas that have been the site of commercial resource extraction for at least a century. Population densities are low, even in local centres, with limited presence of built features away from these centres and the highways that serve them. Population centres are often focussed on one or more industrial or transportation features, such as paper mills, hydro-electric generating stations, or railway section yards. Dispersed buildings are typically built for either transient purposes (i.e., mining camps), or recreational purposes (i.e., seasonal camps). Broadly, the cultural landscapes are either weakly defined due to low density of use, or extensive but focussed, as is the case with highways and energy transmission corridors.

Description of Identified Cultural Heritage Resources

Historic plaques

No historic or commemorative plaques are present near the subject properties, apart from two tourism

related installations. One concerns the children's book character Winnie the Pooh, the other celebrates an extreme cold weather event where the temperature dropped to -72°F. Both are installed on the south side of the highway, across from the Option 9 site.

Description of Individual Properties

Windshield and pedestrian survey of the subject properties was completed in October, 2024. Weather during the survey was overcast, with occasional rainfall and temperatures between 5° and 10°C. The purpose of the survey was to examine each candidate property in enough detail to determine the presence of any extant built heritage resources, or landscape features indication cultural heritage landscape presence.

A brief description and photograph of each property (Map 2) is included in Table 1.

As no built heritage resources or cultural heritage landscapes were indicated in background research, or identified during fieldwork, the table does not include information on heritage resource category, type, location, description, digital photograph, or heritage recognition.

Structures are noted at the proposed rest stop area Option 9, although they do not hold cultural heritage value or interest due to their relatively recent age. No built heritage resources are present on the remaining rest stop areas. No visible features suggesting the subject properties are part of a cultural heritage landscape were noted in fieldwork. It remains possible that cultural heritage landscape values overlap with one or more of the subject properties.

Option 7: Discussion

The proposed rest area is a greenfield area west of Highway 17, south of the town. No structures are present on the property.

To the best of our understanding, the property has not previously been reviewed or screened for heritage values. The property is not designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and is not, to the best of our understanding, designated under any federal or international heritage policy.

The property does not contain any historical or interpretive plaques, nor is the property the subject of a commemorative or interpretive plaque. To the best of our understanding there are known burial sites or cemeteries in or adjacent to the property.

The property is not known or understood to be a landmark to the local community or to local Indigenous community and does not form part of a cultural heritage landscape.

Option 8: Discussion

The proposed rest area is a greenfield area east of Highway 17, south of the town. No structures are present on the property.

To the best of our understanding, the property has not previously been reviewed or screened for heritage values. The property is not designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and is not, to the best of our understanding, designated under any federal or international heritage policy.

The property does not contain any historical or interpretive plaques, nor is the property the subject of a commemorative or interpretive plaque. To the best of our understanding there are known burial sites or cemeteries in or adjacent to the property.

The property is not known or understood to be a landmark to the local community or to local Indigenous community and does not form part of a cultural heritage landscape.

Option 9: Discussion

The proposed rest area includes two structures related to the “WR Bar and Grill”. One, the restaurant itself, is a frame building with low pitched roof and is likely less than 40 years old. The second structure is a mobile building, likely used for storage or staff housing, and is less than 40 years in age. To the best of our understanding, the property has not previously been reviewed or screened for heritage values. A Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) is not proposed for the extant buildings. The balance of the property is a low-lying area of second growth forest, with open patches of grass and shrub vegetation.

The property is not designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and is not, to the best of our understanding, designated under any federal or international heritage policy.

The property does not contain any historical or interpretive plaques, nor is the property the subject of a commemorative or interpretive plaque. To the best of our understanding there are known burial sites or cemeteries in or adjacent to the property.

The property is not known or understood to be a landmark to the local community or to local Indigenous community, and does not form part of a cultural heritage landscape.

Table 1: Conditions and descriptions of the proposed rest stop areas.



White River: Proposed rest stop Option 7 The centre point of the property is approximately 48.58014, -85.26513E.	This property is a greenfield area lying to the west of Highway 17.
--	---



View south showing the conditions at the property. Grass in the disturbed portion of the shoulder, conifer mixedwood in the main part of the property.



View north showing the subject property.



<p>White River: Proposed rest stop Option 8 The centre point of the property is approximately 48.58259N, -85.26403E.</p>	<p>This property is a greenfield area lying to the east of Highway 17</p>
<p>View south showing the shoulder and forested part of the proposed rest stop. Mature second growth conifer mixedwood forest.</p>	
<p>View north showing the shoulder and forested portions of the proposed rest stop.</p>	

<p>White River: Proposed rest stop Option 9 The centre point of the property is approximately 48.59349N, -85.27432E.</p>	<p>This property consists of a restaurant and associated storage trailer, gravel parking lot, and second growth forest area. The gravel parking lot is currently in use for short-term layovers by commercial vehicles.</p>
<p>This property includes a level, gravel forecourt accessed from Highway 17.</p> <p>Right: View of the property from the eastern entrance to the parking lot. forecourt, looking east. The restaurant is in the middle distance in the image.</p>	
<p>The existing parking lot has two entrances from Highway 17, immediately west of the junction with Highway 631.</p> <p>Right: View east of the restaurant. Note the marsh vegetation in the broad shoulder area, and the second growth forest cover to the left.</p>	

Potential Effects of the Undertaking on Cultural Heritage Resources

Construction of new highway infrastructure, including the development of rest stop areas, has the potential to adversely affect cultural heritage landscapes and built heritage resources. Impacts may occur during and after construction. Built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes may be directly affected by site preparation or construction, and cultural heritage landscapes that are not entirely subsumed under the development, may experience longer term impacts by the introduction of physical, visual, audible or atmospheric elements that are not in keeping with their character and/or setting.

Built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes may be *altered, displaced or removed* if they are located within the construction footprint of the undertaking. Indirect impacts that disrupt cultural heritage resources may also occur where physical, visual, audible or atmospheric elements incompatible with the character or setting of the resource are introduced. Changing traffic patterns may also introduce indirect impacts by isolating the resource from other components of a heritage landscape, or providing opportunity for vandalism or 'demolition due to neglect'.

The proposed rest stop areas will include paved areas supporting medium term parking of commercial transports, short-term parking for recreational and passenger vehicles, and restroom facilities. Development may include clearing forest vegetation, demolition of previously developed areas, excavation, grading, and paving.

Direct Impacts

Direct impacts to built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscape elements were considered for each option. No built heritage resources were identified during background research or fieldwork. The properties do not appear to be part of known or inferred cultural heritage landscapes.

White River Option 7: As no built heritage resources are present on the property, there will be no direct impacts. No cultural heritage landscape resources have been identified for the properties, and no direct impacts will result.

White River Option 8: As no built heritage resources are present on the property, there will be no direct impacts. No cultural heritage landscape resources have been identified for the properties, and no direct impacts will result.

White River Option 9: Buildings present in the area defined as Option 9 do not hold cultural heritage value or interest. While there will be direct impacts to the structures present through demolition and construction, no impacts will to built heritage resources will occur. Further, no cultural heritage landscape resources have been identified for the properties and no direct impacts will result.

Indirect Impacts

Indirect impacts to built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscape elements were considered for

each option through a review of resources in adjacent areas. No built heritage resources were identified during background research or fieldwork. The properties do not appear to be part of known or inferred cultural heritage landscapes.

White River Option 7: As no built heritage resources are present on or adjacent to the property, there will be no indirect impacts. The property does not belong to any larger, defined cultural heritage landscape, and no indirect impacts will result.

White River Option 8: As no built heritage resources are present on or adjacent to the property, there will be no indirect impacts. The property does not belong to any larger, defined cultural heritage landscape, and no indirect impacts will result.

White River Option 9: Buildings present in the area defined as Option 9 do not hold cultural heritage value or interest and there are no built heritage resources on adjacent properties. There will be no indirect impacts to built heritage resources. Further, the property does not belong to any larger, defined cultural heritage landscape, and no indirect impacts will result.

Mitigation Recommendations

There are no built heritage resources or cultural heritage landscapes associated with the three options identified at White River. No recommendations are made in regards to direct or indirect impacts to cultural heritage resources are made, and no further consideration of cultural heritage values should be required.

We note that the identifications or cultural heritage values, such as inclusion of the properties within larger cultural heritage landscapes, may arise with further public input.



Map 1: Aerial view (Google Earth image) of the White River, Ontario.



Map 2: Aerial view showing Option 7, to the west (left side) of Highway 17, and Option 8, to the east (right) of the highway.



Map 3: Aerial view showing Option 9 at the intersection of Highway 17 and Highway 631. The gravel parking lot and buildings are visible in the image.