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Executive Summary

The 2017 Historic Resources Management Field Program for the Lower Churchill Project commenced in June 2017 and was completed in September 2017.

Stage 2 assessment in 2017 was relatively limited and focused primarily on verifying the nature and significance of cultural material at two sites, one a registered archaeological site (FgCh-06), and the other an unanticipated find-spot of quartzite shatter encountered north of FgCh-06 during routine Historic Resources Management work. The metal detector survey at FgCh-06 indicates that the site is of late 20th-century date and that no further work is warranted. The quartzite scatter identified to the north was assessed by subsurface shovel-testing which indicated that the scatter was a recent product of heavy equipment traffic along the forwarder path. Again, no further work appears to be warranted.

Stage 3 Systematic Data Recovery (SDR) operations were completed at six sites on Gull Lake and a seventh at the bottom of Gull Rapids. The six sites on Gull Lake yielded quartzite-dominated collections of artifacts and debitage comparable to assemblages excavated previously at sites within the Muskrat Falls reservoir area. Artifacts recovered from these precontact occupation areas included projectile points, bifacial knives, scrapers, preforms, linear flakes and retouched/utilized flakes, with large quantities of primary, secondary, and tertiary debitage from quartzite knapping. Some sites and site loci appear to have served primarily as lithic reduction areas (e.g., FgCh-02, possibly FgCh-03, FgCh-05 Locus B, and FfCh-02 Locus C). The remainder (FgCh-01, FgCh-05 Locus A, FfCh-02 Locus A and Locus B and FfCi-01) also contained evidence for hearths, indicating settlement and food-processing activities along the north shore of Gull Lake. This area has been identified as a traditional Innu harvesting area for migratory waterfowl, along with fish and small game, in spring and fall. One of these sites (FgCh-01) is situated in an unusual location 300 m from the present lakeshore.

On two precontact sites (FgCh-01 and FfCh-02), the outlines of dwelling structures are evident around the hearths. The remarkably clear structure at FgCh-01 is defined by a hard-edged polygonal debitage scatter enclosed within an apparently circular ring of tent-pole emplacements approximately 6 m in diameter. The more complex evidence from FfCh-02 (Locus A) suggests a palimpsest of structures of similar size, but with earth-walled perimeters. This latter site also yielded a large collection of precontact ceramics. Precontact ceramics have now been recovered from ten sites between Muskrat Falls and Gull Lake, but the assemblage from FfCh-02 represents the most significant collection of decorated (dentate-stamped) ceramics yet recovered from the Churchill Valley. Two other sites (FgCh-05 and FfCi-01) additionally yielded Palaeo-Eskimo artifacts, presumably collected by Amerindian peoples from Palaeo-Eskimo sites on the coast of Labrador.
The westernmost precontact site recovered in 2017 was FfCi-05, situated west of Gull Lake at the bottom of Gull Rapids. The collection recovered from this site was unique and did not resemble the quartzite-dominated assemblages collected from other sites within the Muskrat Falls reservoir area, being dominated by sharpening flakes of vari-coloured fine-grained cherts. The collection of slender, finely-worked lanceolate points associated with this site has no close parallels with other sites in the Churchill Valley, and few with other Intermediate or Late Precontact Period Amerindian sites in Labrador.

Relatively few historic-period artifacts were recovered in 2017, but the small historic-period artifact assemblage collected from FfCi-01 suggests that this location served as a hunting stand, not only in the precontact period, but in the 20th century as well.

The archaeological sites assessed and recovered along Gull Lake in 2017 represent the last of the known sites scheduled for recovery within the Muskrat Falls development and reservoir areas.
## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFR</td>
<td>Alternative Field Recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMS</td>
<td>Accelerator Mass Spectrometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asl</td>
<td>Above sea level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Before present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca.</td>
<td>Circa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cm</td>
<td>Centimetre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>Cone Penetration Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information System or Geospatial Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>Global Positioning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBC</td>
<td>Hudson’s Bay Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVac</td>
<td>High Voltage Alternating Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVdc</td>
<td>High Voltage Direct Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Km</td>
<td>Kilometre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kV</td>
<td>Kilovolt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Metre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m²</td>
<td>Square metre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAO</td>
<td>Provincial Archaeology Office of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDR</td>
<td>Systematic Data Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR/SS</td>
<td>Systematic Field Recording and Subsurface Sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>Transmission Line</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A or Ae Horizon</strong></td>
<td>Soil horizons are specific layers in the soil. The A Horizon is the topmost level of sediment beneath the organic (e.g., moss, leaf litter) layer. There are many variations but in northern forest soils a common type is “Ae,” a leached grey horizon. The B Horizon lies beneath the A Horizon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aboriginal</strong></td>
<td>A broad term referring to those peoples who have inhabited North America since before European contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accelerator Mass Spectrometry (AMS)</strong></td>
<td>A form of radiocarbon dating that gives more precise results than conventional radiocarbon dating and can be employed using smaller samples of carbon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adze</strong></td>
<td>A bladed woodworking tool similar to an axe, but with the blade edge mounted perpendicular to the handle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative Field Recording (AFR)</strong></td>
<td>Detailed photographic, videographic and illustrative recording of a site, possibly also including the collection and conservation of visible artifacts. AFR is normally implemented at sites, such as historic tilts, where features and artifacts are located on the surface and excavation is not required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amerindian</strong></td>
<td>A broad term sometimes used to refer to the aboriginal inhabitants of North America, excepting the Arctic-adapted Inuit and Palaeo-Eskimo peoples. In Newfoundland and Labrador, it may refer to the Maritime Archaic, Intermediate and Late Precontact occupations, as well as to the historic Beothuk and the historic and contemporary Innu and Mi’kmaq people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archaeological Site</strong></td>
<td>A location which contains the material remains of human land use in the past. Technically, only those sites which date to the historic or precontact periods and which are assigned Borden numbers are true archaeological sites. Sites with more recent remains are considered ethnographic sites and are assigned Ethno numbers by the PAO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archaic</strong></td>
<td>In Labrador, the initial period of Amerindian occupation, dating from approximately 8,000 – 3,700 BP. In Newfoundland and Labrador, generally synonymous with Maritime Archaic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arris</strong></td>
<td>In precontact lithic technology, the ridge or ridges running parallel to the edges of a blade or linear flake. These ridges mark the edges of blades or linear flakes previously removed from the core.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Artifact
A discrete object deliberately manufactured or modified by human activity.

Auger
tool with a screw-like thread used for drilling

Awl
A pointed instrument used to pierce cloth or leather.

Bedrock
A general term for the rock, usually solid, that underlies soil or other unconsolidated superficial material.

Before Present (BP)
In radiocarbon dating, “Present” is arbitrarily fixed at the year 1950 AD.

Berm
A low raised earth ridge. In this study, the term refers to the ridge which flanks the foundation of a building.

B Horizon
A soil horizon is a specific layer in the soil. The B Horizon lies beneath the A Horizon and is commonly referred to as ‘subsoil’. It may be characterized by concentrations of minerals. In northern forest soils, the B Horizon is often rich in iron and is orange, red or reddish-black in colour.

Blade
In precontact archaeology, a type of stone tool consisting of long, narrow, parallel-sided flake deliberately detached from a prepared stone core, generally for use as an expedient disposable cutting tool. Blades exhibit one or more arrises, resulting from the repeated removal of blades from the core. See also Linear Flake.

Blank
A very early stage in the manufacture of a flaked stone artifact, usually a partly-worked piece of chert or other stone, made at a quarry for later use elsewhere. A blank can resemble a thick, wide biface and may serve as the basis for manufacturing almost any type of stone tool.

Biface
In precontact archaeological sites, a lithic artifact chipped on both opposite sides is referred to as a biface, or bifacially-flaked tool.

Bodkin
A thick needle, often with a blunt tip and a large eye.

Borden Number
Archaeological sites in Canada are registered under a nationwide site registration system known as the Borden System, which assigns each site a unique Borden number. In Newfoundland and Labrador, the PAO assigns these numbers. Only true archaeological sites (those predating the mid-20th century) receive a Borden number. More recent ethnographic sites are assigned an Ethno number.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caplock Firearm</td>
<td>A muzzle-loading firearm in which the main charge is ignited by means of a percussion cap rather than a flint and steel (i.e. a flintlock).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Complex</td>
<td>A culture-historical unit representing an early-middle period in the Intermediate Period of central Labrador, ca. 3000 BP to 2700 BP. Characterized by triangular and linear flakes, bifaces, and formal scrapers, many fashioned of banded rhyolite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chert</td>
<td>A fine-grained silica-rich sedimentary rock, often selected by precontact peoples for manufacturing chipped stone tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circa (ca.)</td>
<td>Approximately (literally “around”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cladonia</td>
<td>A white, moss-like lichen which grows abundantly on sandy soils in Labrador and serves as an important winter food source for caribou. See lichen woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinker-built</td>
<td>A boat-building method in which the bottom edges of the external planking (or strakes) overlap the top edges of the planks immediately below (similar to clapboard cladding). This method of boat-building (also referred to as lapstrake) is in contrast to carvel construction, whereby all the external planks butt edge to edge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cone Penetration Test</td>
<td>A geotechnical investigation method in which a cone-tipped probe is inserted into sediments in order to determine the bearing capacity or other properties of soils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>In an archaeological site, a component is a period of occupation. A site occupied at various times, for example, once 3,000 years ago and again less than 25 years ago, may be said to have a precontact component and a contemporary component.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Site</td>
<td>A location which contains the material remains of human land use in the recent past (by convention, post-dating the mid-20th century). As a category of land use sites, “contemporary” may be used interchangeably with “ethnographic.” Contemporary sites may be important in interpreting the history of human land use in a region, but are not considered true archaeological sites, and are not assigned Borden numbers. Contemporary/recent sites are assigned Ethno numbers by the PAO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>A piece of knappable stone used as the basis for producing flakes or blades for use as tools. Cores may be deliberately prepared to produce flakes of specific types. For example, blade cores are cores specifically prepared for the production of narrow, straight-sided blades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortex</td>
<td>The naturally-weathered outer surface of a rock, particularly a beach cobble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortical Flake</td>
<td>A flake of stone whose dorsal surface is partly or entirely cortex. See also Primary Flake and Secondary Flake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner-Notched</td>
<td>In precontact archaeology, a descriptive term applied to bifaces modified for hafting by chipping notches into the basal corners, forming drooping shoulders and an expanding base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow Head Complex</td>
<td>A culture-historical unit representing the first period in the Late Precontact Period on the Island of Newfoundland, ca. 2000 BP to 1000 BP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture-Historical Sequence</td>
<td>In archaeology, the human history of a region, defined as a series of culture-historical units, each characterized by distinctive artifact styles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture-Historical Unit</td>
<td>In archaeology, a division of the human history of a region. It consists of a period of time defined by diagnostic artifact and feature styles that distinguish it from earlier and later periods in a culture-historical sequence. Culture-historical units are equated with past human cultures and given distinctive names. They may be broad periods of time (e.g. Intermediate Period or Late Precontact Period) or finer chronological subdivisions (e.g. Daniel Rattle Complex, North West River Phase).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Rattle Complex</td>
<td>A culture-historical unit representing the first period in the Late Precontact Period of coastal Labrador, ca. 2000-1000 BP. Characterized by moderately large projectile points and large triangular-lanceolate bifaces fashioned almost exclusively of Ramah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dart</td>
<td>In precontact archaeology, a dart is a projectile larger and heavier than an arrow but shorter than a spear, usually projected using a spear-thrower.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debitage</td>
<td>In precontact sites, the lithic waste flakes and shatter left over from the manufacture of stone tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Tool Type</td>
<td>A class of artifact with stylistic features that allow it to be assigned to a culture-historical unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorsal Surface</td>
<td>For precontact lithics, the “back”, generally the most convex or most flake-scarred surface, on a flake or stone tool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>The final period in the Palaeo-Eskimo occupation of the Island of Newfoundland and the Labrador coast, dating approximately 2,500 to 550 BP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duff</td>
<td>The layer of organic, and partly-decayed organic material, on the floor of a forest, overlying the mineral sediment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic site</td>
<td>A location that contains the material remains of human land use in the recent past (by convention, post-dating the mid-20th century). As a category of land use sites, “ethnographic” may be used interchangeably with “contemporary.” Ethnographic sites may be important in interpreting the history of human land use in a region, but are not considered true archaeological sites, and are not assigned Borden numbers. Ethnographic sites are assigned Ethno numbers by the PAO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethno Number</td>
<td>The registration number assigned to an ethnographic site by the PAO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>In an archaeological context, an activity, action or process, whether cultural or natural, that leaves recognizable physical evidence in the archaeological record (e.g. the deposition of horizontal soil layers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedient Tool</td>
<td>In precontact archaeological sites, a retouched or utilized flake, or other stone tool that has been minimally-worked. Expedient tools were often disposable implements, intended to be used for very short periods of time and then discarded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>In archaeology, a feature is a group of related objects, which may include artifacts, and which reflect past human activity. Features differ from artifacts in that they are an assemblage of objects. As a result, while the individual objects within a feature may be collected and physically removed, the feature itself is a set of relationships between those objects, which can only be recorded in the field. An example would be a hearth, composed of interrelated rocks, artifacts, and soils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>In precontact archaeological sites, a flake is a sharp-edged piece of fine-grained rock left over from making stone tools. Seedebitage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flakepoint</td>
<td>A projectile point made from a flake, generally shaped with minimal retouch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friable</td>
<td>Easily crumbled or reduced to powder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grit Temper</td>
<td>Coarse sand added to the paste of precontact Aboriginal ceramics in North America to strengthen clay vessels and prevent cracking during firing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Groswater  A period in the Palaeo-Eskimo occupation of the Island of Newfoundland and the Labrador coast, dating approximately 2,800 to 2,100 BP.

Gunflint  An artifact found on historic sites. A gunflint is a prepared square or oval of flint used to strike the spark that ignites the powder in a flintlock musket. European flint is a type of chert but is readily distinguishable from the North American cherts employed by precontact peoples in Labrador for the manufacture of stone tools.

Hearth  A campfire feature. In central Labrador archaeology, these generally take the form of distinct clusters of firecracked rocks and charcoal. However, sand-mound hearths and pit hearths are also known.

Historic Site  In Newfoundland and Labrador, an archaeological site dating between the initial period of European contact with Aboriginal peoples (approximately 500 BP) but before the mid-20th century.

Historic Resources  In the context of environmental assessment, these include palaeontological, architectural and archaeological resources, but may also include ethnographic sites or other material evidence of past human land use.

Ice-Push Ridge  A ridge of sediment formed along the beach of a river, lake, or bay, when ice creeps shoreward and pushes rock and sediment into linear mounds.

Illuviation  In a soil layer, this refers to the percolation of water leaching out particles from one layer (e.g. the Ae Horizon) and redepositing them in an underlying soil layer (e.g. the B Horizon).

In situ  Literally “in place”. In situ archaeological remains are those which are undisturbed and still found in the same place as when they were originally deposited through past human activities.

Intermediate Period  The middle period of the Amerindian occupation of Labrador, including the interior, from approximately 3,500 to 2,000 BP.

Kaolin  A soft, white clay employed in the manufacture of porcelain, and also for the manufacture of clay tobacco pipes found on historic sites in North America.

Knapping  The chipping of fine-grained stone such as chert to fashion tools and other objects.

Labrador Trough Cherts  A group of cherts with highly variable colours and flaking properties derived from the iron-bearing sedimentary and volcanic rocks of the Labrador Trough in western Labrador.
Lanceolate  In precontact archaeology, a descriptive term applied to narrow, lance-shaped bifaces.

Late Precontact  The final precontact Amerindian occupation of Newfoundland and Labrador after the Intermediate period, beginning approximately 2,000 BP. This period is also referred to as “Recent Indian” in some archaeological literature. The Late Precontact period arbitrarily ends at the time of European contact, approximately 500 years BP, but the same people continued to inhabit Labrador and are directly ancestral to the Innu, while Late Precontact people on the Island of Newfoundland were ancestral to the Beothuk.

Ledum  The genus commonly known as “Labrador Tea.” An ericaceous shrub now classified within the genus Rhododendron.

Lichen Woodland  An open woodland vegetation community which, in Labrador, generally consists of black spruce widely-spaced over a ground cover of Cladonia. This vegetation pattern is common in central Labrador and often associated with nutrient-poor, well-drained sandy terraces.

Line-Cutter  A deeply-notched cutting tool used for quickly cutting line or cordage. Deeply-notched unifacial stone tools may have been employed for this purpose.

Linear Flake  A flake with some attributes of a blade but lacking one or more of the attributes associated with blade technology, including evidence for the use of deliberately prepared blade cores.

Lithic  Literally, a term referring to stone. In the context of historic resources, lithic usually refers to stone tools and debitage found on archaeological sites once occupied by precontact peoples.

Loam  A soil composed of a mixture of sand and silt, possibly also containing smaller amounts of clay.

Locus (pl. Loci)  Literally a “place”. In archaeological literature a locus is a discrete concentration of artifacts and features that forms one part of a larger archaeological site.

Macroblade  In precontact lithic technology, a large blade more than 11 mm wide.

Maritime Archaic  The first major period in the Amerindian occupation of the province, dating approximately 8,000 to 3,700 BP in Labrador, and from ca. 6,000 BP to 3,200 BP on the Island.
Metamorphic | In geology, normally refers to recrystallized minerals; rocks which have been transformed in the past by extreme temperature and/or pressure.

Microblade | In precontact lithic technology, a small blade less than 11 mm wide. Normally associated with Palaeo-Eskimo archaeological sites.

Midden | A deliberate, often concentrated, deposit of discarded waste, which may include animal bone, plant waste, and/or shell, along with tools, clothing, containers, and other artifacts. See also Sheet Midden.

Mistassini Quartzite | A very fine-grained, semi-translucent, waxy-finished quartzite derived from the Colline Blanche on the Témiscamie River in Québec and widely-used for stone tool manufacture in the northern Québec interior.

Mokoshan | A spiritually-important Innu communal feasting ceremony.

Mugford Chert | A semi-translucent stone from the Cape Mugford area of the north-central Labrador coast, south of Ramah Bay. Mugford, or “Cod Island Chert” often resembles Ramah but may have a greener colour. Widely used for stone tool manufacture in north-central Labrador.

North West River Phase | A culture-historical unit representing the final period in the Intermediate Period in Labrador, ca. 2000 BP. Characterized by ovate and leaf-shaped bifaces and preforms bifaces fashioned almost exclusively of local quartzite.

Ordovician Chert | On the Island of Newfoundland, Ordovician cherts are particularly abundant in the Cow Head Group of western Newfoundland. These cherts, often green, tan, or brown in colour, were widely used by precontact peoples on the island of Newfoundland for stone tool manufacture. In Labrador, Ordovician cherts from western Newfoundland were widely used in the Strait of Belle Isle in all periods, and, in sites of the Groswater Palaeo-Eskimo period are commonly found as far north as the north-central Labrador coast.

Palaeo-Eskimo | A term referring to a series of occupations of Newfoundland and Labrador by Arctic-adapted peoples arriving from the north. Although also deriving from the north, the Palaeo-Eskimo peoples were not directly ancestral to the later Inuit occupation.

Palimpsest | In archaeology, refers to a distribution of cultural materials that reflects multiple successive occupations and depositions of cultural material within a single location.
Paste: In ceramic technology, the clay mixture used to form the body of a ceramic vessel.

Point Revenge Complex: A culture-historical unit representing the second and final period in the Late Precontact Period of coastal Labrador, ca. 1000 BP to 500 BP. Characterized by small projectile points and triangular bifaces fashioned almost exclusively of Ramah.

Podzol/Podzolic: Refers to the typical soil associated with coniferous forest in the subarctic, including central Labrador. Podzols are formed through the process of podzolisation, whereby organic material and soluble minerals (particularly iron) are leached from the upper levels of sediment, forming a white or grey A Horizon, and redeposited below, forming an orange, red or maroon B horizon.

Porcelain: In North American archaeology, a high-fired, hard, vitrified and translucent historic Chinese or European ceramic ware containing a high proportion of kaolin.

Portage: The practice of carrying boats or supplies around an obstacle to water travel, such as a falls or rapids. Also refers to the route or trail followed when doing so.

Precontact: The period of Aboriginal occupation in Newfoundland and Labrador that occurred before significant contact with Europeans, approximately 500 years BP.

Preform: An early stage in the reduction and manufacture of a flaked stone artifact. A preform may resemble a finished biface but will be larger, thicker and more roughly-worked.

Primary Flake: A flake of stone on which the dorsal surface is entirely cortex. See also Cortical Flake.

Primary Reduction: The initial removal of cortical flakes from a beach cobble or other cortical piece of fine-grained stone. The first stage in manufacturing stone tools.

Projectile point: The cutting and piercing end of a projectile, such as a spear, harpoon, dart or arrow. In precontact archaeological sites, projectile points are normally made of chert or other fine-grained stone.

Provincial Archaeology Office: The office of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador which regulates and oversees the protection of historic resources within the province.

Quartz: An extremely common clear, glassy silicate occurring naturally in many forms. Both massive and crystalline varieties were used by precontact people in Labrador to make chipped stone tools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quartzite</td>
<td>A granular metamorphosed quartz which, despite its relatively coarse grain, is adequate for the manufacture of chipped stone tools. Quartzite is readily available in cobble form on beaches in the Muskrat Falls area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiocarbon Dating</td>
<td>An absolute dating technique that dates the age of organic materials such as wood, bone, and charcoal by measuring the relative frequency of carbon isotopes present in a sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramah</td>
<td>A metamorphosed quartzite found on the Tomat coast of Labrador. Prized by precontact peoples for manufacturing chipped stone tools and widely traded across eastern North America in the precontact period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Réappropriation du Littoral</td>
<td>A culture-historical unit in the Strait of Belle Isle, equivalent to the Intermediate Period in central Labrador, ca. 3500 BP to 2500 BP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Ochre</td>
<td>A bright or rich red friable mineral soil composed of hematite-rich or dehydrated iron oxide. In powdered form it has been widely used as a pigment from antiquity down to the present day. In eastern North America, red ochre pigments were used by Amerindian people in the contact period as body paints, as well as to paint clothing, canoes, and other objects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction (Lithic)</td>
<td>The process of chipping stone to produce stone tools, blanks, and preforms. Lithic reduction produces large quantities ofdebitage. See also Knapping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Earthenware</td>
<td>A broad category of historic ceramic wares originally developed in England in the eighteenth century, and including creamware, pearlware, and “whiteware”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retouch</td>
<td>The deliberate removal of flakes along the edge of a roughed-out stone tool or flake to produce a bifacial or unifacial working edge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhyolite</td>
<td>A silicate-rich igneous rock. Fine-grained varieties are particularly suitable for manufacturing stone tools. Rhyolites visually identical to those found in central Labrador archaeological site have been identified in river cobbles form on the upper-middle Churchill River upstream of Minipi Rapids, and as small cobbles in the Muskrat Falls area. Associated with sites of the Intermediate Period in general and the Charles Complex in particular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>A granular sediment in which individual grains range from 0.0625 mm to 2 mm in size.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Saunders Complex  A culture-historical unit which comprises much of the Intermediate Period on the north-central Labrador coast, ca. 3500 BP to 2800 BP. Characterized by a wide variety of artifact types fashioned from Saunders Chert, rhyolite, and quartzite.

Saunders Chert  A colourful fine-grained opaque chert, generally pink, salmon-pink, red or purple in colour, derived from an as-yet unknown source, likely in the north-central Labrador interior. Widely used for stone tool manufacture in the Intermediate Period in central Labrador, but not normally common on sites of other periods.

Schist  A medium-grained metamorphic rock.

Scraper  In archaeology, a unifacially-chipped stone tool generally employed for hideworking or woodworking.

Secondary Flake  A flake of stone on which the dorsal surface is partly a cortical surface.

Settler  In 19th century historic sources, "Settler," and more rarely "Planter" are terms used to refer to people of European or mixed descent who came to settle permanently in central Labrador. Their modern descendants may nowadays affiliate politically with Nunatsiavut, NunatuKavut, or neither.

Shaputuan  A large feasting tent erected by the Innu for performing mokoshan. Other neighbouring peoples, such as the Cree of Québec, also build Shaputuan structures.

Shatter  Irregular thick or blocky lithic debris produced during the making of stone tools.

Side-Notched  In precontact archaeology, a descriptive term applied to bifaces modified for hafting by chipping notches into both sides near the base, generally forming straight shoulders and a rectangular or semi-circular base.

Silt  A fine granular sediment in which individual grains range from 0.0039 mm to 0.0625 mm in size.

Siltstone  A fairly fine-grained sedimentary rock composed of silt-sized particles.

Slate  A very fine-grained metamorphosed sedimentary rock which tends to fracture into sheets. In Labrador precontact archaeology, slate was most commonly used for making ground and polished stone tools such as axeheads, and adzes.
Soil Development Horizon

A recognizable soil layer formed by one or more of the principal soil horizon development processes: addition, transformation, translocation, and removal. All of these may act on soils, but in typical podzolic soils the most conspicuous process is transformation, creating distinctly coloured A and B horizons. In Labrador, these are often not separately-deposited layers, but rather a single sediment column transformed differently at higher and at lower levels by chemical processes. See Podzol/podzolic.

Sphagnum

A genus of green mosses particularly associated in Labrador with spruce-sphagnum forests and peat bogs.

Spokeshave

A concave-edged planning tool used to form and smooth wooden shafts, such as arrow or spear-shafts.

Sprue

A piece of metal that has solidified in the pouring channel for a mold. For example, a strip of lead from resulting from pouring into a mold forming shot.

Stage 1 Historic Resources Assessment

The initial step in the historic resources assessment process in Newfoundland and Labrador. Typically involves background research and may involve a preliminary field study. The Stage 1 Assessment is intended to serve as the basis for determining if any additional research is required.

Stage 2 Historic Resources Assessment

The second stage in the historic resources assessment process in Newfoundland and Labrador, following the Stage 1 Assessment. Stage 2 Assessment involves a more detailed and extensive field study to gain a thorough understanding of the historic resources within a defined study area and any interactions that may result from any proposed development.

Stage 3 Historic Resources Assessment

Stage 3 Assessment follows directly from previous assessment studies and may include a broad range of activities and mitigation measures, including site avoidance, or scientific recovery (excavation) of archaeological sites. Stage 3 Assessment constitutes the management of any historic resources that may be present within a Project Area and its objectives are to protect resources and mitigate potentially adverse effects to sites of cultural and/or spiritual importance.

Stoneware

In North American archaeology, a high-fired, hard and vitrified historic European ceramic ware type.

Stratigraphy

In archaeology, the study of soil layers undertaken in order to understand the processes by which archaeological sites are formed and transformed over time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stream Swamp</td>
<td>Periodically-flooded terrain on the margins of a waterway, generally characterized in Labrador by reworked unstable sediments and dense alder growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic Data Recovery</td>
<td>The scientific and systematic excavation and recording of historic resources using accepted data recovery techniques. Generally synonymous with archaeological excavation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic Field Recording</td>
<td>Assessment of a known historic site by means of visual inspection of surface-visible cultural materials and subsurface sampling to determine whether the site contains additional evidence for undetermined historic or older occupation(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace</td>
<td>An area of level terrain bordered by a slope, in Labrador generally formed by riverine erosion or by falling sea levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Flake</td>
<td>A flake of stone on which the dorsal surface exhibits no cortex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testpit</td>
<td>In archaeological assessment, a testpit is usually a small pit excavated by shovel and hand tools. Large number of testpits may be excavated within a single testing location. Testpitting is usually the only way to locate those archaeological sites which are not visible on the surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilt</td>
<td>A small, single-roomed, log-built hut employed by trappers as temporary accommodation while trapping. Tilts may include “main cabins” used throughout the trapping season, and also “line tilts” used for overnight stays along trap lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Station</td>
<td>An electronic/optical survey instrument comprising an electronic theodolite (transit) integrated with an electronic distance meter to read slope distances from the instrument to a particular point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treethrow</td>
<td>The depression, often flanked by a mound, that results when a tree falls and its rootmass and associated soils are pulled from the ground, generally as a result of wind action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniface</td>
<td>In precontact archaeological sites, a lithic artifact chipped on a single side is referred to as a uniface, or unifacially-flaked tool. Unifaces are often assumed to have served as scraping or planning tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usewear</td>
<td>Flaking scars, often quite small, that are not produced by deliberate retouch but represent wear damage resulting from the use of an unmodified flake as a cutting or scraping tool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilized Flake</td>
<td>A flake which has not been retouched or otherwise deliberately shaped, but which has been used as a scraping or cutting tool, leaving minute flake scars as evidence of usewear.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ventral Surface  For precontact lithics, the “bottom,” generally the flattest and/or smoothest surface, on a flake or stone tool.

Whiteware  Refined earthenware of European origin with a white paste and clear lead glaze, dating primarily after the 1820s.

Zone  In the context of this study, a zone is a landform with particular slope, vegetation and drainage features, and specifically one that has been identified and mapped within the Survey Area. The characteristic features will determine which zone type a zone belongs to and this will determine its archaeological potential rating. These will also determine whether testing locations will be chosen within that zone as part of the archaeological assessment.

Zone Type  All of the zones which share certain characteristics of slope, or drainage, or vegetation, are assigned to a particular zone type. Zone types are assigned archaeological potential ratings, based on the probability of finding archaeological sites within zones of that zone type.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Works in Labrador

Nalcor Energy (Nalcor) is constructing extensive infrastructure at Muskrat Falls, central Labrador, as part of the development of the lower Churchill River for hydroelectric power. The principal works in Labrador required for the development (hereinafter referred to as the “Lower Churchill Project” or “LCP”), include: extensive tree and brush clearing at Muskrat Falls and within the upstream reservoir; stabilization of the North Spur; bulk excavation of earth and rock from the south side of Churchill River; and construction of the dam itself, as well as access roads, accommodations camp and office complex. Key LCP components required for transmission of power include construction of a high voltage alternating current (HVac) transmission line (TL) from Muskrat Falls to Churchill Falls, a high voltage direct current (HVdc) transmission line from Muskrat Falls to Forteau Point on the Strait of Belle Isle, southern Labrador, a transition compound and associated cable infrastructure at Forteau Point, and an electrode site at L’Anse au Diable (Figure 1-1). Pre-flooding of the Muskrat Falls reservoir commenced in October 2016, and flooding to the full supply level is scheduled to occur after 2019. The 2017 Historic Resources Management Program, undertaken by Stassinu Stantec in support of the Lower Churchill Project, is the subject of this report.
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Figure 1-1  Project components in Labrador
1.2 Historic Resources Assessment and Management

The overall goals of the Historic Resources Management Program are to identify and manage the impact of the development on any archaeological or cultural resources located within the Project Area to achieve a mutually acceptable balance between the development and the provincial historic resource legislation and management requirements. Regarding the latter, emphasis is usually directed toward efforts to conserve and protect the resource. In accordance with these regulations (Government of Newfoundland and Labrador 1992), historic resources assessment and management for the Project required one or more of the following three stages.

1.2.1 Stage 1 Historic Resources Overview Assessment

A Stage 1 Historic Resources Overview Assessment (Stage 1 Assessment) is normally the initial step in the provincial historic resources assessment process and typically involves background research and, frequently, a preliminary field study. The Stage 1 Assessment is intended to serve as the basis for determining if any additional research is required under the Historic Resources Act (1985) of Newfoundland and Labrador.

1.2.2 Stage 2 Detailed Impact Assessment

For many development projects, Stage 2 Assessment is the standard procedure following the Stage 1 Assessment and, in most cases, involves a more detailed and extensive field study to gain a thorough understanding of the historic resources within a defined study area and any interactions that may result from the proposed development. Stage 2 assessment may include a combination of visual surface inspection and subsurface testing (shovel testing).

1.2.3 Stage 3 Historic Resources Assessment

Stage 3 Assessment follows directly from previous assessment studies and may include a broad range of activities and mitigation measures, including site avoidance, capping (i.e. securing materials and features in such a way as to ensure their long-term integrity) or systematic data recovery/excavation. By acting upon results and recommendations of the previous stages of assessment, Stage 3 Assessment involves the effective, professional management of any historic resources that may be affected within the Project Area. In sum, the priority of historic resources management is to protect resources and mitigate potentially adverse effects to reduce loss or disturbance of sites, objects or materials, and places of cultural and/or spiritual importance.

1.3 2017 Historic Resources Assessment and Recovery Program

1.3.1 Permitting and Study Area

The 2017 Historic Resources Management Program for the Lower Churchill Project was undertaken under Archaeological Investigation Permit #17.15 issued to Dr. Fred Schwarz by the PAO. This permit encompassed Stage 2 and Stage 3 Historic Resources Management activities within the
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Muskrat Falls reservoir area of the Churchill Valley, central Labrador (Figure 1-2). This report summarizes the methods and results of the 2017 historic resources assessment and recovery program conducted in relation to reservoir preparation in the Churchill Valley.

1.3.2 2017 Study Objectives

Previous archaeological work at the Muskrat Falls dam site was completed in 2012-2013 and involved the recovery of 32 archaeological sites at Muskrat Falls (Stantec 2014a, 2014b). Subsequent recovery work beginning in 2014 has focused on the proposed Muskrat Falls Reservoir area between Lower Brook and Gull Rapids, where Stage 1 and Stage 2 assessments had identified 23 registered archaeological sites (Stantec 2015; 2016; 2017). Although preparation activities (mechanical tree-felling) commenced within the Muskrat Falls Reservoir area in 2013-2014, 50 m buffer zones were defined around these known sites and, within these buffers the natural vegetation was left standing.

Stage 3 mitigation is required at these sites before creation of the Reservoir. Required mitigation varies according to site type: precontact and historic-period sites with subsurface remains require Systematic Data Recovery (SDR), consisting of conventional archaeological excavation, while historic sites composed of surface-visible remains and/or standing structures require Alternative Field Recording (AFR) by other means such as surface feature inventory, photography, and videography.

Stage 3 mitigation in the Muskrat Falls Reservoir area first commenced in 2014. The objective of the 2017 historic resources management program was to complete the Stage 3 mitigation of remaining archaeological sites in the reservoir area prior to flooding of the reservoir to full supply level.

The work required in 2017 to achieve the objectives therefore focused on the completion of Stage 3 mitigation at seven archaeological sites, all situated in the Gull Lake-Gull Rapids area.
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2.0 APPROACH AND METHODS

A program of this nature follows a logical assessment sequence. The approach and methods employed for each assessment stage are summarized in Sections 2.1 through 2.4 and the personnel makeup and training are discussed in Sections 2.5 and 2.6.

2.1 Stage 1 Background Research

Extensive background research has been conducted for the entire Project Area, including the Churchill River Valley in central Labrador, the central interior south of Muskrat Falls, and the Strait of Belle Isle region in southern Labrador (see Thurlow et al. 1974; Tuck 1981; IED/JWEL 2000; JWEL/IELP 2001a; JWEL/IELP 2001b; JWEL/IELP 2001c; Minaskuat 2008a; Stantec 2014a; 2014b; 2015). Stage 1 background research in 2017 consisted primarily of reviewing site record forms and other data on known archaeological sites to ensure that previously-assessed locations were correctly relocated.

2.2 Stage 2 Field Assessment Methodology

Stage 2 Field Assessment was focused primarily on delineating the distribution of cultural materials at sites during Stage 3 Recovery (see below) to facilitate comprehensive recovery from these sites. Assessment methods employed during the recovery process included visual inspection for surface-visible remains, inspection of treethrows, and subsurface shovel testing around the margins of excavated areas.

In addition, two testing locations which were not subjected to Stage 3 Recovery were nevertheless targeted for Stage 2 Field Assessment. Two distinct Stage 2 Assessment methods were employed to identify and delineate possible cultural materials at these two sites.

One was a registered archaeological site (FgCh-06). The site was initially identified in 2006 as the site of a contemporary camp dating to the 1980s or 1990s backed by regenerating clearings that appeared to be anthropogenic and were potentially several decades older than the contemporary camp. Since historic occupation may be characterized by very sparse artifact scatters not readily identifiable in testpitting, a metal detector survey was undertaken at the site to determine whether or not archaeologically-significant remains were present. The assessment was completed using a Schonstedt GA-52Cx magnetic locator set at sensitivity 3, one level above “normal.” The entire upper terrace within the forested buffer corresponding to the site was surveyed in eight transects oriented parallel to the shoreline of Gull Lake.

The second site consisted of a scatter of quartzite shatter noted on the surface of a forwarder path not far from FgCh-06 during travel to and from other sites. Subsurface testing was undertaken along the undisturbed margins of the path to determine whether this material derived from an archaeological site or was a product of heavy equipment breaking up quartzite cobbles during
travel along the path. Testpits were excavated in two rows flaking the path at 4 m intervals, and more intermittently between boulders further from the path. Testpits consisted of 30 cm x 30 cm shovel-tests excavated with shovel and trowel into the B Horizon or until rock was encountered. Sediments recovered in testing were screened using ¼-in (.635 cm) mesh screens.

2.3 Stage 3 Recovery Program Methodology

The Stage 3 Systematic Data Recovery (SDR) of subsurface precontact and historic archaeological remains was completed by teams of field technicians supervised by Team Leads and by the permit holder. Unlike previous years, access for most sites recovered in 2017 was primarily by ground vehicle, with helicopter access reserved for deploying heavy materials and equipment, and for accessing more remote sites. Excavations consisted of 2 m x 2 m units, separated by 20 cm-wide baulks and excavated by natural and, where indicated, cultural layers. This grid pattern of excavation allows sufficient areas to be uncovered in order that spatial patterns of archaeological features and cultural debris may be easily discerned, while the continuous baulks enable stratigraphic control to be maintained at all times. This method is preferred over trenching or checkerboard excavation, since site significance depends in part on the presence or absence of significant archaeological features (such as hearths), and broad simultaneous areal exposure is the most effective way of identifying and recording these in deposits anticipated to have relatively simple soil stratigraphy.

During reservoir clearing in 2013-2014, wooded buffers had been maintained around all identified archaeological sites. Preparation of these sites for recovery, by manual woodcutting using chainsaws to remove trees from the excavation areas within these buffers, was completed in 2014-2015. Further preparation for excavation activities at each site in 2017 was required to remove recently-downed trees, and to permit the expansion of excavation areas as required. Battery-powered reciprocating saws, as well as hand saws and shears were employed during the excavation process to remove roots and stumps. This was followed by laying out the site grids using total stations. Key grid points were subsequently georeferenced by professional surveyors using high-precision GPS with <5 cm accuracy. All units were excavated by trowel and all soils gathered from excavation units were screened using ¼-in (.635 cm) mesh screens. Point provenience was recorded in three dimensions for historic and lithic artifacts, including debitage, bone, and soil and charcoal samples, using total stations. Total stations were also employed to map rocks, features, and soil lenses, and to develop local contour mapping for each recovered site.

Regarding stratigraphic recording for the Churchill Valley precontact sites, the vertical excavation was typically conducted by natural soil development horizons ("Levels"). Virtually all cultural materials were recovered from the illuviated A Horizon, normally found directly beneath the duff, although in places cultural material was found to extend into the underlying iron-enriched B Horizon.

Recording methods included field notes and a digital photographic and video record of the excavation and features. Excavation areas, point elevations, and cultural features were mapped.
using total stations and the data collected with the total station, including artifact distributions, were later downloaded and converted into detailed site plans by Stantec GIS personnel. Representative baulks and sidewalls were manually profiled at a scale of 1:10. Sites and cultural materials were cataloged on PAO-compliant digital site and artifact record forms.

Progress reports summarizing key findings were submitted to Nalcor and the PAO on a weekly basis over the course of the 2017 Historic and Heritage Resources Assessment and Recovery Field Program.

2.4 Artifact Processing and Conservation Methodology

The division of processing activities between Happy Valley-Goose Bay (HVGB) and St. John’s was a necessary outcome of several challenges, including the large volume of recovered material, timely catalogue processing, and preventive preservation measures. In order to protect the integrity of the collection while minimizing potential data error during processing, procedural guidelines were followed for artifact recovery, collections management/processing, and stabilization as designed by the Project Conservator. These guidelines outlined a clear division of processing activities and responsibilities in the field and cataloging office, required preparatory work and coordination of cataloging activities in HVGB and subsequently the analysis and final submissions work in St. John’s. Unlike the previous treatment-heavy 2016 season that required extensive stabilization, specialized recovery techniques, and remedial treatment of complex historic materials, the substantial yield of lithic material in 2017 demanded a focus primarily on effective cataloguing efforts.

2.4.1 Artifact Processing and Collections Management

In HVGB, the cataloging team members’ responsibilities included sorting all artifacts by material type (e.g., bone, lithic, metals) while maintaining intellectual control of field information (i.e., excavation field tags). The few metal artifacts recovered were stabilized and packaged according to the requirements of the Project Conservator and catalogued prior to being shipped to St. John’s as part of the overall collection.

All material was measured, weighed, identified at the basic level, assigned an identifier (catalogue number), and entered into the designated site-specific spreadsheet (Specimen Record Form). Further field specific information unique to each artifact was provided separately by the Archaeology Leads. Total Station coordinates were then matched to their corresponding artifact and also entered into the record.

Data entry including the assigning and coordinating of catalogue numbers and identification of Total Station information was the responsibility of the cataloging team lead in HVGB with oversight by the Project Conservator. Clear procedural delineations, regular coordinated checks, and the prearrangement of spreadsheets were made in order to eliminate the risk of information loss and/or error.
The cataloging, packing, and shipment of the HVGB component of the 2017 collection was completed on February 23, and the collection was received in St. John’s on February 26, 2018. Site-specific Specimen Record databases were distributed to the archaeologists approximately a week in advance to assist in analysis preparations.

During analysis, the conservator was charged with supporting the Archaeology Team Leads on an on-call basis. Post-analysis activities included reviewing and incorporating each Team Lead’s spreadsheet with their edits/comments into one final copy for each site.

### 2.4.2 Conservation Methodology

The 2017 field season saw conservation activities implemented for the full duration of the field season on the excavation site by all team members responsible for artifact recovery. In the field, attention was given to maintaining intellectual control of the field data with the recovered objects and confirming that the collection was protected from damage during handling, packing, and transport activities.

### 2.5 Training Program Methodology

Relevant training for field work is important to the success of the program. All field technicians involved in the 2017 recovery program (Table 2.1) had previous experience in archaeological recovery work on this project. Nevertheless, a one-day course of refresher training was delivered to the field team prior to the commencement of recovery work. One artifact processing specialist (along with one Field Team Lead) had also previously received a two-day training course in field stabilization and conservation of artifacts delivered by the Canadian Conservation Institute in 2014, and an artifact processing orientation delivered by the Project Conservator.

### 2.6 Project Personnel

The 2017 historic resources assessment and recovery program was conducted by Stassinu Stantec. Project personnel included Project Managers, Technical and Field Leads, Field Technicians, Data Analysts and Report Writers, and GIS Specialists. All principal project personnel have in-depth knowledge and experience in their fields of expertise and a broad general knowledge of the work conducted by other experts in related areas of the program. Brief biographical statements for the principal archaeological team members are provided below.

**Fred Schwarz**, Ph.D. (Senior Archaeologist and permit holder) holds a BA in Anthropology from Memorial University, an MA in Archaeology from the University of Calgary and a Ph.D. in Archaeology from the University of Cambridge. He specializes in the archaeology and pre-history of the Newfoundland and Labrador interior. His research interests include predictive modelling and field investigation of precontact interior settlement in Newfoundland and Labrador, settlement patterns and the interpretation of interior adaptations and culture history in the region. Dr. Schwarz has been directing field research projects in Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova
Scotia, and Latin America for 31 years. His work in Labrador has included scientific management of the Stage 1 Historic Resources Overview Assessment of the Churchill River Power Project from 1998 to 2006, which included a series of three training programs for Innu researchers. In addition, he has worked on numerous projects with and for Innu organizations and companies. In 1996, he directed the Regional Context Component of the Voisey’s Bay Historic Resources Impact Assessment for the Mushuau Innu Band Council (in conjunction with the Labrador Inuit Association and Jacques Whitford Ltd). In 1997, he served as field consultant to the Innu History Commemoration Project for the Department of Canadian Heritage and directed the Archaeological Resource Inventory of Akamiuapishku Proposed National Park for Innu Nation and Parks Canada, eventually preparing the Human History Study of the proposed park in 2001. Since that time, he has also completed major assessments for IELP, including the Historic Resources Study of Phase III of the Trans Labrador Highway, as well as assessments and research in the town of Sheshatshiu for the Sheshatshiu Innu Band Council. More recently, since 2006 he has undertaken several projects with Minaskuat Limited Partnership and Stantec, including archaeological potential mapping and field assessment of the LabMag Iron Ore project in western Labrador, and scientific management of historic resources assessment of the Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Generation Project and the Labrador - Island Transmission Link. Dr. Schwarz held the Archaeological Investigation Permit issued by the Provincial Archaeology Office (PAO) for the Lower Churchill Project Historic Resources Management programs in 2017. Dr. Schwarz co-directed the background and field research programs and co-authored this report.

Corey Hutchings, BA, MA (Archaeologist), has worked in cultural resource management for the past Ten years and participated in additional archaeological and heritage research since 2002. Mr. Hutchings holds a BA in anthropology and a Master’s degree in archaeology from Memorial University. His research interests have primarily been the archaeology of the Arctic’s prehistoric people with a focus on the Labrador Archaic. He has participated in various cultural resource management and academic research projects on the Island of Newfoundland, Labrador, Baffin Island and Aleutian Islands. Mr. Hutchings’ work in Labrador has included multiple years as a field supervisor for the Porcupine Strand Archaeology Project based in Cartwright Labrador. Over 2011 and 2012 he worked with local people in assessment and mitigation for the Baffinland Iron Ore Company. This work consisted of assessments and excavation of sites that fell in the footprint of the ore loading area as well as the route of a 150 km railway. He has had multiple archaeology reports approved by the Newfoundland Provincial Archaeology office, the Alaskan Department of the Interior and most recently an ethnographic report approved by the Nunatsiavut Government. Mr. Hutchings co-directed the background and field research for the 2017 Historic Resources Management Program and co-authored the required reporting on this work.

Vincent Bourgeois, MA, (Archaeologist) has 25 years’ experience in archaeology and cultural resource management in both public and private sector capacities. He completed a Master’s degree in Anthropology from the University of New Brunswick with a focus on the study of precontact Aboriginal ceramics in the Northeast. He has participated in numerous field projects in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Labrador, Ontario, and New Jersey. His primary areas of expertise include historical and pre-contact archaeology, and archaeological...
impact assessments including shovel testing, excavation, mitigation, and historical research. He also has practical laboratory experience that includes both historic and precontact artifact analysis and cataloguing. During this time, he has had the opportunity to excavate numerous First Nations Pre-contact archaeological sites from the Paleo-Indian, Archaic and Woodland Periods as well as Euro-Canadian archaeological sites dating to the protohistoric, early French, Acadian, Scottish, Loyalist, and 19th century industrial periods. Mr. Bourgeois is bilingual. Mr. Bourgeois co-directed the field research for the 2016 Historic Resources Management Program and co-authored this report.

*Miki Lee,* (Conservator) is an associate of Stantec Consulting Ltd. with over 15 years' experience in conservation treatment and preservation consulting for an extensive range of municipal, provincial, and federal institutions. Ms Lee has trained and directed teams in both archaeological and historical conservation treatment, collections management, and preventive conservation. Accredited through the Canadian Association of Professional Conservators (CAPC) in 2007, Ms Lee's areas of specialty include preventive conservation, archaeology, archives, mixed collections, collections management, and education. Ms Lee served as Project Conservator, designing the artifact processing, shipping, and conservation procedures, and establishing the artifact processing facilities for the Project. Ms Lee also prepared the description of conservation methodology for this report.

Table 2.1 lists the complete historic resources team as well as their identified roles.
### Table 2.1  2017 Historic Resources Assessment and Recovery Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Management</strong></td>
<td>Diane Ingraham (Senior Project Manager), Wayne Tucker (Project Manager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical and Field Archaeology Leads</strong></td>
<td>Fred Schwarz, Corey Hutchings, Vincent Bourgeois, Colin Varley, Tony Parr, Stacey Camus, Mary Ann Aylward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Conservator</strong></td>
<td>Miki Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manual Tree-Felling – Team Leads and Wilderness First-Aiders</strong></td>
<td>Corey Hutchings, Stacey Camus, Tony Parr, Randy Best, Chris White, Fred Schwarz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Analysis and Report Preparation</strong></td>
<td>Fred Schwarz, Corey Hutchings, Vincent Bourgeois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Technical Review</strong></td>
<td>Chris Blair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field Technicians</strong></td>
<td>Mary Ann Aylward, Randy Best, Dorman Campbell, Marjorie Campbell, Margie Clarke, Amy Goodyear, Bradley Guy, Judy Guy, Jonathan Holley, Robert Holwell, Stephen Holwell, Kelly Hopkins, Roslyn Hunter, Scott Kautjasiak, Caitlin Pardy, Lewis Penney, Taylor Noseworthy-Pilgrim, Tony Noseworthy-Pilgrim, Jamie Rose, Chris White,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health &amp; Safety</strong></td>
<td>Caroline Hong, Kyle Ferguson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artifact Cataloging Packaging and Shipping</strong></td>
<td>Charlene Clark, Margie Clarke, Mary Ann Aylward, June Flowers, Chris White, Barry Keough, Jessica Steffler, Patrick Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GIS</strong></td>
<td>Heather Ward, Neil Mackey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Support and Controls</strong></td>
<td>Mary Ann Aylward, Victoria Greeley, Barry Keough, Wayne Tucker, Lois Strangemore, Patrick Oliver,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stage 2 assessment in 2017 was relatively limited and focused primarily on verifying the nature and significance of cultural material at two sites, one a registered archaeological site, and the other an unanticipated findspot encountered during routine Historic Resources Management work (Figure 1-2, Photo 3-1):

- The first location was FgCh-06, the site of a contemporary campsite and potentially older clearings, originally recorded in 2006.
- The second is a previously unrecorded scatter of quartzite shatter observed on the surface of a forwarder path not far from FgCh-06 in 2017.
3.1 FgCh-06

As noted above, FgCh-06 was initially identified in 2006 as the site of a contemporary camp dating to the 1980s or 1990s backed by regenerating clearings that appeared to be anthropogenic and were potentially several decades older than the recent campsite. Testpitting within the clearings in 2006 did not yield any artifacts, historic or otherwise. Since historic occupation may be characterized by very sparse artifact scatters not readily identifiable in testpitting, a metal detector survey was undertaken at the site to determine if archaeologically-significant remains were present. The area subjected to metal detector survey was the terrace behind the contemporary camp; the wooded buffer (Photo 3-1) corresponds to the area of clearings identified in 2006.

Five metallic anomalies were detected and (if subsurface) were excavated with shovel and trowel: a paint can, a cluster of three tin cans, a fragment of a fuel drum, a large rectangular can with a circular opening (Photo 3-2), and another tin can were found. All findspots were aligned along the edge of the terrace behind the previously-recorded contemporary camp and appear to be of recent date. The clearings have substantially regenerated in the 11 years since the site was first recorded, and it now appears likely that the clearings too are of relatively recent date.
3.2 Quartzite Scatter Near FgCh-06

The recovery teams accessed FgCh-02 and FgCh-03 daily on foot by walking a forwarder path that led across the mulch field from a parking area near FgCh-01. Cracked and split cobbles of various rocks, including quartzite, were present along the path and these appeared to have been fragmented by the passage of heavy equipment. However, in one location midway along the path, the recovery team observed five much smaller pieces of quartzite shatter within a 3 m diameter area on the surface of the path. None exhibited any features diagnostic of deliberate flaking (e.g. prepared striking platforms or bulbs of percussion) and these were potentially another product of heavy equipment traffic along the path. Nevertheless, these finds raised the possibility that there was a previously undiscovered precontact site in this location. Fourteen testpits were excavated in undisturbed former lichen woodland alongside the path in this area to determine whether quartzite shatter or flakes were also present in sediments that had not experienced heavy
equipment traffic. No flakes or quartzite shatter were encountered during testing, indicating that the pieces observed along the trail were not archaeological materials.

![Photo 3-3 View Southwest of Quartzite Scatter along a Forwarder Path near FgCh-06](image)

### 3.3 Summary

The artifacts identified during metal detector survey of FgCh-06 do not appear to be archaeologically-significant, and all appear to be debris associated with the contemporary camp. Assessment of the site is considered to be complete, and no further work is recommended at FgCh-06.

The quartzite scatter assessed to the north of FgCh-06 does not appear to be cultural, but rather, a recent product of heavy equipment traffic along the forwarder path. Assessment is considered to be complete, and no further work is recommended at this location.
Stage 3 recovery was completed at seven archaeological sites in the Muskrat Falls reservoir area in 2017. Six of these sites were situated along the north shore of Gull Lake, and the seventh just below Gull Rapids (Figure 1-2).

All of these sites were initially recorded during Stage 2 assessment on the Churchill River in 1998, 2000, and 2006 (IED/JWEL 2000; JWEL/IELP 2001b; Minaskuat 2008a).

The six sites recovered on Gull Lake (FgCh-01, FgCh-02, FgCh-03, FgCh-05, FfCh-02 and FfCi-01) belong to a notable cluster of precontact sites on the north shore of Gull Lake (Photo 4-1), one of three precontact archaeological site clusters identified along the Churchill River below Gull Rapids. These clusters are regularly-spaced at intervals of approximately 25 km, at Gull Lake, Sandy Banks, and Muskrat Falls. Sites of the Muskrat Falls cluster were previously recovered in 2012-2013 (Stantec 2014a; 2014b), and those at Sandy Banks in 2014-2016 (Stantec 2015; Stantec 2016;
Stantec 2017). Recovery work at the sites on Gull Lake, the westernmost of the three clusters, was largely deferred until 2017, in part because these sites lie at elevations above the planned pre-flooding level for the Muskrat Falls reservoir. However, the largest of the Gull Lake sites (FfCi-02) was recovered in 2015 (Stantec 2016).

The seventh site recovered in 2017 (FfCi-05) was the easternmost site of another precontact site cluster situated at Gull Rapids; the remainder of the sites in this cluster lie outside the Muskrat Falls reservoir area and are not presently scheduled for recovery.

Gull Lake itself is the largest and westernmost of the chain of connected “ponds” or widened, branching channels, that characterize the broad, wandering reach of the Churchill River below Gull Rapids (JWEL 2000). The lake is noteworthy for the extensive flats and shoals at its western end, which trap grounded ice into the early summer and which, along with the lowlands on the south shore, also provide staging areas for ducks and geese in the fall and spring. Gull Lake is identified in Innu Nation land use data as a harvesting area for fish, small game, furbearers and migratory waterfowl (Armitage 1990).

Recovery results for the sites recovered in 2017 are described in the following Sections (Sections 5.0 - 11.0).
5.0 STAGE 3 RECOVERY RESULTS: FgCh-01

FgCh-01 (the “Kaku Site;” Kaku means “porcupine” in Innu-aimun) is situated in a rather unusual location in that it is distant from the present bank of the Churchill River: approximately 300 m from the north shore of Gull Lake, on the northern margin of a small brook which appears to follow a relict river channel (Photo 4-1, Figure 5-1). The site location is relatively level, with vegetation cover of black spruce, lichen and Labrador tea, sloping gently to the south and grading to a stream-swamp of sphagnum moss and scattered alders toward the edge of the stream.
Figure 5-1   LIDAR Imagery Showing Excavation Units at FgCh-01
The site was first recorded in 1998 (see IED/J WEL 2000) when over 600 quartzite flakes and artifacts were observed in three small surface exposures and six of the thirteen test pits excavated in the vicinity of the original surface discovery location.

In 2017, an area of 32 m² was initially opened in an unsuccessful effort to relocate the site; subsequently, the original 1998 testpits were relocated 20 m to the south and the remainder of the recovery effort was focused on a 99 m² area around these testpits, close to the edge of the stream (Photos 5-1, 5-2). The outlines of the 1998 testpits were clearly recognizable during excavation (see Photo 5-5).

### 5.1 Site Stratigraphy and Features

**Photo 5-1**  View South across FgCh-01, Excavated to the Top of the A Horizon. Gull Lake, 300 m away, is barely visible in the distance through the trees.
The basic stratigraphy at FgCh-01 (Figure 5-2) resembled the typical soil development profiles encountered at precontact archaeological sites previously recovered in the Churchill Valley, but differed considerably in detail. The topmost layer of sphagnum moss, lichen and Labrador Tea roots achieved thicknesses of 25 cm, particularly near the edges of the excavation area. This duff generally overlays a gray-white illuviated clayey-silt A Horizon which varied in thickness from 2-5 cm to occasionally as much as 9 cm. To the western end of the excavation area, the illuvial silt was interrupted, and partly underlain, by a darker, mottled grey-tan, clayey silt 5-15 cm in thickness. In this same portion of the site, the grey-white and darker silts were both underlain in turn by a mottled grey/tan/red silt with lenses of friable bog-iron concretions up to 10-15 cm thick. Toward the opposite (eastern) edge of the site, the grey-white illuvial silt was underlain by discontinuous 3-8 cm-thick lenses of darker tan-grey silt with bog-iron concretions. These horizons were themselves underlain by the iron-enriched B Horizon, which, like the overlying pale illuvial, darker and mottled silts, varied in character across the site. Toward the eastern and western margins of the site, the basal horizon consisted of a black-brown friable B Horizon with bog-iron concretions. Within the central portion of the site, a laminated mottled sandy red-orange B Horizon 10-20 cm thick was underlain by a more uniform red-orange sand. One other lens observed at FgCh-01, again confined to the central portion of the site, was a small but thick (8-12 cm) mottled silt and sand with lenses of charcoal staining and sparse firecracked rock beneath the pale
illuviated A Horizon. This lens corresponds to the center of the Feature 1 hearth (see below). Cultural material was recovered from all horizons, excepting the basal black-brown friable B Horizon (at the margins of the site) and the basal uniform red-orange sandy B Horizon (toward the center of the site).

Although the basic natural sequence of horizons, evident at the far eastern and western edges of the site, is a typical podzolic profile, the sediments at FgCh-01 are atypical in character. While most precontact sites excavated in the Churchill Valley to date have been situated on well-drained landforms with sandy or silty-sand sediments, the soils at FgCh-01 were unusually clayey, with numerous small lenses of bog-iron, reflecting poor drainage at the site. Poor drainage at FgCh-01 was not unexpected, given the vegetation cover, and the site location adjacent to a stream in the swale of a relict river channel, and in fact, it was found that the southern 2-2.5 m of the excavation area required repeated bailing during recovery work. However, the relatively poor drainage is yet another atypical aspect of the unusual location of FgCh-01.

The slightly more complex stratigraphy evident in the central portion of the site reflects the construction and use of the mounded hearth feature designated Feature 1, described in more detail below. In all, four cultural features (Figures 5-2, 5-3, 5-4, Photos 5-3, 5-4) were recorded at FgCh-01. All four of these features pertain to a single unusually well-defined precontact dwelling structure, designated Structure 1.
Figure 5-2  FgCh-01 East-West Profile
Figure 5-3  Plan of Excavations at FgCh-01
5.1.1 Feature 1

Feature 1 was a low, subtle mound feature situated near the center of the artifact scatter at FgCh-01 (Figure 5-3, Photos 5-2, 5-3). The mound itself was roughly triangular and measured approximately 2 m in diameter, with a shallow central depression approximately 75 cm in diameter and approximately 12 cm in depth. This depression was filled with a shallow (12 cm thick) deposit of mottled illuviated silt and sand enriched with lenses of charcoal staining. A diffuse scatter of firecracked rock was noted both atop and within the mound, although in no notable concentration. However, both the mound deposit and the enriched illuviated deposit at the center did yield an extremely high density of quartzite debitage, shatter, and artifacts. The distribution of firecracked rock, including firecracked quartzite fragments, along with quartzite split cobbles, extended south of Feature 1, toward the southern edge of the site (Figure 5-4). As a result of the density of debitage in the site center, an additional 1 m x 1 m unit (E21N4) was excavated in the northwest corner of the site to ensure that the scatter, and its edges, were defined in their entirety (this unit was excavated in the final days of excavation, after the site photographs were taken and does not appear in Photos 5-1, 5-2, or 5-3).

Although associated firecracked rock was sparse and diffuse, Feature 1 is interpreted as the remains of a low mounded-sand hearth.
5.1.2 Feature 2

Feature 1 was surrounded by a level area 1.5 – 2 m wide, sloping very gently to the west, and this was in turn encircled to the north, east and south by Feature 2, a 60 cm-wide subtle ring of low, irregular hummocks rising from the top of the A Horizon (Figure 5-3). Feature 2 is interpreted as the subtle remains of a structure perimeter surrounding the Feature 1 hearth. Although this perimeter was slightly mounded, it was not underlain by a buried sod deposit. Consequently, it cannot be said to represent an “earthwalled” tent ring as such, but rather a ring of disturbance resulting from the emplacement of tent poles. One postmold was associated with Feature 2 (see Feature 3 below). Feature 2 is interpreted as the remains of a (likely) circular tent perimeter enclosing an interior space approximately 5.5 m in diameter. Feature 2 does appear to be interrupted on the western side, and it is possible that the dwelling entry was situated somewhere along this side.
5.1.3 Feature 3

Feature 3 was a small localized deposit of distinctive coarse loose grey sand, lined, especially at the bottom, with a thin organic layer (Figure 5-3, Photo 5-4). Feature 2 measured 12 cm in diameter and extended from the top of the A Horizon to a depth of 9 cm into the underlying tan-grey silt with bog iron concretions. Feature 3 was situated on the outer edge of the northeastern portion of Feature 2. Feature 3 is interpreted as a shallow postmold, and its placement is consistent with the interpretation of Feature 2 as the remains of tent pole emplacements, although no other postmolds were identified at FgCh-01.

Photo 5-4 Profile View West of Feature 3 at FgCh-01

5.1.4 Feature 4

Feature 4 consists of the dense scatter of lithic (principally quartzite) debitage and artifacts at FgCh-01. There is one such scatter at the site, oriented NE-SW and measuring approximately 6.75 m by 5.5 m (Figure 5-4). Most precontact sites recovered in the Churchill Valley contain one or more
discrete lithic scatters, and each generally presents as a circular or oblong “point-cloud,” with a high-density central concentration of lithics, gradually petering-out toward the margins (Stantec 2014a, 2014b, 2015, 2016). The lithic scatter at FgCh-01, however, although particularly dense within a 2 m diameter area centered on Feature 1, continues at high densities to its margins, which are unusually “hard-edged” and well-defined, particularly toward the northeast (note that the apparent voids in the lithic scatter correspond to the testpits excavated in 1998: Figure 5-4, Photo 5-5). The hard-edged lithic scatter at FgCh-01 is consistent with lithic deposition occurring within an enclosed space such as the interior of a dwelling structure.

Interestingly, this lithic cluster is not circular, but rather appears to be polygonal, with three well-defined, straight edges to the northwest, northeast and southeast. The margins are less clearly-defined to the southwest, but the hard edge of the lithic scatter in the northeast quadrant appears to terminate in a straight line, some 1.5 m inside the structure perimeter defined by Feature 2. It is possible that the circular outer wall defined by Feature 2 enclosed a slightly smaller polygonal interior wall.
Figure 5-4  Site Plan showing the Distribution of Artifacts (Feature 4). The voids in the south-central portion of Feature 4 correspond to the 1998 testpits.
5.2 Cultural Materials

FgCh-01 contained only precontact cultural material, with no evidence for later historic occupation. The site yielded a large collection of 9,670 lithic pieces of quartzite, chert, rhyolite and quartz, weighing over 48 kg, the overwhelming majority (9,509 pieces, or 98.3%) being knapping debitage. The remainder (161 pieces) are finished or utilized artifacts.

5.2.1 Debitage

The debitage assemblage consisted almost entirely of quartzite, with rhyolite (37 pieces), chert (13 pieces), and quartz (2 pieces) present in only trace frequencies. The few pieces of rhyolite were notably concentrated within and around the Feature 1 hearth (see Figure 5-1). Particularly common is a translucent moderately-coarse grey quartzite shot through with occasional clouds, bands and streaks of red (e.g. Photo 5-7: M); many natural cobbles of this material were observed along the beach of Gull Lake some 300-500 m away near FgCh-05, and it is likely widely available all around the eastern outflow of Gull Lake. While the small debitage collection of chert, rhyolite and quartz consists entirely of small sharpening and repair flakes, the quartzite assemblage includes a wide diversity of debitage, including cobble fragments, shatter, and primary, secondary and tertiary flakes. The abundance of large split cobbles and chunks, some of them firecracked, account for the substantial weight of the quartzite assemblage, and attest to the importance of primary reduction of locally-available quartzite cobbles at the site.

5.2.2 Artifacts

FgCh-01 yielded a moderately large collection of 161 finished artifacts. Raw material frequency was similar to that of the debitage, with 159 of these (98.75%) being of quartzite, and two of chert. They included three projectile points, 28 biface fragments, 5 scrapers, 10 preforms, 11 cores, 60 linear flakes, 40 retouched and utilized flakes, one hammerstone, one drill or pick, and two worked split cobbles (Tables 12.1, 12.2; Photos 5-6 – 5-13).

The three projectile points recovered from FgCh-01 (Photo 5-6) vary widely in form. One, of quartzite, is represented only by a midsection fragment and appears to be from a triangular-bladed point (Photo 5-6: B). The hafting modification is unknown. A second, of light grey chert, is also triangular-bladed, and is pentagonal in form, with subtle shoulders and a wide, or slightly-waisted, stem (Photo 5-6: A); the very end of the base is missing. The third is a flake point, somewhat irregular in form but originally leaf-shaped, with a convex-sided blade and a rounded base (Photo 5-6: C). The hafting modification consists of broad, asymmetric corner notches. Corner-notched points have been encountered previously at precontact sites in the Churchill valley, including FgCg-01 Locus D (Stantec 2015) and FfCi-02 (Stantec 2016) but are generally rare, the vast majority of points being stemmed.
Twenty-eight bifaces and biface fragments were recovered during excavation at FgCh-01 in 2017 (Photo 5-7), representing 17% of the artifact assemblage. All were fashioned from local quartzite. The majority were tip or lateral fragments from broad-bladed bifaces of either indeterminate form, or with convex margins that appear to have been leaf-shaped in form (e.g. Photo 5-7: B, D). At least two of the lateral fragments (e.g. Photo 5-7: J) exhibit plunging fractures indicating breakage resulting from errors during thinning or sharpening. Larger pieces (e.g. Photo 5-7: G, H, I, N, O) and complete specimens (Photo 5-7: L, M) are clearly leaf-shaped in form. Basal fragments, which often preserve the striking platform of the flake from which the biface was made, are rather more diverse. Some (e.g. Photo 5-7: A, K) are rounded and likely again from leaf-shaped bifaces. Two basal corner fragments (e.g. Photo 5-7: E) may be from lanceolate bifaces, and one (Photo 5-7: F) is an unusual stemmed biface base which appears to form an asymmetric stem, one side straight, the other concave, curving outward to form a shoulder.
Photo 5-7  Selected Bifaces Recovered from FgCh-01
Five scrapers were recovered at FgCh-01 (Photo 5-8), and these conform to a single type. All are flake end scrapers fashioned from quartzite, with more-or-less parallel sides, and convex distal ends exhibiting extensive steep unifacial retouch.

Photo 5-8 Scrapers Recovered from FgCh-01
Two unique items recovered from FgCh-01 include a slender split cobble that exhibits no battering wear but may represent the proximal end of a hammerstone (Photo 5-9: A), and an unusual thick quartzite T-shaped biface, worked along all edges, and tapering to a blunt point (Photo 5-9: B). This piece is interpreted as a drill, pick, or punch.
FgCh-01, yielded a collection of 10 preforms, all of quartzite. Two complete specimens include one roughly lanceolate in form and another leaf-shaped (Photo 5-10: E and F, respectively). A third complete example is a thick, ovate cobble spall which exhibits initial marginal retouch but was not subsequently worked (Photo 5-10: G). The remainder are lateral fragments from preforms of indeterminate form (e.g. Photo 5-10: A), or basal fragments of preforms that appear to be ovate or leaf-shaped (e.g. Photo 5-10: B-D).

Photo 5-10  Selected Preforms Recovered from FgCh-01

The collection of 11 cores and core fragments recovered from FgCh-01 represents 7% of the precontact assemblage, an unusually high percentage compared to most sites previously recovered in the Churchill Valley.

Four (Photo 5-11: A-D) are small fragments, one (Photo 5-11: C) unusual in that it was subsequently retouched to form one light but well-defined unifacial convex scraping edge, and one unifacial
spokeshave notch. Five are large split cobbles and cobble fragments with considerable cortex remaining (e.g. Photo 5-11: F, G, I), from which flakes have been removed, in one case large flakes probably for fashioning preforms and bifaces (e.g. Photo 5-11: I). All are fragmentary or amorphous with the exception of one large split cobble which has been extensively worked to form a turtle-backed core (Photo 5-11: H; this piece may have been ultimately intended to serve as a blank). Three of these cores exhibit broad parallel flaking scars resulting from the removal of large linear flakes (Photo 5-11: B, F, G).
The 60 linear flakes recovered from FgCh-01 (Photo 5-12) comprise the largest single artifact class at the site. All are quartzite. As is normally the case at precontact sites in the Churchill Valley, the overwhelming majority (58) are single-arris linear flakes, with only two (Photo 5-12: AA, CC) exhibiting two parallel arrises. The linear flakes from FgCh-01 vary widely in size. There are no particular modes evident in the length/width distribution of these pieces, but there is a relatively high frequency of large examples (e.g. Photo 5-12: Z-EE), with 32 (53%) being more than 13 mm wide, and 13 (22%) exceeding 20 mm in width. The larger linear flakes tend to be broad in relation to their length, and in many cases the single arris bifurcates to form a “Y” at the distal end (e.g. Photo 5-12: U, W, Z, BB, DD), indicating that the linear flakes previously detached from the core were shorter. It thus appears that linear flakes detached from linear flake cores became progressively wider, longer, and wider in proportion to their width as the core was reduced. This may explain the relative scarcity of clear linear flake cores at these sites, since such cores will not exhibit the narrow fluting associated with true blade cores, but merely a small number of relatively broad parallel flake scars.
Photo 5-12   Selected Linear Flakes Recovered from FgCh-01
The 40 retouched and utilized flakes recovered from FgCh-01 (Photo 5-13) comprise the second-largest single artifact class at the site. All are quartzite except for one small retouched flake of black chert (Photo 5-13: F).

As on most precontact sites recovered in the Churchill Valley, the majority exhibit unifacial usewear or light retouch along straight or convex edges and appear to have served as expedient scraping tools. However, one (Photo 5-13: G) has been retouched bifacially along one gently convex edge. Two (Photo 5-13: D, F) show usewear along shallow notches, and may have served as expedient spokeshaves. In many instances, usewear along straight and convex margins has produced a jagged edge that may result from use as scraping tools on relatively rigid surfaces (e.g. Photo 5-13: I, T, V), and such jagged usewear appears to be more prevalent at FgCh-01 than at other sites excavated previously in the Churchill Valley. In some instances (e.g. Photo 5-13: U), jagged and spurred saw-toothed edges reflect deliberate retouch.

Photo 5-13  Selected Retouched and Utilized Flakes Recovered from FgCh-01
5.3 Interpretation and Summary

FgCh-01 is interesting for a number of reasons, not least being the presence of four features that combine to delineate one of the best-defined precontact dwelling structures encountered in the Churchill Valley to date. Structure 1 at FgCh-01 is centered on an approximately triangular sand-mound hearth with a shallow central charcoal-stained depression (Feature 1). Firecracked rock is present, but the hearth is defined more by mounded sand than by firecracked cobbles. The central hearth is surrounded by a relatively level circular area 5.5 m in diameter surrounded to the north, east and south by an annular perimeter of subtle but noticeable relief 60 cm wide (Feature 2). The perimeter is not underlain by a recognizable buried sod and cannot be clearly shown to comprise a definable earthen wall but appears to reflect a ring of tent pole emplacements; the entry is not clearly definable but was likely situated to the southwest. Only one postmold (Feature 3) was identified along this perimeter. The lithic artifact scatter (Feature 4), particularly dense within the central hearth (Feature 1), is entirely confined within Feature 2, and exhibits hard-edged boundaries consistent with deposition inside a confined structure. However, this scatter appears to be polygonal in outline, and terminates within the interior edge of the structure perimeter. Structure 1 is interpreted as an approximately circular dwelling constructed of tent poles enclosing an interior space centered on a sand-mound hearth and measuring 5.5 m in diameter. It is possible that the exterior circular tent ring enclosed a polygonal interior wall.

A compactly distributed but large artifact assemblage recovered from FgCh-01 includes various bifaces generally comparable in style and form to those recovered from other quartzite-dominated assemblages recovered to date in the Churchill Valley. The projectile points include one corner-notched example, and one pentagonal, with subtle shoulders and a wide, or slightly-waisted, stem. The most unusual artifact recovered from FgCh-01 is a heavy quartzite drill. The collection also included a small collection of thumbnail flake scrapers. The raw materials, bifaces, and preform styles are compatible with a North West River Phase cultural affiliation.

With regard to site function, the lithic assemblage at FgCh-01, as with most quartzite-dominated sites in the Churchill Valley, contained numerous primary flakes, split cobbles, quartzite chunks, and preforms, all reflecting the importance of primary reduction of locally-available quartzite at the site. In most respects, the relative frequencies of the major artifact classes are comparable to those noted at other sites in the Churchill Valley. Linear flakes are the most frequent class, numbering 30-40% of the assemblage, with retouched and utilized flakes also well-represented in the collection. This, along with the relatively high frequency of flake and linear flake cores, speaks to the importance of the manufacture and use of expedient tools at the site. The remaining functional categories, such as projectile points and scrapers, are generally rare. In general, the assemblage suggests that the working of local quartzites was an important activity at the site, although the high frequencies of linear flakes, bifacial knives, and retouched and utilized flakes indicate a range of domestic activities including food processing around the central hearth.

The unusual site location of FgCh-01 300 m from the shore of Gull Lake raises additional uncertainties about site function. Initially, it was hypothesized that the site was established to
access good quality quartzite cobbles exposed along the stream bed south of the site, and the large size of some worked and split cobbles indicates that quartzite material was indeed sourced and reduced in the immediate vicinity of the site. However, the quartzites worked at FgCh-01 were of varieties readily available on the present beach on the north shore of Gull Lake, near FgCh-05. It does not appear to have been necessary to move hundreds of meters inland simply to access these materials. Moreover, the well-defined structural remains and the conventional artifact class frequencies imply a site that was primarily domestic in function, and not simply a cobble quarry.

Alternatively, FgCh-01 may have been occupied when the swale to the south was an active river channel. Certainly, sites have been identified during the course of the project along former riverfront landforms no longer close to active shorelines (e.g. IED/JWEL 2000; JWEL/IELP 2001a, 2001b), although the majority of sites identified in the Muskrat Falls reservoir are more-or-less oriented to the present riverbanks.
6.0 STAGE 3 RECOVERY RESULTS: FgCh-02

FgCh-02 (Gull Lake 1) is one of a pair of adjacent sites (the other being FgCh-03) situated on the northern shore of Gull Lake, approximately 800 m above the outflow (Figure 6-1, Photo 6-1 and 6-2). Both sites were discovered in 2000 (JWEL/IELP 2001b), and at the time, FgCh-02 appeared to be a relatively small site pertaining to the Intermediate Period. One test pit yielded a single small quartzite flake approximately 10 cm below surface, and a second produced a tiny flake of patinated chert.

The site location is broadly strategic, in proximity to the narrows at the outflow of Gull Lake and the Porcupine Rapids just below. Some 300 m offshore, a low sandbar in the lake serves as a staging area for ducks and geese in the fall (Photo 6-3). Both sites exhibited poorly-drained clayey soils with sinuous subsurface drainage channels, which contrast with the well-drained sandy sites more characteristic of precontact sites along the Churchill River.
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Figure 6-1  LIDAR Imagery Showing Excavation Units at FgCh-02 and FgCh-03
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Photo 6-1   Aerial Photo Showing Excavation Units at FgCh-02 (top is north)

Photo 6-2   Oblique View towards Southwest of FgCh-02
6.1 Site Stratigraphy and Features

The basic stratigraphy at FgCh-02 was slightly more complex than the typical sediment development profile encountered at precontact archaeological sites previously recovered in the Churchill Valley (Figure 6-2). A thick (10-20 cm) layer of sphagnum moss and forest litter overlies various thin lenses of grey clay A Horizon which varied in thickness from 2 to 10 cm. These grey clay lenses terminated at a mottled and laminated red-brown to grey tan clay B Horizon. Material culture was recovered mostly in the A horizon, but a small number of artifacts (7%) were located within the B Horizon. The saturated clayey deposits and subsurface drainage channels at the site may account for the vertical postdeposition movement of artifacts into the normally sterile B Horizon.
LEGEND

- DUFF
- DARK GREY-BROWN CLAY
- PALE GREY-TAN CLAY
- MOTTLED AND LAMINATED RED-BROWN / GREY TAN CLAY
- MID-GREY UNIFORM CLAY
- BURIED SOD
- ROOT / STUMP
- ROCK

NOTE: THIS DRAWING ILLUSTRATES SUPPORTING INFORMATION SPECIFIC TO A STANTEC CONSULTING LTD. REPORT AND MUST NOT BE USED FOR OTHER PURPOSES.
In all, 176 m² were excavated at FgCh-02 (Figure 6-3), revealing two discrete scatters (Features 1 and 2) of quartzite cobble fragments, debitage and tools reflecting considerable primary reduction of quartzite at the site (Figure 6-4). Both scatters were ellipsoidal in outline, and oriented approximately perpendicular to the bank of the Churchill River. Firecracked rock was extremely sparse and there were no clearly-defined hearth features.
Figure 6-3  Plan of Excavations at FgCh-02
Figure 6-4  Plan of Excavations at FgCh-02 Showing Artifact Distribution
6.1.1 Feature 1

Feature 1 was the larger of the lithic scatters at FgCh-02, measuring approximately 4 m x 8 m. The scatter was extraordinarily dense and yielded one of the largest lithic collections recovered in 2017. Lithic material continued at some depth into the clayey subsoil, and many flakes were positioned vertically, suggesting some form of secondary deposition or re-working of the clay deposits on site. The scatter was most dense within the upper flat area of the site but continued down the gentle southern slope of the site terrace, likely the result of secondary outwash action. Most of the formal tools from FgCh-02 were recovered from Feature 1, including a precontact ceramic sherd (see below). Only a small sample (0.11 g) of charcoal was recovered from Feature 1.

6.1.2 Feature 2

Feature 2 located at the east end of FgCh-02, was the smaller of the lithic scatters, measuring approximately 4 m in diameter. Unlike Feature 1, Feature 2 was limited to the flat upper portion of the site. The lithic assemblage from Feature 2 consisted mostly of quartzite debitage. Only a modest number of formal tools were recovered from Feature 2. These include: a biface fragment, 5 retouched/utilized flakes, 10 linear flakes and a hammerstone.

6.2 Cultural Materials

FgCh-02 contained only precontact cultural material, with no evidence for later historic occupation. The site yielded a large collection of 11,767 lithic pieces of quartzite, chert, rhyolite and quartz, weighing over 59 kg, the overwhelming majority (11,538 pieces, or 98%) being knapping debitage (Figure 6-4). The remainder (229 pieces) are finished or utilized artifacts and a single precontact ceramic sherd (Figure 6-3).

6.2.1 Debitage

FgCh-02 contained a large collection of 11,538 pieces of lithic debitage, dominated by quartzite (99%), with chert (n=83), and quartz (n=5) recovered in trace amounts. As is typically the case in quartzite-dominated assemblages in the Churchill Valley, the quartzite assemblage at FgCh-02 includes a wide diversity of debitage, including cobble fragments, shatter, and primary, secondary and tertiary flakes. The abundance of large split cobbles and chunks, some of them firecracked, account for the substantial weight of the quartzite assemblage, and attest to the importance of primary reduction of locally-available quartzite cobbles at the site. Of note is the near absence of Ramah chert (n=6). A black to dark purple satiny chert is the more abundant chert recovered on site (n=77).

6.2.2 Artifacts

FgCh-02 yielded a large collection of 234 finished artifacts. Raw material frequency was similar to that of the debitage, consisting almost entirely of quartzite (n=219), with only a small occurrence
of a dark purple to black chert (n=10) (Figure 6-3). They included one projectile point fragment, 15 bifaces and biface fragments, 4 scrapers, 12 preforms and blanks, 9 cores, 75 linear flakes, 115 retouched and utilized flakes, 2 hammerstones, and 1 precontact ceramic sherd (Tables 12.1, 12.2; Photos 6-4 – 6-8). Virtually all were recovered from Feature 1, with the smaller and sparser Feature 2 yielding only a single preform, a hammerstone, a flake core, several linear flakes (n=8) and utilized/retouched flakes (n=5).

A total of 16 quartzite bifaces (Photo 6-4) were recovered from FgCh-02, including a well formed and somewhat asymmetrical and ovate shaped projectile point with a rounded base (Photo 6-4: C). The remaining bifaces and biface fragments appear similar in form; however, these lack the finishing flake removal of a formal point.

![Biface Fragments Recovered from FgCh-02](Image)
Of the twelve quartzite preform/blanks (Photo 6-5) recovered from FgCh-02, only one is unbroken (Photo 6-5: F). The late stage unbroken preform was likely abandoned due to inability to further thin into a formal biface. The remaining preforms appear to have been broken during early stages of manufacture.
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A total of 4 scrapers were recovered from FgCh-02 (Photo 6-6). Two are made on large quartzite flake spalls and exhibit steep unifacial retouch along the distal edge (Photo 6-6: A, B). One of the scrapers is made from a black satiny chert flake and exhibit similar steep unifacial retouch (Photo 6-6: C). The fourth example is a finely flaked end scraper made on a linear flake with a single arris line running along the longest axis (Photo 6-6: D).

Photo 6-6    Selected Scrapers Recovered from FgCh-02
A total of 75 linear flakes were recovered from FgCh-02 (Photo 6-7). All are made of quartzite except for four of purple chert (Photo 6-7: T). They vary in shape and size with some being small enough to be considered microblades.
A total of 36 retouched flakes and 79 utilized flakes were recovered from FgCh-02 (Photo 6-8). Combined, these represent the largest artifact class from the site. These are for the most part expedient tools which exhibit unifacial retouch or use wear along convex, concave and straight margins. All are made of quartzite with the exception of one retouched flake which was of black satiny chert (Photo 6-8: Q).
A single ceramic sherd was recovered from FgCh-02 (Photo 6-9). It consists of a thin, grit tempered rim sherd recovered in the western portion of the site, within Feature 1.

Photo 6-9     Precontact Ceramic Sherd Recovered from FgCh-02

6.3 Interpretation and Summary

The artifact assemblage of FgCh-02 is composed mostly of quartzite flakes, shatter, and cobbles. Formal artifacts include one projectile point fragment, 16 biface and biface fragments, 12 preforms/blanks, 4 scrapers, 115 utilized/retouched flakes, 75 linear flakes, 2 hammerstones, and a single undecorated ceramic rim sherd. Aside from the ceramic sherd, none of the formal tools recovered are particularly diagnostic. The assemblage of lithics suggests that this site was primarily used for the production of stone tools. The abundance of fire cracked cobbles suggest heat treating activities despite the absence of formal hearths. The number of linear flakes as well as the presence of scrapers and Pre-contact ceramics suggest some domestic activities. This expression suggests that FgCh-02 was a short-term encampment that engaged in intensive preparation of quartzite for the production of tools.
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7.0  **STAGE 3 RECOVERY RESULTS: FgCh-03**

FgCh-03 (Gull Lake 2) was situated immediately adjacent to FgCh-02, and the two sites were excavated using a common grid (Figure 7-1). The initial testing of FgCh-03 in 2000 recovered 15 flakes of Ramah Chert, two flakes of quartzite, and one fragment of a unifacially-retouched tool of Ramah Chert. The material was recovered from within and just beneath a gray/white illuviated lens, which sits atop a clay/sand layer, and underlies 9 cm of peat/duff. The illuviated layer was loose, very wet and had some sand content.
Figure 7-1  LIDAR Imagery Showing Excavation Units at FgCh-03 and Adjacent FgCh-02
LOWER CHURCHILL HYDRO ELECTRIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECT 2017 HISTORIC RESOURCES ASSESSMENT AND RECOVERY PROGRAM PERMIT #17.15

STAGE 3 RECOVERY RESULTS: FgCh-03
February 12, 2019

Photo 7-1   Aerial Photo Showing Excavation Units at FgCh-03 (top is north)

Photo 7-2   Oblique View towards Northwest of FgCh-03
7.1 Site Stratigraphy and Features

The basic stratigraphy at FgCh-03 conformed more or less to the typical sediment development profile encountered at precontact archaeological sites previously recovered in the Churchill Valley (Figure 7-2). A thick (5-20 cm) layer of sphagnum moss and forest litter overlays a grey silty clay A Horizon which varied in thickness from 2 to 10 cm. The A horizon terminated at reddish clay sand B Horizon. Pockets of grey marine clay were observed along the flat part of the terrace, between the moss and silty clay. A mix of degraded organic charcoal staining was present along the southern slope of the site, above the A Horizon. Several large boulders, including one huge immovable glacial erratic, were present throughout the western half of the site.

Material culture was recovered mostly in the A horizon, however a sample of artifacts (9,594 pieces or 38%) were located at the top of and within the B Horizon. Like FgCh-02, the clayey deposits and saturated nature of FgCh-03 may account for the vertical postdeposition movement of artifacts into the normally sterile B Horizon.

In all, 128 m² was excavated at FgCh-03 in 2017 (Figure 7-3), and like FgCh-02, FgCh-03 presented as a pair of relatively discrete ellipsoidal scatters of quartzite cobbles, debitage and tools oriented approximately perpendicular to the riverbank (Figure 7-4). As at FgCh-02, the yield of quartzite pieces was extremely high. In contrast with FgCh-02, however, the quartzite scatters at FgCh-03 were clearly associated with features. Both features are tentatively interpreted as features related to heat-treating quartzite during or prior to primary reduction.
Figure 7-2  FgCh-03 North-South Profile
Figure 7-3 Plan of excavations at FgCh-03
Figure 7-4  Plan of excavations showing artifact material distribution at FgCh-03
7.1.1 Feature 1

Feature 1 appears to be the remains of a hearth only visible as a cluster of fire cracked cobbles and quartzite measuring approximately 80 cm by 80 cm (Photo 7-3; Figure 7-4). No charcoal suitable for dating was observed or collected. Artifacts associated with the hearth include debitage, a linear flake and a retouched flake, all of quartzite with the exception of two rhyolite flakes.

Photo 7-3 Feature 1 Fire-Cracked Rock Cluster Located on Left Side of Baulk at FgCh-03

7.1.2 Feature 2

Feature 2 consists of a 2 m x 5 m lithic scatter at the eastern end of the site, associated with Feature 1. Lithic material from this scatter was primarily composed of blocky quartzite shatter, with formal tools only present near the hearth itself.
7.1.3 Feature 3

Feature 3 consists of a larger (4 m x 10 m) and denser lithic scatter at the western end of the site adjacent to the large erratic boulder. It contained quartzite debitage representing all stages of tool production and some quartzite shatter and was associated with a series of well-defined buried burn layers alongside a large immovable boulder. A charcoal sample (0.59 g) was collected.

Most of the formal tools from FgCh-03 were recovered in association with Feature 3. These include virtually all biface and biface fragments (n=75), all scrapers and preform/blanks, 111 linear flakes, and 64 utilized/retouched flakes.

7.2 Cultural Materials

The assemblage of cultural materials from FgCh-03 included a very large precontact component of 25,325 pieces of debitage and 270 finished or utilized artifacts, along with a small historic component consisting of three pieces.

7.2.1 Historic Component

Three kaolin tobacco pipe bowl fragments were recovered from FgCh-03. These cannot be dated precisely, but likely date to the late 19th or early 20th century. Otherwise no evidence for historic activity or occupation was encountered at the site.

7.2.2 Precontact Component

FgCh-03 contained primarily precontact cultural material. The site yielded a large collection of 25,325 lithic pieces of quartzite, Ramah, quartz, and rhyolite, weighing over 33 kg, the overwhelming majority (25,055 pieces, or 98.9%) being knapping debitage. The remainder (270 pieces) are finished or utilized artifacts.

7.2.2.1 Debitage

The debitage assemblage consisted almost entirely of quartzite, with Ramah (18 pieces), quartz (11 pieces), and rhyolite (8 pieces) present in only trace frequencies. The majority of the quartzite pieces were of the same moderately coarse-grained, grey-tan, grey-pink and grey-red semi-translucent quartzites generally found on precontact sites in the Churchill Valley, although other colour varieties, including black, purple, and dark red, were also present in smaller quantities. As is typically the case in quartzite-dominated assemblages in the Churchill Valley, the quartzite assemblage at FgCh-03 includes a wide diversity of debitage, including cobble fragments, shatter, and primary, secondary and tertiary flakes. The abundance of large split cobbles and chunks, some of them firecracked, account for the substantial weight of the quartzite assemblage, and attest to the importance of primary reduction of locally-available quartzite cobbles at the site. Blocky, opaque white quartzite chunks with burnt reddened cortex, most
showing little evidence for subsequent working, were also common at the site and these unworked chunks are likely rejected material, a by-product of heat-treating and heat-splitting quartzite cobbles.

### 7.2.2.2 Artifacts

FgCh-03 yielded a large collection of 270 finished artifacts. Raw material frequency was similar to that of the debitage, consisting almost entirely of quartzite, with one piece of Ramah and two of rhyolite. They included two (cross-mending) projectile point fragments, 76 bifaces and biface fragments (nearly a third of which also cross-mend), 5 scrapers, 15 preforms and blanks, 5 cores, 103 linear flakes, 58 retouched and utilized flakes, and 6 hammerstones (Tables 12.1, 12.2; Photos 7-4 – 7-12). Virtually all were recovered from Feature 2, with the smaller and sparser Feature 1 yielding only four linear flakes and one utilized flake.

![Photo 7-4 Projectile Point Recovered from FgCh-03](image-url)
The projectile point class at FgCh-03 is represented by two fragments of a single quartzite point (Photo 7-4) with weakly-defined rising shoulders and a slightly-expanding “waisted” wide stem. Wide- and waisted-stemmed projectile points have previously been encountered on quartzite-dominated precontact assemblages in the Churchill Valley (e.g. Stantec 2016: Photo 10, Photo 54).

Photo 7-5  Biface Fragments Recovered from FgCh-03

The unusually large collection of 76 bifaces and biface fragments from FgCh-03 (Photos 7-5, 7-6,) constitutes the second-largest class of artifacts recovered during excavation at the site, representing 28% of the artifact assemblage. All were fashioned from local quartzite.

The 16 lateral, corner and midsection fragments recovered from the site (e.g. Photo 7-5: H) are generally of indeterminate form. The 18 tip fragments (e.g. Photo 7-5: A-G) are similarly of indeterminate form in most instances, although some larger examples (e.g. Photo 7-5: F, G)
appear to be from broad, and likely ovate or leaf-shaped bifaces; substantially-complete specimens lacking only their bases (e.g. Photo 7-5: S, T, U) similarly appear to be from bifaces of broad, leaf-shaped form. Basal fragments come in two forms: relatively narrow tapered, straight, or slightly-concave bases likely from lanceolate bifaces (e.g. Photo 7-5: I-L, R); and broad, rounded or straight asymmetric bases likely from leaf-shaped bifaces (e.g. Photo 7-5: M, N). One of the latter (Photo 7-5: N) exhibits a single shallow side-notch.

Few complete bifaces were recovered. One is a somewhat irregular, small, wide convex-bladed triangular biface (Photo 7-6: C). The second is a thin, leaf-shaped biface with a tapered base (Photo 7-6: H), and the third is a small, thick, round-based biface. Particularly noteworthy was the number of cross-mending biface fragments, all recovered from within Feature 3. Although not tightly-clustered, all of the cross-mending pieces were recovered from an approximately 8 m² area southeast of the large boulder in Feature 3. The two joining fragments of the stemmed projectile point described above (Photo 7-4) were also recovered from this area.

All twelve of these cross-mending biface fragments (Photo 7-6: A, B, D-G, I-N) are in two parts, and all but one (Photo 7-6: I) join to form complete, or substantially complete, tools. Two are relatively thick and roughly-worked (Photo 7-6: B, L), and a third exhibits a thick dorsal irreducible bump encircled by step-fractures (Photo 7-6: F), but the majority are thin and well-finished. The forms are variable; three have slender lanceolate blades and narrow, slightly-tapering stems (Photo 7-6: L, M, N), and one is triangular, with a slightly asymmetric base (Photo 7-6: A). The remainder are more broad-bladed with approximately leaf-shaped blades, in some cases with markedly asymmetric bases (Photo 7-6: F, I, K). Both are forms characteristic of the precontact sites previously recovered in the Churchill Valley. Rather more distinctive and less typical are three (Photo 7-6: D, G, and possibly J) that exhibit weakly-defined shoulders, concave bases, and slightly-concave or “waisted” basal lateral margins.
Photo 7-6    Complete and Cross-Mending Bifaces Recovered from FgCh-03
Five scrapers were recovered at FgCh-03 (Photo 7-7). None are formal endscrapers with any characteristic attributes, and as a result there is little clear distinction between scrapers on the one hand, and retouched flakes with scraping edges on the other. Two of these (e.g. Photo 7-7: A) appear to be cobble spall endscraper fragments, while another two (Photo 7-7: B, C) are sidescrapers.

Photo 7-7   Selected Scrapers Recovered from FgCh-03
FgCh-03 yielded a collection of 15 preforms, all of quartzite. Some (e.g. Photo 7-8: D, E, G) are leaf-shaped or ovate in form, but the majority are fragmentary and of indeterminate form. One thick example with extensive cortex (Photo 7-8: H) was only minimally worked prior to abandonment. Two additional examples are large, heavy, and primarily unifacially-worked (e.g. Photo 7-8: I). These appear to be blanks but may initially have been worked as flake cores.
A relatively large collection of six hammerstones was recovered from FgCh-03 (Photo 7-9). All exhibit battering wear on at least one end, and one spherical example is battered around much of its equator (Photo 7-9: D). Although most are quartzite, one (Photo 7-9: C) is of rhyolite.
Five cores and core fragments were recovered from FgCh-03. Two are linear flake core fragments exhibiting parallel flaking scars resulting from the removal of linear flakes (Photo 7-10: A, B). A further two are large split cobble fragments with considerable cortex remaining (e.g. Photo 7-10: D, E), from which large flakes have been removed.

Photo 7-10  Cores and Core Fragments Recovered from FgCh-03
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The 103 linear flakes recovered from FgCh-03 (Photo 7-11) comprise the largest single artifact class at the site. All are quartzite. As is normally the case at precontact sites in the Churchill Valley, the overwhelming majority (97) are single-ariss linear flakes, with only six (e.g. Photo 7-11: A, M) exhibiting two parallel arrises. The linear flakes from FgCh-03 vary widely in size, with virtually all (85%) being between 8 mm and 23 mm in width. Two of the larger examples (Photo 7-11: O, P) show clear evidence of unifacial usewear along one lateral edge.

Photo 7-11  Selected Linear Flakes Recovered from FgCh-03
The 58 retouched and utilized flakes recovered from FgCh-03 (Photo 7-12) comprise the third-largest single artifact class at the site. All are quartzite except for one small utilized flake of rhyolite (Photo 7-12: K) and one relatively large flake of Ramah with extensive unifacial retouch along one straight edge, which may have served as an expedient sidescraper (Photo 7-12: M).

As on most precontact sites recovered in the Churchill Valley, the majority exhibit unifacial usewear or light retouch along straight or convex edges and appear to have served as expedient scrapers. Twelve cortical flakes are either cobble-spall scraper fragments, or expedient cobble-spall scrapers (e.g. Photo 7-12: R, S). Two pieces (e.g. Photo 7-12: Q) exhibit bifacial retouch and usewear. Eight show unifacial retouch and/or usewear along concave working edges (e.g. Photo 7-12: H); one of these is not a “flake” as such, but rather, appears to be a re-purposed bifacial fragment (Photo 7-12: I). In three cases, the concave working edge forms one or more distinct notches, indicating use as expedient spokeshaves (e.g. Photo 7-12: A, P).
7.3 Interpretation and Summary

The artifact assemblage from FgCh-03 represents one of the largest collections recovered in 2017, including 25,325 pieces of debitage and 270 finished or utilized artifacts, along with a small historic component of three historic pieces. As at FgCh-02 nearby, the abundance of quartzite debitage in two discrete clusters, (Features 2 and 3), suggest that the primary activity at the site was the production of stone tools. Nevertheless, the number of linear flakes as well as retouched and utilized flakes suggests some domestic activities. The unusually high frequency of bifaces and biface fragments is consistent with this interpretation. The large number of snapped bifaces is unusual, although some are irregularly-formed and may have broken during manufacture.
8.0 **STAGE 3 RECOVERY RESULTS: FgCh-05**

FgCh-05 (Tshiashkunish 6) was situated on the north shore of Gull Lake, overlooking the Gull Lake outflow. The beaches below the site are characterized by an abundance of large quartzite cobbles. Initial testing in 2006 (Minaskuat 2008a) indicated that the site may be composed of two discrete loci situated approximately 20 m apart (Locus A and B). Based on the previous shovel testing results in 2006, two separate excavation areas sharing a common grid were staked out to encompass the two discrete locations (Figure 8-1).
Figure 8-1  LIDAR Imagery Showing Excavation Units at FgCh-05
In all, 194 m² were excavated at FgCh-05 in 2017, confirming the presence of two discrete precontact loci; each locus was characterized by a large, ellipsoidal lithic scatter composed primarily of quartzite cobbles, shatter, and debitage, and oriented approximately perpendicular to the edge of the terrace overlooking the water (Photo 8-1).

Photo 8-1  View Toward the East of the Two Excavation Loci at FgCh-05 at the Top of the A Horizon

8.1 Site Stratigraphy and Features

The basic stratigraphy at FgCh-05 conformed to the typical soil development profile encountered at precontact archaeological sites previously recovered in the Churchill Valley. A thick (5 to 15 cm) layer of sphagnum moss overlies a sandy gray-white illuviated A Horizon which varied in thickness from 5 to 10 cm and which yielded virtually all of the cultural material from the site (Figure 8-4). This white sandy layer terminated at an iron rich, red, sandy B Horizon. Each stratigraphic horizon, including the layer of moss, was thinner and more uniform along the southern slope of the site, while the flat areas of the site varied considerably. An earthen mound within the southwest corner of Locus A did not yield any cultural material and was determined to have been formed through natural processes. The western third of the mound was excavated, revealing a mixture of A and B horizon overlaying a compact marine clay.
A total of 122 m² was excavated in the eastern locus (Locus A). The distribution of lithic material extended downslope toward the water as a sparse scatter of firecracked rock and firecracked quartzite fragments with lesser quantities of quartzite tertiary flakes (Figures 8-2, 8-3).

At the western locus (Locus B), excavation of 72 m² revealed another elongated scatter of lithic materials measuring 4 m x 7 m and similar to that recovered to the east.
Figure 8-2  Plan of Excavations at FgCh-05: Locus A at right, Locus B at left.
Figure 8-3 Plan of Excavations Showing Artifact Distribution at FgCh-05: Locus A at right, Locus B at left.
Figure 8-4  FgCh-05 Locus A North-South Profile
8.1.1 Locus A Features

Four features were identified in Locus A.

8.1.1.1 Feature 1

Feature 1 (Figure 8-2) consisted of a discrete concentration of small unidentified calcine bone interspersed with flecks of charcoal and fire-cracked rock roughly 60 cm in diameter (Photo 8-2). The northwest corner of this feature appears to have been disturbed by a previous test pit. The intact portions of the feature were mostly situated on the surface of the A horizon and somewhat ephemeral. Efforts to section the feature were unrevealing. Samples of charcoal were collected, and the calcined bone was collected in clusters. Feature 1 is interpreted as a small hearth. A lithic scatter was observed adjacent to and below Feature 1 and attributed a separate feature number (Feature 2).

Photo 8-2 View of Feature 1 Charcoal and Calcined Bone Cluster at FgCh-05 Locus A
8.1.1.2 Feature 2

Feature 2 in Locus A consisted of a lithic scatter measuring approximately 1.5 m in diameter. The cluster overlapped and surrounded the Feature 1 hearth. The lithics include predominantly small secondary and tertiary thinning flakes of quartzite, with a minority of larger primary flakes, a single biface, and two preforms, all of quartzite. The only non-quartzite lithics found in association with Feature 2 were two Saunders chert flakes and two Ramah chert flakes.

8.1.1.3 Feature 3

Feature 3 in Locus A consisted of a small irregular charcoal and organic stain (Figure 8-2). It measured roughly 50 cm x 35 cm at its maximum (Photo 8-3). A moderate flake and split cobble concentration was recovered within and adjacent to the feature. The feature was sectioned in half to determine its shape in profile. Instead of the usual basin shape of the typical hearth, the charcoal stain branched off into several directions deeper into the B horizon. It was therefore concluded that the charcoal stain was the result of natural root burn. The lithic association is considered coincidental.

Photo 8-3  View of Feature 3 in FgCh-05 Locus A
Feature 4 in Locus A consisted of an earthen mound (Figure 8-2). It measured approximately 3 m in diameter but given the lack of associated cultural materials on the surface, only the upper 2/3 was exposed. The mound was sectioned, revealing a 20-25 cm thick mixture of A and B horizon sediments over a compact marine clay (Photo 8-4). The near lack of artifacts recovered on the surface of the mound below the duff, and the total absence of artifacts within the excavated cross section, suggests that the mound was most likely formed more recently than the site activities, likely the result of a back-dirt piling from a tree throw that occurred further down the southern slope.
8.1.2 Locus B Feature

Only one feature (Feature 1) was observed in Locus B, consisting of a dense concentration of lithic debitage and tools.

8.1.2.1 Feature 1

Feature 1 in Locus B consisted of a dense and elongated lithic scatter measuring approximately 4 m x 7 m. It included both fire-cracked rock and fire-cracked quartzite, split cobbles, and quartzite debitage with a minor presence of Ramah debitage (n=48). A modest number of lithic tools was also recovered from Feature 1, including biface fragments and preforms, scrapers, linear flakes, and utilized/retouched flakes. A small concentration of unidentified calcined bone was recovered in the central portion of the lithic scatter.

8.2 Cultural Materials

A total 15,430 artifacts were collected from both loci at FgCh-05. Given the slightly heterogeneous nature of Locus A and B assemblages, these will be treated separately in this section.

8.2.1 Locus A

A total of 7,996 specimens were recovered from FgCh-05 Locus A, composed primarily of quartzite but with some (n=64) grey speckled chert (apparently a variety of Saunders chert) and Ramah (n=84), along with a small, localized concentration of calcined bone fragments (Feature 1). The small collection of worked tools consisted primarily of quartzite preforms.

8.2.1.1 Debitage

Locus A at FgCh-05 contained a moderately-large collection of 7,784 pieces of lithic debitage, dominated by quartzite (98%), with chert (n=148), quartz (n=1) and rhyolite (n=1) recovered in trace amounts. The quartzite debitage is represented by all stages of reduction from split cobbles to tiny tertiary flakes. The abundance of quartzite debitage is not surprising given the abundance of quartzite cobbles still available on the beach directly below the site. The chert, quartz and rhyolite flakes were limited to secondary thinning flakes (Photo 8-5: A-F, N-T). It should be noted that the Saunders chert flakes were concentrated within the flake scatter surrounding Feature 1, however none were recovered within or immediately adjacent to the feature. The Ramah flakes were dispersed over a slightly broader area of Locus A; however, most were recovered in the western half of the locus.
Photo 8-5 Selection of Chert Debitage from FgCh-05. Locus A (A-F, and N-T), and Locus B (G-M)
8.2.1.2 **Artifacts**

A modest collection of worked tools was recovered from Locus A, consisting of bifacially flaked tools (n=11), scrapers (n=3), retouched/utilized flakes (n=60), and a hammerstone (n=1). A selection of linear flakes (n=58) was also recovered.

The bifaces and biface fragments recovered from Locus A are in various stages of production from preform (n=7) to finished tool (n=4) including one flake point (Photo 8-6: B, D, F). None seem to be attributable to a formal projectile point, but rather likely used for cutting.

![Selection of Bifaces Recovered from FgCh-05. Locus A (B, D and F), and Locus B (A, C, E, G, and H)](image-url)
Of the three scrapers that were recovered from Locus A (Photo 8-7: A, B, E), two consist of steeply unifacially-retouched cobble spalls. The third is a well formed spurred end scraper made of Ramah (Photo 8-7: A).

Photo 8-7  Scrapers Recovered from FgCh-05. Locus A (A, B, and E), and Locus B (C and D)
A total of 58 linear flakes were recovered from Locus A, all of which were manufactured from quartzite (Photo 8-8). These range considerably in size and form, some of which could be considered micro blades.

Photo 8-8 Linear Flakes Recovered from FgCh-05, Locus A (B, D, and I-M) and Locus B (A, C, E-H, and N-U)
A total of 60 retouched (n=7) and or utilized flakes (n=53) were recovered from Locus A (Photo 8-9: B-E, K, N, P-R). Retouched flakes are typically described as expedient flakes exhibiting some form of deliberate retouching along one or several margins. Utilized flakes, on the other hand, are expedient flakes that exhibit "rounded" edges from use wear rather than deliberate retouching. Some unintentional flake removal may occur on utilized flakes from use. One of the retouched flakes could have been used as a graver (Photo 8-9: Q). All were made from quartzite flakes with the exception of two (#1011 and #1777 no photo) that were made of Ramah.
A single complete hammerstone was recovered from Locus A (Photo 8-10: C). It consists of a quartzite beach cobble with cortex present over much of the surface except for peck marks at both ends.

Photo 8-10  Hammerstones recovered from FgCh-05 Locus B (A-B) and Locus A (C).

### 8.2.2  Locus B

A total of 3,703 specimens were collected from FgCh-05 Locus B. Similar to Locus A, the predominant artifact class and raw material consisted of quartzite debitage (n=3,606).

#### 8.2.2.1  Debitage

Locus B from FgCh-05 contained a small collection of 3,606 pieces of lithic debitage, dominated by quartzite (98.7%), with Ramah chert (n=48) recovered in trace amounts. The quartzite debitage, as at Locus A, is represented by all stages of reduction from split cobble to tiny tertiary flake. Ramah was again limited to secondary thinning flakes (Photo 8-3: G-M). Unlike Locus A, grey speckled Saunders chert was completely absent from Locus B.
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8.2.2.2 Artifacts

A modest collection of worked tools was recovered from Locus B (n=92), consisting of bifacially flaked tools (n=14), a burin like tool (n=1), scrapers (n=2), retouched/utilized flakes (n=45), and hammerstones (n=2). A selection of linear flakes (n=29) was also recovered.

The collection includes a total of 14 bifacially flaked tools and tool fragments in various stages of production including 8 preforms and 6 finished biface fragments, none of which are particularly diagnostic (Photo 8-6: C, E, G, H). Of note is the recovery of three separate biface fragments that mend to form a complete biface (Photo 8-6: H). All three fragments were located in close proximity.

One unusual piece recovered from Locus B is a tiny ground and polished beveled-edge tablet of patinated material, possibly chert, which appears to be a burin-like-tool (Photo 8-6: A).

Only two scrapers were recovered from Locus B (Photo 8-7: C, D). Both consist of quartzite cobble spalls which have been steeply unifacially retouched along one edge.

A total of 3 retouched flakes and 42 utilized flakes were recovered from Locus B. Unlike Locus A, these are all made from quartzite flakes.

In total, 29 linear flakes were recovered from Locus B (Photo 8-8: A, C, E-H, N-U). Like Locus A, these were made of quartzite and of similar size and form.

A total of 2 hammerstones were recovered from Locus B (Photo 8-10: A, B). Similar to Locus A, both consist of quartzite cobbles with evidence of peck marks at both ends.

8.3 Interpretation and Summary

The lithic assemblage recovered at both Locus A and B from FgCh-05 is composed mostly of quartzite flakes, shatter, and cobbles. The assemblage of lithics and flake scatters at both Loci suggests that this site was primarily used for the production of stone tools. The number of linear flakes as well as the presence of scrapers suggests some domestic activities. This expression suggests that FgCh-05 was a short-term encampment that engaged in intensive preparation of quartzite for the production of tools. The patinated burin-like-tool is the only Palaeo-Eskimo artifact in the collection.

In addition to lithic tool production, the presence of a hearth containing charcoal and calcined bone at Locus A suggests that domestic food preparation also occurred on site. Similarly, in Locus B but to a lesser degree, the presence of firecracked rock in association with small concentration of calcined bone suggest food preparation along with lithic heat treating.
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9.0 Stage 3 Recovery Results: FfCh-02

FfCh-02 was situated on a low point of land projecting from the northern shore of Gull Lake (Photo 9-1, Figure 9-1).

Photo 9-1 View Looking Northeast Towards FfCh-02. The site occupies a small point that allows views up and down the river
Figure 9-1  LIDAR Imagery Showing Excavation Units at FfCh-02
FfCh-02 was discovered in 2006, when debitage was uncovered through a combination of test-pitting and tree throw disturbance (Minaskuat 2008a). These initial results, including a high number of white quartzite flakes, suggested the presence of two discrete loci approximately 14 m apart. Northeast of these two precontact deposits was the remains of a contemporary Innu campsite marked with a variety of debris dating the site to within the last 20 years.

Fieldwork at FfCh-02 commenced in April 2017 with a final excavation area of 269 m². Excavation confirmed the initial assessment of two adjacent loci, one to the east and one to the west, and also led to the discovery of a third locus to the northeast (Photo 9-2).

These three loci were discretely separated, showing unique cultural expressions. As such, these loci will be discussed independently below.
Figure 9-2   FCh-02 Locus A, B, and C Artifact Distribution
Figure 9-3 Distribution of Non-Quartzite Materials at FfCh-02
9.1  FfCh-02 Locus A

Locus A is located in the western half of FfCh-02, with its southern limit determined by a berm of soil and rock piled by ice action along the shore of Gull Lake. Locus A is separated by a 3-4 m gap from the debitage scatter that marks the limit of Locus B. The 141 m² excavation area revealed three discrete lithic scatters within this locus (Figures 9-2, 9-3).

Photo 9-3  FfCh-02 Locus A and B, Top of B Horizon

9.1.1  Site Stratigraphy and Features

For the most part, the stratigraphy at FfCh-02 Locus A (Figure 9-4) conformed to the typical soil development profile encountered at precontact archaeological sites previously recovered in the Churchill Valley. A layer of sphagnum moss and forest litter of variable thickness (5-20 cm) overlays a silty gray-white A horizon which also varied in thickness (from 2 to 10 cm) and which yielded the majority of cultural material recovered from the site. This white silty layer terminated at an iron-rich, orange sandy and silty B horizon. In addition to this expected profile Locus A contained many unique stratigraphic elements that suggest a more complex development pattern at the site. The majority of these stratigraphic differences are linked to the construction of structures and associated elements on the site, which are discussed below, but two natural elements further complicate the stratigraphy. The most obvious difference seen at Locus A is the large amount of rocks encountered (Photo 9-3). The A horizon contained a large collection of waterworn rocks of
various materials in a size range of 5-30 cm. This is notable because the rocks outside of those associated with tool production are normally rare on precontact sites from the Churchill Valley. The second unusual element is seen at the southern limit of the locus where the final 3 m of excavation exposed an unconsolidated sand layer below the duff. This layer appears to be related to ice action from Gull Lake, disturbing and redepositing soil.
Figure 7-4  FfCh-02 Locus A North-South Profile
Figure 9-5  FCh-02 Locus A East-West Profile.
Four cultural features were recorded at Locus A (Photo 9-4, Figure 9-3).

9.1.1.1 Feature 1

Feature 1 (Photo 9-5) found in the southeastern quadrant of the site consists of a pile of medium to large sized rocks laid multiple courses thick. No charcoal or cultural material was recovered from this feature and it is interpreted as a discard pile of rocks cleared from the area directly to the north, which is the location of dense lithic scatter.
9.1.1.2 Feature 2

Feature 2 (Photo 9-6) situated in the north, near the western edge of the site, consisted of a small 1.5 m x 0.75 m x 25 cm high ochre-stained mound and additional surrounding ochre/charcoal staining which spread for over 1.5 m². This mound contained a collection (n=244) of decorated precontact pottery, including a number of fragments with burned residue and/or ochre staining. This feature also contained the highest density of quartzite debitage recovered on the site, along with a number of tool fragments. The concentrated nature of the cultural material recovered, along with lack of associated fire cracked rock, suggest this feature may be related to a disposal cleaning event rather than a hearth.

Photo 9-5 View Looking West Across Feature 1 at FfCh-02 Locus A. Note the void of rocks to the north of the feature.
Photo 9-6 Feature 2 Ochre Stained Mound at FfCh-02 Locus A

9.1.1.3 Structure 1

A series of construction elements in the north of the locus are interpreted as evidence of at least a single structure or, more likely, a palimpsest of multiple structures (Figure 9-3, Photo 9-3). These remains occupy most of the northern half of Locus A.

These structures are composed of two key elements. The first and most obvious of these features is a semicircular section of a 30 cm high earthen perimeter wall with a length of approximately 4.5 m. This berm is not a complete circle, but if circular the enclosed interior space would be roughly 6 m² (see Photos 9-7, 9-8) As can be seen in the stratigraphic profiles (Figure 9-5, Photo 9-8), this berm was formed by scooping earth, presumably from the interior of a structure, and depositing it atop the original organic duff surface. Excavation of the surface of the berm uncovered an incomplete layer of buried duff (Photo 9-8). The berm is interrupted to the west by a large tree throw and tapers off to the south.

The second element suggesting a structure is high-density scatters of debitage. These sharp-edged artifact concentrations are separated by distinct voids and follow the visible berm discussed above. The voids also seem to correspond to areas where larger rocks are present. This suggests that either the rocks were being used to delineate space or that natural rocks were
relocated to the outside perimeter of the structures during construction mirroring the practice seen in the berm.

The elements which compose Structure 1 are suggestive of a precontact structure or possibly multiple structures. These structures would have required significant investment of time and effort to remove and transport soil to construct the visible berm and to clear the interior areas of large rocks. This is the first evidence for earth-walled dwelling construction identified for the precontact period in the Churchill Valley; nevertheless, the structure appears to be comparable in size to the circular structure identified at FgCh-01 (see Section 5.0).

Photo 9-7 Structure 1 at FfCh-02 Locus A
Cultural Materials

FFC-02 Locus A contained by far the largest collection of lithics at the site, with 20,019 lithic pieces. The lithic collection consists almost exclusively of quartzite, with minimal traces of rhyolite and chert. The overwhelming majority (19,670 pieces or 98%) of the lithic assemblage consists of debitage. The debitage assemblage reflects the percentages of materials seen in the artifacts for the locus, consisting almost entirely of quartzite, with only low numbers of rhyolite (42 pieces), chert (31 pieces) and Ramah (41 pieces). The quartzite assemblage shows the full range of production debitage including a sizable collection of cobble fragments and split cobbles, as well as shatter, and primary, secondary, and tertiary flakes. The non-quartzite debitage collection is much more consistent in type, with only small flakes that appear to be maintenance and sharpening flakes.
9.1.2.1 Artifacts

In comparison to the large amount of debitage material, FfCh-02 Locus A produced a relatively small collection of 349 precontact lithic tools. Linear, retouched and utilized flakes comprised the majority of the collection (285 pieces). The collection of tools made from materials other than quartzite, while small, was a higher proportion than expected. These consisted of four fragments of linear flakes and a biface fragment made of Ramah, and a biface fragment, retouched flake and a split cobble all made of rhyolite. Other artifact types represented in the collection include 32 preforms, 16 bifaces and biface fragments, three scrapers, and 5 projectile points.

In addition to the lithic assemblage, 275 pieces of precontact ceramic were recovered from Locus A. This represents the entirety of the ceramic assemblage from the site with the exception of a single piece from Locus B. All but two fragments of Locus A’s ceramic collection were associated with Feature 2 discussed above.
FFCh-02 Locus A produced a collection of six projectile points (Photo 9-9: A-F) all of which are produced from locally-available quartzite. All examples show evidence of pressure flaking with a single example (Photo 9-9: F) showing evidence of unifacial flaking rather than bifacial. Of the four examples with visible bases three exhibit some style of stem (Photo 9-9: B-D). Two points (Photo 9-9: B, D) show the square stem and asymmetric rising shoulders type that are common on Churchill River sites. The other stemmed example (Photo 9-9: C) appears to have more of a contracting stem with a rounded, leaf-shaped edge profile and less distinct shoulders. This contracting stem point is also significantly thicker, and its final form may relate more to production issues rather than style choices. The final complete point (Photo 9-9: A) is un-stemmed and is almost bi-pointed with significant flaking on the base of the tool. Despite extensive bifacial flaking on margins, an obvious arris line runs the complete length of the tool suggesting that the point was made on a linear flake. The two fragmentary pieces (Photo 9-9: E, F) both appear to be thin finely-flaked distal tips of points of a similar size and shape to the above discussed examples.
A total of 19 biface fragments was recovered from FfCh-02 Locus A. Quartzite was the predominant lithic raw material employed in the manufacture, although one small bifacial Ramah chert fragment was recovered. These fragments appear to come from bifaces of various forms (Photo 9-10). The majority appear to be from broad, thin, well-made knives (Photo 9-10: A-D; I-L), while others appear to be from a tool with a thinner, longer shape (Photo 9-10: G, O). In fragments with visible bases, two styles are present: either a wide rounded base with a small point (Photo 9-10: A-D) or square stemmed (Photo 9-10: E, I, K-M). Of the latter, two examples show asymmetric shoulders (Photo 9-10: K, M).

Photo 9-10  Selected Biface Fragments Recovered from FfCh-02 Locus A
Of the large collection of 192 linear flakes recovered from FfCh-02, four examples were made of Ramah (Photo 9-11: E, for example) with the remainder being made of quartzite. Included along with the many single-aris examples there were a small number (N=5) with double aris-es.

There was a large variety in size with some relatively large blades (A-J), but many (84, or 44%) were relatively small (less than 11 mm wide) with an average width of 15 mm.
Thirty-two preforms were recovered from FfCh-02 Locus A (Photo 9-12). All show evidence of bifacial flaking but exhibit a variety of forms. Ten of the preforms are complete or near complete specimens, and the majority of these are oval/pentagonal in nature (Photo 9-12: A-B, G-I, Q, U). Four examples are roughly triangular in nature with uniform flaking on all margins (Photo 9-12: S-V). A unique specimen (Photo 9-12: L) is quite thin and, though covered in step fractures, appears to be a late preform of a knife with asymmetric edges. Other examples are quite irregular in form (Photo 9-12: C-F) and, based on the large amount of cortex still present, were abandoned early in production.
The lithic artifact collection from FfCh-02 Locus A had a small assemblage of scrapers with three recovered examples. All were made from quartzite and of two different expedient styles. Two of the recovered scrapers are flakes with additional unifacial flaking on the lateral margins (Photo 9-13: A) and the third example being a large cobble-spall scraper with unifacial flaking along the margin of the cortex.

**Photo 9-13  Selected Scraper Recovered from FfCh-02 Locus A**

A small (4) collection of very thin, asymmetric quartzite knives was recovered from FfCh-02 Locus A. Three of these knives have square or slightly contracting stems (Photo 9-14: A-C) with the same asymmetric sloping shoulders seen in projectile points recovered from this locus. The defining feature of this type, though, is the differential shaping and flaking angle of the longitudinal edges. In two examples (Photo 9-14: B, C) the “backed” edge which has a steeper blunter profile is near in line with the stem while the cutting edge is angled to the point. A single (Photo 9-14: D) example is not stemmed. Instead the base is made on a thick striking platform; the same differentiated edge preparation is seen.
A second unusual object type that was recovered from FfCh-02 Locus A was a single example of a quartzite graver (Photo 9-14: E). The piece is completely covered in flake scars and is quite thick (15.19 mm), with two working points on opposite ends of the piece. One of the points has been broken and the intact point appears to have been repeatedly re-sharpened. Based on the fragile nature of the working points it is likely that this object was used on softer materials rather than stone or bone.

Other lithic tools recovered from FfCh-02 Locus A included an extensive collection of utilized (N=71) and retouched flakes (N=28). The assemblage of utilized flakes (e.g., Photo 9-15: A-H) constitutes the second most numerous tool type. The majority of these flakes showing evidence of unifacial scraping use-wear (Photo 9-15: B, E, G) with a smaller proportion appearing to have been used as expedient blades (Photo 9-15: D, H). Recovered retouched flakes were predominantly tertiary flakes with a large proportion still having intact cortex (Photo 9-15: I-J, M-N). Retouch was generally bifacial but with some examples of unifacial flaking on larger flakes (Photo 9-15: M-N) with some of these probably used for scraping. Both retouched and utilized tools were primarily made of local quartzite with only a single example of a rhyolite retouched flake.
An impressive Aboriginal ceramic assemblage was recovered from FfCh-02, Locus A. It includes 276 sherds, most of which were associated with Feature 2 (Photo 9-16). Sherds vary in thickness from approximately 2 mm to 6.5 mm depending on the area of the pot from which they originate. Other attributes present include a grey to brown low-fired paste, grit temper, and smooth interior and exterior surface treatment. While most of the bodysherds tend to be thicker and undecorated, the assemblage does include several thin rim and neck sherds exhibiting exterior decoration. The decoration consists exclusively of linear dentate stamps applied in a simple
horizontal fashion along the exterior surface. The few decorated rim sherds that were recovered show a series of slightly diagonal notches along the lip of the rim (Photo 9-16: A, B). These notches were likely applied with the dentate tool used on the exterior surface. No decoration was observed on the interior surfaces of any of the sherds. Several of the sherds also display convincing coil breaks which suggest a coiling method of manufacture.

Certain sherds also have burnt residues preserved on the interior surface (Photo 9-16: N). These have the potential of being used in residue analysis as well as C14 dating.

Given that the presence of ceramics on precontact sites in interior Labrador is relatively rare (Loring 2013, Stapelfeldt 2009), there are few dated samples with which to compare them, although dentate-stamped ceramics from the Gould Site in Port au Choix on the Island of Newfoundland (see Stapelfeldt 2009) have been dated to 1500 ± 40 BP (Beta 134156). In a broader context, based on well-established precontact ceramic sequences in the Northeast, the attributes
present on the ceramics from FfCh-02 are consistent with those on ceramics from the early part of the Middle Woodland period (2200-1800 BP) in the Maritimes (Petersen and Sanger 1991, Bourgeois 1999). These attributes include: thin walls, grit temper, and dentate stamping.

9.1.3 Interpretation and Summary

FfCh-02 Locus A yielded a large lithic assemblage composed almost entirely of quartzite cobbles, shatter, and flakes. The assemblage of finished artifacts was primarily composed of utilized and linear flakes (74.8%) but included projectile points, bifaces, preforms, scrapers, a graver, and an assemblage of asymmetric knives. The lithic assemblage is unique at the site with a far more comprehensive collection of projectile points and preform styles than seen on the Churchill River sites. Scraper forms are underrepresented in comparison to other types with a complete lack of formalized types. The near-exclusive use of local quartzites (99.43%), along with the biface forms, are compatible with the North West River Phase, while the stemmed projectile points are more suggestive of the David Michelin Component (Fitzhugh 1972).

In addition to lithic artifacts, Locus A yielded a large collection of decorated ceramics. While most of the body sherds tend to be thicker and undecorated, the assemblage does include several thin rim and neck sherds exhibiting exterior decoration. The decoration consists exclusively of linear dentate stamps applied in a simple horizontal fashion along the exterior surface. The combination of coil-built manufacture, grit temper, smoothed interior and dentate stamped exterior surfaces would normally suggest a dating broadly in the Middle Woodland period (Côté and Inksetter 2001; more specifically Ceramic Periods 2-4: Petersen and Sanger 1991), at least partly contemporary with the North West River Phase in central Labrador or the Daniel Rattle Complex on the north-central coast.

Determination of site function has to consider the cultural features and evidence for structural elements previously poorly-documented for the Intermediate Period. The elements of earth-berm walls, and notable sharp-edged gaps in debitage distribution suggest the presence of dwelling structures, and the distribution of debitage also demonstrates clustering of material types, indicative of multiple reoccupations. Feature 2, the location of nearly all the ceramic sherds, is also a previously unidentified cultural element and is identified as a discard area. The presence of ochre on the surface and surrounding this feature as well as fragmentary charcoal and the high density of lithic debitage in association with the nearby Structure 1 all suggest that this feature is the result of clearing episodes of the structure. Both of these aspects would be expected in long-term habitation sites where concerted effort was invested in site preparation. FfCh-02 Locus A is a site in which large amounts of quartzite debitage, along with large numbers of preforms at various levels of production, suggest that quartzite reduction was an important activity at the site. Unique to this locus is the abundance of ceramic sherds, though all recovered sherds share the same decoration the clustered nature of the fragments suggest that there was a significant amount of ceramic present at the site at various times.
The wide variety of tool types encountered in Locus A, most notably the very high frequencies of expedient and disposable cutting and scraping tools along with unique features indicate that Locus A was a long term domestic habitation site as well as a lithic production area.

9.2 FfCh-02 Locus B

Locus B is the second-largest of the site loci at FfCh-02, where 94 m² was opened and excavated to sterile in 2017. Locus B occupies a gentle slope to the east of Locus A. While the western and northern limits of the locus were determined by debitage scatter, the southern limit was defined by the transition from the gentle slope to a lower flat terrace. The eastern edge of the locus, though reflected in debitage patterns, is additionally marked by a collection of large boulders in the northeastern corner of the excavation (Figure 9-2, Photo 9-17).

Photo 9-17 Overview to the Southeast across FfCh-02 Locus B

9.2.1 Site Stratigraphy and Features

The basic stratigraphy at FfCh-02 Locus B conformed to the typical soil development profile previously encountered at FfCh-02 Locus A and elsewhere in the Churchill Valley. A layer of sphagnum moss and forest litter of variable thickness (3-20 cm) overlays a silty gray-white A horizon which also varied in thickness (generally from 2 cm to 5 cm, occasionally as thick as 10 cm). The defining aspect of the Locus B stratigraphy is the extremely high density of medium to large-sized cobbles that are included in the A horizon in the northeast of the Locus. It is from directly above or between these cobbles that virtually all of the cultural material from the Locus was collected. This layer of white silt and cobbles terminated at an iron rich, orange, sandy and silty B Horizon. The basic stratigraphy was complicated in places by several treethrow disturbances including a very large pit (1 m x 1 m x 1 m) and associated mound located in the center of the excavation (Photo 9-17). One cultural feature was recorded at Locus B: a diffuse scatter of charcoal
distributed through a deposit of large gravel associated with a dense scatter of debitage and artifacts.

9.2.1.1 Feature 1

Feature 1 (Figure 9-2; Photo 9-18) is a charcoal-stained depression surrounded by several large rocks encompassing an area measuring approximately 1.5 m in diameter. The feature was quite ephemeral and was only recognised during the removal of the A horizon, with none of the charcoal staining visible until later in the excavation process. Though there was a complete lack of fire-cracked rock or recovered bone from this feature a small amount of intact charcoal was sampled. Despite the fact that Feature 1 is not centrally located in the site it is associated with a dense scatter of debitage and artifacts, many of these coming from within the charcoal stained soil. Feature 1 is interpreted as a hearth that was created through the use of the in-place stones that make up a large component of the A horizon for this locus.
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Photo 9-18  Charcoal-Stained White Silt and Quartzite Debitage in FfCh-02 Locus B, Feature 1
9.2.2 Cultural Material

FfCh-02 Locus B yielded a small collection of 1,631 lithic pieces of quartzite, chert, rhyolite, and quartzite, the overwhelming majority (1,563 pieces, or 95.8 %) being knapping debitage. The debitage assemblage consisted almost entirely of quartzite, with chert (29 pieces), Ramah (24 pieces) and rhyolite (1 piece) present in only trace frequencies. The chert debitage collection contained larger pieces in a greater variety of colour than has been seen in the sites surrounding Gull Lake and contained a number of examples of variable colour cherts which may derive from western Newfoundland. Despite this larger size, the chert flakes do appear to be from later in production, with no examples showing intact cortex. The quartzite assemblage includes a wide diversity of debitage, including cobble fragments, shatter, and primary, secondary, and tertiary flakes, as well as microdebitage. The quartzite fragments also show some colour variation, although all appear to be varieties of the local grey, grey-tan, grey-pink, and reddish-purple quartzites.

9.2.2.1 Artifacts

FfCh-02 Locus B yielded a collection of 60 (3.68%) finished precontact artifacts (Tables 12.1, 12.2; Photos 9-19 – 9-22). Thus, Locus B contains more than twice the ratio of tools to debitage as that seen in either of the other loci at FfCh-02. Of these, three projectile points (e.g. Photo 9-19), one endscraper (Photo 9-22: A), and two linear flakes, were manufactured from chert, the remainder of the finished artifacts were of quartzite. With respect to artifact types, 20 pieces (33.3 % of the assemblage) consisted of utilized flakes. Otherwise, the collection included 17 linear flakes, three preforms, seven retouched flakes, four scrapers, two cores, a hammerstone and a unique schist tool with a bevelled surface leading to a rounded working edge.

The three projectile points in the collection are markedly different in style from each other and in comparison, to the point collection from Locus A (Photo 9-19). The two complete examples show contrasting stem styles (Photo 9-19: A, B). Both examples show rising, asymmetric shoulders but while one piece has a square stem with a rounded distal margin (Photo 9-19: A) the other shows a wide side-notched or “waisted” hafting modification (Photo 9-19: B) These points are made from two different varieties of chert, with the first example being identical to the material seen in a formal end scraper recovered from the same Locus. The last specimen is the rounded and thinned base of a larger object (Photo 9-19: C); it has been tentatively identified as a projectile point due to the presence of two partial asymmetric side-notches, both of which were bisected when the object was broken. The material for this object is an extremely fine grained, lustrous, brown chert with some evidence of banding. This material is scattered throughout this locus and was used in the production of scrapers (see below). Visually, this material matches Cow Head Chert, a common lithic material in western Newfoundland, the lower North Shore of Québec (Pintal 1998), and in some contexts, the north-central Labrador coast.
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Photo 9-19 Projectile Points Recovered from FfCh-02 Locus B

Bifaces and biface fragments were unusually rare in this Locus, with only three examples recovered. While two of these biface fragments (Photo 9-20: A, C) are made of the common locally-available quartzite, the third (Photo 9-20: B) is of an opaque, coarse white quartzite with a sugary texture. The two former specimens are a medial fragment and a tip of two separate tools of indeterminate form. The latter is wide bodied with a leaf shape. The proximal end of the tool has some evidence of additional thinning and shaping related to hafting. On the distal end of the tool, flakes have been removed bifacially from a transverse break, suggesting that this tool was being reworked.

Photo 9-20 Bifaces Recovered from FfCh-02 Locus B
The small collection of linear flakes (N=20) was made of quartzite except for two small Ramah fragments. All were of the single-aris variety and usewear was not pronounced on any examples. Average width for all examples is 12.71 mm but it should be noted that there are as many examples (4) below 10 mm as there are above 15 mm in width. The high variability of size and the cluster of these small-sized linear flakes may point to some of these flakes being the result of parallel flaking of larger tools rather than the purposeful production of microblades.

Three quartzite preforms were recovered from FfCh-02 Locus B. These include a lateral fragment of indistinct form (Photo 9-21: A). In addition, two near-complete examples (Photo 9-21: B, C), both of the leaf-shaped variety, were recovered. None of the examples have any evidence of use wear and all appear to have been abandoned during manufacture.

Photo 9-21 Preforms Recovered from FfCh-02 Locus B

The three scrapers recovered from FfCh-02 Locus B are each made of a different variety of chert. One example (Photo 9-22: A), a large, thick formal endscraper with an elongated teardrop form and a tapered-stem is made from the same dull black chert as the projectile point discussed above. The object has a sharp longitudinal break, but this looks to predate the knapping done to create the scraper implying that despite the rough finish this object is intact and complete. The remaining examples are finely-knapped and unifacially-retouched flakes that have been altered into scrapers. While one of these has the general outline and rounded working edge seen in the larger teardrop-shaped example (Photo 9-22: C), the other has more angular working surfaces converging on a corner. Both of the flake scrapers have evidence of lateral and basal flaking.
proximal to the working edges, indicative of hafting preparation, despite neither of these objects having a formal stem. These two expedient scrapers are made of high-quality fine-grained chert. The highly lustrous brown chert (Photo 9-22: C) resembles Cow Head Chert from the west coast of Newfoundland. The veined black chert, (Photo 9-22 A,), is very similar to materials seen used in scrapers from sites previously recovered in the Sandy Banks area, such as FgCg-01 Locus C, and FgCg-06 (Stantec 2015; 2016). Finely-made chert scrapers are therefore a rare but distinct tool type on sites in the Churchill Valley, suggesting a selective choice of raw material for this particular tool type.

Other lithic tools recovered from FfCh-02 Locus B included 20 utilized flakes and seven retouched flakes (e.g. Photo 9-23: B-D). A number of the retouched flakes still retain original cortex and were likely used as split-cobble scrapers. Both retouched and utilized flakes were all made of local quartzites. A quartzite hammerstone was recovered from Locus B with significant use wear on one end and evidence of grinding along one side. Finally, a unique tool made of a coarse-textured igneous rock was recovered (Photo 9-23: E). A single edge of the tool shows evidence of unifacial grinding forming a rounded and beveled working edge. A semi-circular notch in the working edge could be related to some variety of hafting or possibly a simple break.
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Photo 9-23  Miscellaneous Tools Recovered from FfCh-02 Locus B (E shows both dorsal surface and worked edge)
Interpretation and Summary

FfCh-02 Locus B yielded a moderately small lithic assemblage composed almost entirely of quartzite cobbles, shatter, and flakes. The collection of finished artifacts includes bifaces and biface fragments, linear flakes, preforms, retouched and utilized flakes, a hammerstone, a graver, and an assemblage of scrapers made from exotic raw materials, as well as a unique ground-stone tool with a beveled edge. The raw materials and the biface forms, notably the square stem and waisted examples, are similar to bifaces and points previously recovered from quartzite-dominated precontact sites in the Churchill Valley, comparable to the terminal Intermediate-period North West River Phase in upper Lake Melville (Fitzhugh 1972). Thick formal endscrapers, especially of chert or rhyolite, are more commonly associated with the early-Intermediate period Charles Complex (Fitzhugh 1972), although formal teardrop-shaped endscrapers have been recovered from quartzite-dominated sites in the Churchill Valley (e.g. FfCi-02 Locus E; Stantec 2016). Aside from having twice the ratio of tools to debitage as the nearby Locus A, the relative frequencies of artifact types are also quite distinct. (see Tables 12.1, 12.2). Projectile points were three times more abundant at Locus B than at Locus A, and although almost equal in numbers, the scrapers from Locus B are significantly more formalized. Linear flakes were significantly less well-represented in the Locus B collection than in that from Locus A.

With the multiple separated lithic scatters seen in the nearby Locus A it would seem likely that Locus B could be included in the broad occupation seen in the western half of the site. In contradiction to this Locus B did yield a hearth feature, associated with a fairly complete artifact assemblage with a high proportion of finished tools in exotic materials, suggesting that it may represent a distinct occupation of its own, albeit with clear functional differences from Locus A. FfCh-02 Locus B is therefore interpreted as a distinct small habitation area placed for unknown reasons in an especially rocky area of the site. The contrasting ratio of tool types and debitage ratios likely reflects the season of occupation or perhaps differences in site function.

FfCh-02 Locus C

Locus C was the smallest of the Locii at FfCh-02, in both area excavated and total artifact collection. A total area of 34 m² was excavated on a flat upper terrace at the northeastern limit of the site directly north of Locus B. Locus C revealed evidence for a small, localized and shallow quartzite-chipping activity area associated with a large boulder (Photo 9-24).
Photo 9-24  View Looking Southeast Across FfCh-02 Locus C

9.3.1  Site Stratigraphy and Features

The basic stratigraphy at FfCi-02 Locus C displays the typical soil development profile encountered at most sites in the Churchill Valley. A thin layer of sphagnum moss and forest litter of variable thickness (5-10 cm) overlays a gray-white, silty-sand A horizon. This A horizon, the occupation layer, was incredibly consistent in thickness (2-4 cm) and is notable at this site for its near complete lack of rocks. This thin occupation layer is also unique at the site as cultural material was deposited in what appears to be a single event rather than prolonged time period. This white silty layer transitions into a sterile, iron rich, orange-red, silty-sand B horizon.

9.3.2  Cultural Materials

FfCh-02 Locus C yielded a limited collection of 985 lithic pieces of quartzite, weighing less than 5 kg, with 20% of that total weight coming from two samples. The lithic assemblage is overwhelmingly comprised of debitage with only 16 (1.62%) identified tool fragments. The debitage assemblage includes a wide diversity of pieces including cobble fragments, shatter, and primary, secondary, and tertiary flakes, as well as microdebitage. In addition to the precontact assemblage a single fragment of window glass was recovered and may be related to the recent Innu campsite which was recorded in 2006 (Minaskuat 2008a), 4 m to the east of Locus C.
9.3.2.1 Artifacts

FfCh-02 Locus C yielded a collection of 16 artifacts (Tables 12.1, 12.2; Photo 9-25). This assemblage contains only a single formal tool, the distal tip of a thin wide-bodied biface (Photo 9-25: A). Otherwise, the collection included 12 linear flakes (e.g. Photo 9-24: B-C) and two retouched flakes. The majority of the linear flakes are quite small with an average length of 27.92 mm and average width of 15.25 mm. All the linear flakes are of the single-arris variety and clear evidence of usewear is quite rare. A number of the linear and retouched flakes still have visible cortex with minimal numbers of flake scars visible suggesting that primary reduction was an important aspect of the activity at FfCh-02 Locus C.

Photo 9-25 Selected Tools Recovered from FfCh-02 Locus C

9.3.3 Interpretation and Summary

FfCh-02 Locus C yielded a lithic assemblage composed of quartzite cobbles, shatter, and flakes with trace amounts of expedient and a single formalized tool fragment. The assemblage of artifacts, with a single exception, consisted of linear and utilized flakes. This lack of formal tools taken along with the complete lack of raw-material diversity and absence of cultural features distinguishes this Locus at the site.

Locus C is unique within FfCh-02 in its lack of finished tools or tool fragments, the dominance of local quartzite to the exclusion of all exotic raw materials, and the dearth of any cultural features. All of these factors, added to the stratigraphic evidence of a thin occupation layer, suggests that this Locus was a short-term occupation area that was primarily used for the production of tools and potentially could represent a single very short-term occupation or activity area event.
10.0 STAGE 3 RECOVERY RESULTS: FfCi-01

FfCi-01 (Tshiashkunish 1) is situated approximately midway along the north shore of Gull Lake, on a high narrow terrace between the mouths of two brooks at the bottom of a small, sheltered cove (Photo 10-1, Figure 10-1). On the other side of the eastern brook lies FfCi-02, a large, multi-component precontact and historic site excavated in 2015 (Stantec 2016).

Photo 10-1 Aerial View Northeast across FfCi-01 (centre, in front of blue tarp). The 2015 excavation area at FfCi-02 is visible across the brook right of center.
Figure 10-1  LIDAR Imagery Showing Excavation Units at FfCi-01
FFCi-01 was first recorded in 1998 (see IED/JWEL 2000) when 38 pieces of quartzite debitage were recovered from a single testpit excavated on the eastern edge of the terrace. Adjacent testpits were negative. In addition to the precontact component on the eastern side of the terrace, a recent Innu campsite with wooden tent-frame poles, tin cans and rocks visible on the surface of the duff was recorded on the western side. Sometime between 1998 and 2017, the rocks around this campsite were re-arranged to form a low rock wall, presumably a hunting blind (Photo 10-2).

In 2017, a total of 94 m² was excavated on the level terrace around the 1998 positive testpit and extending down the terrace fall to the east (Photos 10-3, 10-4, 10-5). Upon encountering sparse scatter of historic artifacts in the southern portion of the excavations, the excavation area was extended to the west to determine whether historic structural remains (e.g. an earth-walled tent-ring like that recovered at the nearby site FfCi-02) were present at FfCi-01.
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Photo 10-3  Aerial View South across FfCi-01, Excavated to the Top of the A Horizon

Photo 10-4  Aerial View Southeast across FfCi-01, Excavated to the Top of the A Horizon
10.1 Site Stratigraphy and Features

Broadly, the basic stratigraphy at FfCi-01 (Figure 10-2) conformed to the typical soil development profile encountered at precontact archaeological sites previously recovered in the Churchill Valley. The topmost layer of sphagnum moss and forest litter achieved thicknesses of 15-20 cm, particularly near the edge of the terrace, although generally this organic duff was noticeably thinner elsewhere on the site. This may reflect the impact of compression through foot traffic across this area through the historic period, or the possibility that the duff has only reformed here over the past century. Several rocks were encountered within the duff, possibly related to the recent Innu campsite and hunting blind at the southwest corner of the site. This duff generally overlays a gray-white illuviated silty-sand A Horizon which varied in thickness from 2-5 cm to occasionally as much as 8-12 cm, and which in turn terminated at an iron-rich, orange-red, sandy B Horizon. The historic cultural material from the site was primarily recovered from the duff, and the top of the underlying A Horizon.
Figure 10-2  FCI-01 East-West Profile
However, the basic stratigraphy was complicated in places, not only by several treethrow disturbances, but also by occasional lenses of compressed buried sod (Figure 10-2). These lenses were thin (1-3 cm) and most were small, but one large buried sod layer of irregular outline, approximately 4 m² in area, was encountered in the eastern portion of the excavation area near the edge of the terrace fall (Figure 10-2, Figure 10-3; Photo 10-6). The smaller lenses were overlain by thin layers of tan-grey sand, interpreted as redeposited mixed A Horizon and B Horizon sediments, and underlain by discontinuous lenses of illuviated silty sand and soft, loose beach sand. The largest buried sod deposit was overlain by greyish loose beach sand deposits up to 5 cm thick and underlain variously by thick (up to 10 cm) grey and tan loose beach sands, and in places by lenses of grey illuviated silty sand (the A Horizon).

The buried sod lenses and overlying mixed sand deposits are reminiscent of the stratigraphy associated with the historic Innu earth-walled tent-ring excavated at the nearby site FfCi-02 in 2015 (Stantec 2016), and initially it was hoped that a similar historic structure would be uncovered at FfCi-01, especially given that a small historic component was clearly present at FfCi-01. Alternatively, it was possible that the buried sod might define the perimeter of a precontact structure surrounding Feature 1 (see Figure 10-3). However, FfCi-01 showed no evidence for the characteristic ring-shaped arrangement of buried sod; instead, buried sod lenses at FfCi-01 proved to be generally small, and, in the case of the largest layer, quite irregular in shape. While the buried sod layers and overlying redeposited sands at FfCi-01 may reflect deliberate excavation by previous inhabitants, there is no discernable pattern that may aid in interpreting...
Moreover, the presence of the loose sand deposits both overlying and underlying the buried sod suggests that these lenses result in part from aeolian re-deposition of sand from blowouts or other exposures on the site. It is likely that a combination of cultural and natural processes have contributed to the unusual stratigraphy at FfCi-01.

Five cultural features (Figures 10-3, 10-4, 10-5) were recorded at FfCi-01.
Figure 10-3   Site plan of FfCi-01 Showing Features 1 and 5
10.1.1 Feature 1

Feature 1 (Photo 10-7; Figure 10-3) consisted of a low mound measuring 1 m in diameter, containing small quantities of rock and firecracked rock fragments, split quartzite cobbles, and large quantities of quartzite debitage. Other lithic raw materials, including Ramah (1 piece) and rhyolite (2 pieces) were present only in trace frequencies. Within Feature 1, the A Horizon was patchily charcoal-stained, and one small (2.66 g) charcoal sample was recovered from the eastern edge of the feature. Artifacts, including split quartzite cobbles, and large quantities of quartzite debitage, along with one chert artifact and one piece of sheet tin were recovered from the A Horizon. The artifact distribution continued into the underlying B Horizon to a lesser extent, and a small sample (just over 22 g) of calcined bone fragments was also recovered from the B Horizon within Feature 1.

Photo 10-7  View South across Feature 1 at FfCi-01. Feature 1 is the low mound at the intersection of the two cross-baulks, associated with the cluster of quartzite shatter. The deep depression to the right was a treethrow.
10.1.2 Feature 2

Feature 2 (Photo 10-7; Figure 10-4) consisted of a scatter of lithic debitage and artifacts centered on, and associated with, Feature 1. The maximum extent of this scatter was approximately 2 m in diameter, although the dense central core of this cluster measured approximately 1 m in diameter. 1,341 lithic pieces (along with one piece of tin sheet and one sherd of flat glass) were recovered from the A Horizon overlying Feature 1, and also from the B Horizon within and around the Feature 1 central hearth mound. The lithic assemblage from Feature 2 was overwhelmingly dominated by quartzite (99.9% of the collection) and included large split cobble fragments, chunks, shatter, and cortical flakes indicating primary reduction of quartzite. The majority of preforms recovered at FfCi-01 were from Feature 2.
Figure 10-4  Site plan of FfCi-01 Showing Features 2 and 3 and the Distribution of Historic Artifacts at the Site
Feature 3 (Photo 10-6; Figure 10-4) consisted of a 2 m x 3 m scatter of lithic debitage and historic artifacts situated near the eastern edge of FfCi-01, alongside the terrace fall. The soil matrix of Feature 3 included both illuviated silty sand and loose beach sand and overlays the large lens of buried sod identified in the eastern portion of FfCi-01 (Photo 10-6; Figure 10-4). The lithic assemblage from Feature 3 consisted of 985 pieces and was dominated by quartzite (99.6% of the collection) with four pieces of chert (two grey and two peloidal). In contrast with Feature 2, the majority of flakes were tertiary flakes reflecting re-sharpening and repair of stone tools rather than primary reduction. Feature 3 contained fewer finished artifacts (16) than Features 2 and 4. Interspersed with the lithic artifacts and extending down to the top of the buried sod, was a collection of 27 historic artifacts (64% of the historic assemblage from FfCi-01) that included sheet metal fragments, wire nails, .22 caliber bullets and brass shotgun shell bases.

The interpretation of Feature 3 is problematic. It may represent a primary deposit of lithics with an admixture of later historic artifacts overlying (and therefore post-dating) the buried sod and the separate precontact lithic scatter (Feature 4) sealed beneath the buried sod. Alternatively, it may represent a secondary deposit of sediment and lithic material excavated from elsewhere on the site and redeposited over buried sod, either in the precontact or historic periods. The contrast in lithic raw materials between Features 3 and 4 (see below) suggests a primary deposit, but we cannot discount the possibility that it is a secondary deposit.

Feature 4 (Figures 10-3; 10-5) consisted of a dense 3 m diameter scatter of 1,339 pieces of lithic debitage and artifacts distributed on and in the B Horizon near the eastern edge of FfCi-01, alongside the terrace fall. Feature 4 underlays Feature 3, sealed beneath the large lens of buried sod and a thick beach sand deposit identified in the eastern portion of FfCi-01 (Photo 10-6; Figure 10-4). Feature 4 was centered on Feature 5 (Figure 10-3, Photo 10-8). The lithic collection from Feature 4 was dominated by quartzite (91.9% of the collection) but included a relatively large assemblage of chert debitage, including red, black, grey, and peloidal varieties. The quartzite assemblage also included unusually fine-grained quartzites. The majority of flakes were tertiary flakes reflecting re-sharpening and repair of stone tools, although cortical flakes were present in the assemblage. In contrast with Feature 3, historic artifacts were not encountered in Feature 4.

Unlike Feature 3, where the formation process is difficult to determine, Feature 4 was sealed beneath buried sod and sand deposits and is clearly an in situ cultural deposit, centered on a burned subsoil (see Feature 5 below). The lithic assemblage is somewhat distinctive, containing higher frequencies of both chert and fine-grained quartzite than the other lithic scatters at FfCi-01.
Figure 10-5  Site plan of FfCi-01 Showing the Location of Feature 4
10.1.5 Feature 5

Feature 5 (Figure 10-3, Figure 10-5, Photo 10-8) consisted of a small (30 cm x 40 cm) but conspicuous lens of reddened subsoil immediately underlying the Feature 4 lithic scatter. Although there was no firecracked rock concentration associated with Feature 5, it is interpreted as a fire-reddened subsoil underlying a now-deflated former hearth feature. Feature 5 itself contained no artifacts, but four charcoal samples were recovered from the B Horizon within a 1 m radius, and one of these was only 25 cm from Feature 5.

Photo 10-8 View South across Feature 5 at FfCi-01. Feature 5 is the Lens of Fire-Reddened Subsoil right of the North Arrow.

10.2 Cultural Materials

The assemblage of cultural materials from FfCi-01 included a precontact component of 6,004 pieces of debitage and 94 finished or utilized artifacts, along with a small historic component of 42 historic pieces.
10.2.1 Historic Component

The historic component at FfCi-01 is represented by 42 pieces, the majority recovered from within the duff and the top of the A Horizon. Historic artifacts were sparsely distributed across the site, but were particularly clustered in Feature 3, overlying the buried sod, where 27 of these historic artifacts were recovered. The historic artifacts recovered from FfCi-01 generally duplicate types and classes of artifacts recovered from other historic sites in the Churchill Valley, such as FgCg-01 and FgCg-04 near Sandy Banks (Stantec 2015; 2016; 2017), FhCe-36 on the North Spur at Muskrat Falls (Stantec 2014b), and FfCi-02, just across the brook from FfCi-01 (Stantec 2016).

The largest single class of historic artifacts consisted of fragments of tin sheet and tin strip. Two of these are clearly tin can bases. The remaining fourteen are of indeterminate function, although some exhibit slight curvature and may derive from tin cans or from lengths of stovepipe.

The Firearms Group accounts for the next largest category of historic artifact (11 objects). These include three 10 gauge brass shotshell bases with marked headstamps. Two of these are marked “WINCHESTER NO. 10 REPEATER,” and the third marked “WINCHESTER NO. 10 NUBLACK.” Also noted were three complete (unfired) .22 caliber rimfire rounds. Two had corroded, perforated brass cases and no longer contained any charge. The third was unperforated and potentially live, and was not collected. One brass .44 caliber Winchester centrefire cartridge case marked “WRA 00 24 WCF” was also recovered. The shotshell bases and rifle cartridge case likely date to the first half of the 20th century but may potentially date as early as the late 19th century. Three lead objects collected at FfCi-01 include one fired and squashed lead bullet of uncertain caliber, and one unidentified lead globule, most likely a piece of lead raw material spilled during the manufacture of shot. The third lead object is a musket ball measuring 17.52 mm in diameter, and therefore .69 caliber. Pieces of this heavy .69 caliber are particularly associated with American weapons manufactured between the 18th century and the early 1840s (cf. Hanson 1955), and with their antecedents, the French Charleville muskets of the 18th century.

Artifacts of the Architecture Group (7 pieces) include two 2” (5.08 cm) wire nails, and one 4” (10.16 cm) wire nail, of late 19th century or, more likely, 20th century date. Artifacts likely related to the use of canvas tents include one homemade cut tin stovepipe wall or roof plate, one probable stovepipe fragment, and one metal grommet. At least among the Innu, canvas tents and tin stoves come into use in the early 20th century (Loring 1992). The final artifact in this group consists of a small corner sherd of windowpane glass 2.49 mm thick.

Tobacco-related artifacts (5 pieces) consist of four tiny clay tobacco pipe fragments (3 stem and 1 bowl), none with visible markings, and a heart-shaped tin tobacco brand. The pipe fragments are undatable, but the “voided heart” tobacco brand is identical to tin tobacco tags recovered from FhCe-36 on the North Spur at Muskrat Falls (Stantec 2014b), and FfCi-02, just across the brook from FfCi-01 (Stantec 2016). These were employed to mark tobacco manufactured by the W.C MacDonald tobacco company between 1877 and 1922 (Springate 1997).
Finally, the Clothing Group is represented by one small unidentified object, likely a piece of rubber from a rubber boot, and two ceramic buttons, both of the four-hole dished-front white Prosser shirt button type dating after 1840 (Sprague 2002).

The prevalence of ammunition in the historic component at FfCi-01 suggests that the site functioned in the historic period primarily as a hunting stand. Artifacts of the clothing and tobacco-related groups are consistent with this interpretation. However, the presence of artifacts of the architecture group indicate that the site served as a tent site as well. The one perplexing piece is the sherd of windowpane glass, which might indicate the former presence of a tent in the vicinity. In terms of dating, most of the assemblage indicates a minimum date of occupation in the first quarter of the 20th century. The musket ball, on the other hand, suggests use of the site earlier in the 19th century, and it is plausible that rather than a single historic occupation, FfCi-01 saw intermittent use as a campsite and hunting stand through much of the 19th and 20th centuries.

### 10.2.2 Precontact Component

FfCi-01 yielded a moderately-large collection of 6,098 lithic pieces of quartzite, chert, rhyolite and quartz, weighing over 10.5 kg, the overwhelming majority (6,004 pieces, or 98.46%) being knapping debitage. The remainder (94 pieces) are finished or utilized artifacts.

#### 10.2.2.1 Debitage

The debitage assemblage consisted almost entirely of quartzite, with chert (176 pieces), rhyolite (16 pieces) and quartz (3 pieces) present in only trace frequencies. While the small chert debitage collection consists entirely of small sharpening and repair flakes, the quartzite assemblage includes a wide diversity of debitage, including cobble fragments, shatter, and primary, secondary and tertiary flakes. Debitage is distributed among three horizontally- and vertically-separated lithic scatters (Features 2, 3, and 4), and the majority of pieces in all three features appear to be varieties of the local grey, grey-tan, and grey-pink quartzites commonly-encountered on precontact sites in the Churchill Valley. However, there is some variation between features. The frequency of quartzite primary reduction debris, including split cobbles (and preform fragments), is higher in Feature 2. Features 3 and 4, on the other hand, are characterized by assemblages of fine resharpening flakes with relatively little debris from primary reduction.

Feature 4 in particular, and to a lesser extent, Feature 3, also include two lithic raw material types not evident in Feature 2, and not commonly-seen in other sites in the lower Churchill Valley. The first consists of chert, representing approximately 7.2% of the Feature 4 assemblage. Although cherts are very much in the minority in Feature 4, they are present in the debitage to a much higher degree than in the FfCi-01 assemblage as a whole (where they comprise 2.9% of the collection). A variety of cherts are present in Feature 4, including red and grey varieties consistent with Saunders Chert, along with black cherts of uncertain origin. Approximately 1/3 of the chert debitage consists of a fine-grained translucent chert containing black circular and globular peloids (Photo 10-9: A-B; Photo 10-13: G). At first glance, this material resembles Ramah but closer inspection reveals that it lacks visible grain and is clearly a chert rather than a meta-quartzite. This
peloidal chert is reminiscent of the so-called “Iceberg Chert” encountered at the Iceberg Site (EjBe-19) near L’Anse au Diable in the Strait of Belle Isle (McGhee and Tuck 1975:67-70; Plate 18; Madden 1976). The source of Iceberg chert is unknown. This material also resembles some varieties of the very diverse Labrador Trough cherts from western Labrador (McCaffrey 1989; Minaskuat 2008b). Also present in Feature 4, and to a lesser extent, in Feature 3, was a distinctive and unusually fine-grained quartzite comparable to Mistassini quartzite but buttery-yellow in colour rather than milky-white (Photo 10-9: C; Photo 10-11: C, G, H; Photo 10-13: A, C, H). Since virtually all artifacts of this material were recovered embedded in the B Horizon in Feature 4, the colour may result from post-depositional iron-staining. This variety of quartzite is notably finer than that normally encountered at precontact sites in the lower Churchill Valley, although the presence of cobble cortex on a few pieces does raise the possibility that this is a local material.

Photo 10-9  Debitage from FfCi-01, Feature 4. A-B: Translucent peloidal chert; C: Fine-grained yellowed white quartzite.

10.2.2.2 Artifacts

FfCi-01 yielded a small collection of 94 finished artifacts. Raw material frequency was similar to that of the debitage, with 90 of these (95.75%) being of quartzite, and four of chert. They included one projectile point, 24 biface fragments, 2 scrapers, 5 preforms, 37 linear flakes, 24 retouched and utilized flakes and one hammerstone (Tables 12.1, 12.2; Photos 10-10 - 10-14). Artifact types were fairly evenly-distributed among the cultural features identified at the site, although Feature 3 produced fewer artifacts of all types, while the majority of preforms (4 out of 5) came from Feature 2.
Photo 10-10  Scrapers (A-B) and Projectile Point (C) Recovered from FfCi-01

One projectile point was recovered from Feature 2 at FfCi-01. This thick, minimally-finished point of opaque grey quartzite (Photo 10-10: C) is wide-stemmed, but extremely asymmetric, with one well-defined shoulder; the striking platform of the flake from which it was fashioned forms the asymmetric base of the stem. Formally, this projectile point is broadly comparable to some of the less well-finished pieces from the assemblage of stemmed projectile points previously recovered from FfCi-02 Locus A (Stantec 2016: Photo 10: M-N).

Two formal scrapers were recovered from FfCi-01. One (Photo 10-10: A) is the distal end of a very thin single-aris end-of-blade (or end-of-linear-flake) Ramah endscraper. The other (Photo 10-10: B) is a complete double-ariss end-of-blade scraper of mottled grey/dark grey chert. This unusual piece more closely resembles Palaeo-Eskimo end-of-blade scrapers than any precontact Amerindian artifact type and may have been collected from a Palaeo-Eskimo site, presumably on the Labrador coast. Interestingly, it appears to have been coated with bright red-ochre, still clearly visible in the crevices on the dorsal surface (Photo 10-10: B), suggesting that it was an object loaded with some ritual or spiritual value.

Aside from the projectile point, no complete finished bifaces were recovered from FfCi-01, but 24 biface fragments recovered, and these represent a significant portion of the FfCi-01 lithic artifact assemblage. Biface fragments include five tips from many bifaces of indeterminate form (e.g. Photo 10-11: B, O, P). The ten corner, lateral, and midsection fragments (e.g. Photo 10-11: A, E, J, N, Q) are also mostly from bifaces of indeterminate form, although one is appears to be lanceolate (Photo 10-11: Q), one leaf-shaped (Photo 10-11: N), and one corner fragment may be from a biface of either lanceolate or triangular form (Photo 10-11: J). The nine bases include one rounded (Photo 10-11: F), one irregular base from a wide, possibly leaf-shaped biface (Photo 10-11: G), and another leaf-shaped biface, with a markedly asymmetric base (Photo 10-11: M). However, the majority of bases are from relatively narrow, probably lanceolate bifaces, with a variety of base forms, including tapered (Photo 10-11: C, D), straight (Photo 10-11: I, K), and either
Slightly or markedly asymmetric (Photo 10-11: H, L). All of the biface fragments recovered from FfCi-01 were of quartzite, three of the bases from Feature 4 (Photo 10-11: C, H, I) being of fine-grained yellowed quartzite.

Photo 10-11 Bifaces Recovered from FfCi-01. A-K: Feature 4; L-P: Feature 1; Q: Feature 3.
Prefoms are generally common on the quartzite-dominated precontact sites recovered in the Churchill Valley. FfCi-01, however, yielded only five, four of them recovered from Feature 2. One complete example (Photo 10-12: B) is a small, thick ovate asymmetric-based biface preform of very fine yellow-cream quartzite with reddened cobble cortex on its dorsal surface. The remaining four (e.g. Photo 10-12: A, C) are irregular lateral fragments from preforms of indeterminate form.

One hammerstone (Photo 10-12: D) was recovered from Feature 2. Extensive battering is visible on the broader end.
The 37 linear flakes in the collection comprise the most frequent single artifact type recovered from FFci-01 (Photo 10-13). The dimensions and formal attributes of the linear flakes from FFci-01 are comparable to those of linear flake assemblages collected at other precontact sites in the Churchill Valley. One is a double-arris blade-like flake, but the remainder are all single-arris linear flakes. Linear flake widths are fairly consistent, with 49% of the pieces being between 9.75 and 13.75 mm in width, and 86% between 8 and 15 mm in width, although four larger examples were recovered (e.g. Photo 10-13: L-M). Raw material is similarly quite uniform, with one example made of translucent peloidal chert, (Photo 10-13: G), the remainder all being quartzite. Some of the quartzite examples from Feature 4 and one from Feature 3, are of particularly fine-grained iron-stained quartzite (Photo 10-13: A, C, E, H).
Finally, the collection includes 24 retouched and utilized flakes (e.g. Photo 10-14), one of black chert and the remainder of quartzite. As on most precontact sites recovered in the Churchill Valley, the majority exhibit unifacial usewear or light retouch along straight, sinuous, jagged or convex edges and appear to have served as expedient scraping tools. However, one large, primary flake with retouch and usewear at the tip (Photo 10-14: H) may have been employed as a punch. Two additional specimens with heavy unifacial usewear along narrow, concave notches (Photo 10-14: F, L) are interpreted as expedient spokeshaves.

Photo 10-14  Retouched and Utilized Flakes Recovered from FfCi-01. A-G: Feature 2; H-O: Feature 4; P: Feature 3.

10.3 Interpretation and Summary

FfCi-01 is a relatively small precontact and historic site that may be considered an outlier of the much larger site nearby at FfCi-02, excavated in 2015.

Although small, FfCi-01 proved to be relatively complex, with three discrete precontact artifact clusters. Two are centered on hearth features. The Feature 2 lithic scatter is associated with a mounded sand hearth (Feature 1) containing small quantities of calcined bone. The Feature 4 lithic scatter, 2 m southeast of Feature 2, is situated entirely in the deeper B horizon (and therefore likely earlier in date than Feature 2), sealed beneath a preserved buried sod layer, and is centered on a second former hearth (Feature 5), of which only the heat-reddened sandy subsoil remains.
The third lithic artifact scatter (Feature 3), with its significant admixture of later historic artifacts, may represent a third precontact component, overlying and post-dating Feature 4, or it may represent a later secondary deposit.

The artifacts recovered from these three features consist primarily of quartzite linear flakes, biface fragments and retouched flakes, and for the most part, do not differ stylistically from each other, or from other quartzite-dominated assemblages recovered previously within the Churchill Valley. The single stemmed projectile point, for example, is comparable to the collection of stemmed points recovered in 2015 from FfCi-02 (Stantec 2016), and the bifaces, although fragmentary, duplicate forms recovered from other sites along the river. However, the sealed component recovered from the B Horizon, although composed primarily of local grey-tan quartzites, does include a distinctive collection of pieces of translucent black-flecked chert, along with unusually-fine-grained yellowed quartzites not commonly encountered on other sites in the region. Also noteworthy was the recovery of an unusual ochre-stained chert end-of-blade scraper (Photo 10-10: B) that does not resemble scraper forms typically found on precontact sites in the Churchill Valley and which appears to be of Palaeo-Eskimo origin.

In addition to the precontact components, a small historic component was also identified at the site. Historic artifacts appear to date primarily to the 20th century, some may attest to earlier occupation in the 19th century. The historic occupation(s) at FfCi-01 are interpreted as the remains of short-term campsites at a hunting stand overlooking Gull Lake. The precontact occupations at the site may have served a similar function.
11.0 STAGE 3 RECOVERY RESULTS: FfCi-05

FfCi-05 was the only site excavated in 2017 beyond the limits of Gull Lake; it was situated on a high terrace along Gull Rapids, 12 m above the current river level. The site sits on a small flat section of land between the edge of the terrace to the south and a steep hill to the north. (Photo 11-1, Figure 11-1).

Photo 11-1 FfCi-05 Aerial View Southwest. River Edge Visible at Bottom of a Steep Terrace South of the Site.
Figure 11-1  LIDAR Imagery Showing Excavation Units at FfCi-05
FFCI-05 was originally discovered in 2000 (see JWEL/IELP 2001b), with testing indicating a small precontact site. Artifacts recovered consisted of 38 flakes and two biface fragments all of Saunders chert.

A total of 60 m² was excavated in 2017 (Figure 11-2). This incorporated the central debitage scatter identified in testing, which extended in the south beyond the edge of the terrace and continued down slope. The northern limit of the site was defined by a tapering off of debitage numbers and a distinct switch of the underlying soil to watertight marine clay (Photos 11-2, 11-3).
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Figure 11-2  Distribution of Formalized Tools and Charcoal at FfCi-05
STAGE 3 RECOVERY RESULTS: FfCi-05
February 12, 2019

Photo 11-2  View South Across FfCi-05, Excavated to the Top of the A Horizon
11.1 Site Stratigraphy and Features

The general stratigraphy for FfCi-05 (Figure 11-3) follows the soil development profile pattern seen in other precontact sites along the Churchill River. The upper layer is comprised of a mix of forest litter and sphagnum moss of a variable thickness between 5-15 cm. Below this surface cover was a dark grey layer of organically enriched sand 2-12 cm thick that extends north beyond the limit of recovered cultural material and is likely related to intermittent flooding which was experienced during excavation. Below this layer in areas with evidence of occupation is a gray-white illuviated silty-sand A horizon which varied in thickness from 2-18 cm. The A horizon terminates into an iron-rich, orange-red, sandy B Horizon.
Figure 11-3  East-West Profile
This basic stratigraphy is slightly interrupted by the expected evidence of tree throws throughout the site area. More significant deviation from the expected stratigraphy is seen to the north and south of the scatter of cultural material. To the north, the same organically enriched A horizon seen site wide is found beneath the surface organics. This enriched layer, instead of transitioning into the expected grey/white silt of the A horizon, terminates into hard packed grey marine clay. This clay was sterile and despite excavation to over 25 cm below surface no bottom to this layer was found. Additionally, this layer proved to be impermeable to water and units floored in this clay stayed flooded throughout the majority of the excavation and this area was likely similarly flooded at the time of occupation. To the south the stratigraphy shows obvious evidence of past landslides and collapses. Thin organic cover directly over the sterile B horizon, with small lenses of A horizon buried in the B horizon, all show the downward slide of soil. Despite the cultural material from the site being distributed to the edge of the terrace very little lithic material was found in this downslope area and none was found at the lowest elevations. This lack of cultural material does not dismiss the likelihood that at least some of the site has been lost due to erosion.

Two cultural features (Photos 11-4, 11-5) were observed at FfCi-05.

### 11.1.1 Feature 1

![Photo 11-4](image) View Southeast across Feature 1 at FfCi-05. Feature 1 consists of a scattered collection of burned and firecracked rocks. Feature 2, a potential post mold, is visible near center of frame.
Feature 1 (Photo 11-3; Figure 11-2) consisted of a diffuse hearth of decomposed granite and some fire-cracked rock settled into the surface of the B horizon. No charcoal suitable for sampling was recovered from this feature, but a mix of charcoal stained sand and small fragments of bone were recovered during removal of feature stones. The disturbed nature of the feature makes association of specific artifacts difficult, but this feature does sit at the center of the highest density of the debitage scatter that defines the site.

11.1.2

Photo 11-5  Feature 2 Bisected View of Potential Post Hole/Mold

Feature 2 (Photo 11-4, 11-5; Figure 11-2) consisted of a hole 10 cm in diameter and 20-25 cm deep. This hole was uncovered at the surface of the A horizon; further excavation of the feature was performed in an attempt to exclude the possibility of the hole being a natural occurrence. In bisected view a significant amount of the white/grey silt that composed the A horizon lined the sides and base of the hole. The base of the hole contained a number of rounded rocks though it is unclear whether these are natural, as a number of stones of similar size and type exist in the sterile layers of the site. The hole does not appear to result from animal burrowing or plant action. The central location of this hole in the debitage scatter and its proximity to the hearth (Photo 11-4) makes it likely that this feature is a centrally-located posthole.
11.2 Cultural Materials

The artifact assemblage recovered from the FfC-05 was small (N=2,071), but distinctive. The raw materials from the site show a complete contrast with those from other sites excavated within the Muskrat Falls reservoir area: the lithic assemblage from FfC-05 was dominated by vari-coloured Saunders cherts, with a complete lack of quartzite. Flakes and a limited number of tools were recovered, made in cherts ranging widely in colour and texture. Finished tools recovered were primarily of blue/grey chert.

11.2.1 Debitage

The total collection of debitage (N=2,047) from FfC-05 was comprised of small flakes lacking the common split cobbles, cores, and shatter found on other sites from the Churchill Falls reservoir. Over 99% of this material consisted of various colours of chert, with the remainder being Ramah (N=46) and a single piece of rhyolite. These flakes were all tertiary or resharping flakes, and lacked cortex or evidence of crushed edges common in hard hammer flaking.

11.2.2 Artifacts

A small collection of finished tools was recovered from FfC-05 (N=24), consisting of only three tool types: bifacially-worked fragments (N=5) (Photo 11-6: H-L), small, thin, finely-made lanceolate points (N=9) (Photo 11-5), and linear flakes (N=9)(Photo 11-7).

Nine point fragments, 39.1% of the tool assemblage, were recovered from across the site during the 2017 excavation (Photo 11-6: A-G; Figure 11-2). These fragments all came from a single uniform tool type; an additional two fragments from points of a similar style were recovered during the initial site discovery (see JWEL/IELP 2001b). All but one of the points are made of a blue/grey, fine-grained chert; the remaining example is made of a dull white/brown chert (Photo 11-6: A). Of these, two cross-mends (Photo 11-6: B-C) were made, resulting in 3 near-complete examples (Photo 11-6: A-C). These points are all finely made with parallel pressure flaking along the edges. All pieces are biconvex in cross-section and extremely thin, with a maximum thickness of only 6.11 mm. No evidence of the original striking platforms are present, and longitudinally the points are flat with no evidence of the curve of a flake. The edges are parallel, with no evidence of side-notches. The hafting surface, where visible, is flat with some evidence of additional flaking but not enough to constitute basal thinning (Photo 11-6: A-C, F-G.). This style of point has not previously been encountered among the sites excavated in the Churchill Valley to date.
Only five bifacially-worked artifacts (representing 21.7% of the artifact assemblage) do not belong to this class of projectile points (Photo 11-6: H-L). Three are of salmon-coloured Saunders chert while the remaining examples are a lustrous black chert or a dull white chert with dark brown staining. None of these fragments have an easily identifiable form but with the lack of evidence of tool manufacture on site it is likely that these pieces are from repair or resharpening events. The piece with a rectangular base (Photo 11-6: H) is similar in appearance to the bases of the projectile points but is less finely flaked and does not show evidence of a break from a larger piece. The remaining pieces are of indeterminate form but the pointed shape and small size are similar to stem fragments recovered from other sites in the Churchill Valley.

The nine linear flakes recovered from FfCi-05 (Photo 11-7) comprise 39.1% of the tool assemblage. A single example has double arris lines (Photo 11-7: A) while the remaining are of the single arris variety. All are made of various coloured chert. The small collection of linear flakes is widely consistent in size, with two examples (Photo 11-7: A, C) serving as the outliers on the large and
small sizes respectively. The more rectangular linear flakes (Photo 11-7: B, E-G) have an obvious aris line running the length of the flake roughly in the center of its width. The less consistent shapes (Photo 11-7: A, C-D) can have aris lines that may split or not equally bisect the flake. Overall, despite the linear flake qualities of these artifacts the low number of linear flakes recovered along with the complete lack of recovered utilized flakes suggest that some or all of these linear flakes were not purposely created and were instead debitage from tool maintenance.

![Photo 11-7 Selected Linear Flakes Recovered from FfCi-05]

**11.3 Interpretation and Summary**

FfCi-05 yielded a small lithic assemblage composed almost entirely of chert flakes. The predominance of flakes and the lack of shatter, split cobbles, and other initial lithic reduction by-products, instantly marks FfCi-05 as unique. The collection of finished artifacts includes only three tool types: bifaces, elongated points, and a small collection of linear flakes. The absence of scrapers and preforms, tool types that typify all other sites in the Churchill Valley, hints that FfCi-05 represents a different site type than what has been thus far encountered.

The complete lack of locally available quartzite and the substitution of fine-grained chert is also unique, despite comparable examples of chert usage from sites at Muskrat Falls, no other site west of Muskrat Falls shows this lack of quartzite. Typologically the most noteworthy artifact class is the large collection of near-complete projectile points. Of the seven examples that can be identified from nine fragments recovered, six show an identical hafting type consisting of a basally thinned flat base. This haft is not seen elsewhere in the valley.
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The unusually high frequency of projectile points further indicates the importance of hunting and preparation/maintenance for later hunting activities at the site. The low diversity of tool types suggests that the site functions of FfCi-05 were notably different from those at the nearby sites in Gull Lake. FfCi-05 is interpreted as a short term hunting encampment or travel stop situated at the bottom of the Gull Rapids portage.
12.0 DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

12.1 Stage 2 Assessment

Stage 2 assessment in 2017 was relatively limited and focused primarily on verifying the nature and significance of cultural material at two sites, one a registered archaeological site (FgCh-06), and the other an unanticipated findspot of quartzite shatter encountered north of FgCh-06 during routine Historic Resources Management work.

FgCh-06 was initially identified in 2006 as the site of a contemporary camp dating to the 1980s or 1990s backed by regenerating clearings which appeared to be anthropogenic and potentially several decades older than the contemporary camp, but which yielded negative results in shovel testing. In 2017, a metal detector survey was undertaken at the site to determine if archaeologically-significant remains were present. The artifacts identified during metal detector survey do not appear to be archaeologically-significant, and all appear to be late 20th-century debris associated with the contemporary camp. Assessment of the site is considered to be complete, and no further work is recommended at FgCh-06.

The quartzite scatter identified to the north of FgCh-06 was assessed by subsurface shovel-testing. The results of this testing indicate that the scatter does not appear to be cultural, but rather, to be a recent product of heavy equipment traffic along the forwarder path. Assessment is considered to be complete, and no further work is recommended at this location.

12.2 Stage 3 Recovery: Precontact Components

12.2.1 Intra-Site Patterning and Site Functions

During the course of recovery work in 2017, significant precontact components were recovered at all seven of the sites recovered. The lithic assemblages from six of these sites are all broadly comparable in terms of relative artifact frequencies (Tables 12.1, 12.2), with variable but generally high frequencies of linear flakes, retouched and utilized flakes, and bifaces. In this respect the assemblages resemble those previously recovered from quartzite-dominated precontact sites in the Muskrat Falls reservoir area (e.g. Stantec 2015, 2016), and the preponderance of expedient tools (retouched, utilized and linear flakes) suggests a similar range of domestic food preparation and tool manufacturing tasks, and similar site functions.

However, there are some noteworthy variations. Finished bifaces and biface fragments are found in unusually high frequencies at FgCh-03, FfCi-01, FfCi-05, and in unusually low numbers at FfCh-02. FgCh-01, on the other hand, is distinguished by an unusually high frequency of flake and linear flake cores.
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Table 12.1  Numbers of Precontact Artifacts from Sites Recovered in 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>FgCh-01</th>
<th>FgCh-02</th>
<th>FgCh-03</th>
<th>FgCh-05</th>
<th>FfCh-02 Loci</th>
<th>FfCh-02 Loci</th>
<th>FfCh-02 Loci</th>
<th>FfCh-02 Loci</th>
<th>FfCh-02 Loci</th>
<th>FfCh-02 Loci</th>
<th>FfCh-02 Loci</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Point</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biface</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preform/Blank</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Flake</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>592</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraper</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retouched/Utilized Flake</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammerstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drill/Pick</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>1713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FfCh-02 Loci artifact counts are summarized in FfCh-02 Total

The three loci at FfCh-02, are also distinct, both from other sites and from each other. Locus B exhibits relatively high frequencies of projectile points and scrapers, and the assemblage from Locus C is overwhelmingly dominated by linear flakes. Locus A is distinguished primarily by the high frequency of grit-tempered precontact-period ceramic sherds. One grit-tempered ceramic rimsherd was recovered from FgCh-02, and during the course of recovery work for the Lower Churchill Project, ceramics have now been encountered at ten sites in the Churchill Valley: five at Muskrat Falls, two in the Sandy Banks area, and three on Gull Lake. When first encountered at sites on the south side of Muskrat Falls in 2012, ceramics appeared to be associated with boulder-filled pits and boulder alignments that implied these vessels may have been employed in the process of canoe-building (for example, to boil sap; see Stantec 2014a). While this interpretation may be correct, ceramics have subsequently been encountered on a variety of sites which lack other evidence for canoe-building, and it appears that these wares served a wide variety of cooking and/or storage functions. The ceramic assemblage from FfCh-02 Locus A is noteworthy for its relatively large size, and also for its decoration (see Section 12.2.3).
Six of the seven sites recovered in 2017 yielded evidence for a total of seven small circular hearth features generally measuring approximately 1 m in diameter. All contained at least some firecracked rock, but as is commonly the case at precontact sites in the Muskrat Falls reservoir area, firecracked rock distributions around these hearths are sparse and very diffuse. At two sites (FgCh-03 and FfCi-05), hearths were defined solely by diffuse firecracked rock scatters. More commonly though, hearths were identifiable primarily by underlying deposits, including small deposits of calcined bone (at FgCh-05), sand mounds with small central depressions (at FgCh-01 and FfCi-01 Feature 1, which also contained calcined bone), a charcoal-stained depression (FfCh-02 Locus B) or by burnt red subsoil (FfCi-01 Feature 5). As in other sites recovered in the Muskrat Falls reservoir area, the high frequency of split and/or firecracked quartzite cobbles associated with these hearths suggests deliberate selection of quartzite cobbles for hearth rocks, presumably to split them prior to reduction to form blanks, preforms, and both expedient and finished tools. This apparent subsequent use of hearth rocks for quartzite tool production may account for the diffuse nature of cobble hearth features at these sites.

Other features of note recorded at FfCh-02 Locus A include a rock concentration devoid of artifacts (FfCh-02 Locus A Feature 1), interpreted as a secondary deposit of stones cleared to level.
a habitation floor. Similar rock discard piles have been encountered on the margins of occupation areas at other sites in the Muskrat Falls reservoir area, most notably at FfCh-02 Locus B and Locus C (Stantec 2016). Also recorded at FfCh-02 Locus A was an unusual ochre-stained mound rich in artifacts, including ceramic sherds (FfCh-02 Locus A Feature 1), interpreted as a secondary deposit, again possibly related to clearing a habitation floor (in this case, one previously occupied). Ochre-stained deposits are relatively rare at precontact sites in the Churchill Valley, but one (rather smaller) example was recorded within an inferred dwelling structure at FhCe-33, at Muskrat Falls (Stantec 2014b).

One feature all the precontact sites recovered in 2017 (and indeed those recovered in previous years) share in common is the presence of one or more lithic scatters, in most cases dominated by quartzite debitage. These scatters are quite characteristic of the precontact sites in the Churchill Valley, and vary widely in size, from as small as 1 m diameter (e.g. FgCh-05 Locus B) to as large as 10 m x 4 m (as at FgCh-03). When elliptical, they are generally oriented at a slight angle to perpendicular from the edge of the riverbank. They are occasionally sparse, but normally extremely dense, although “soft-edged,” without clearly-defined perimeters. Although some of these scatters lack evidence for hearths or other domestic features and appear to be simply workshop areas (e.g. FgCh-02 and FfCh-02 Locus C), these lithic scatters are often associated with hearth features; they may thus broadly reflect the extent of circular or elongated dwelling structures surrounding these hearths, although, being generally soft-edged, they normally do not clearly define the nature or extent of any dwelling perimeters.

While hearth features of various sorts are relatively common in sites of the Intermediate and Late Precontact periods in Labrador, clear evidence for dwelling structure perimeters or construction techniques is more elusive.

Although hearth features are common in Labrador Intermediate and Late Precontact periods, evidence for structure perimeters is more elusive. No structure outlines of any sort have been identified at sites of the North West River Phase in central Labrador, the culture-historical unit most closely related to the quartzite-dominated sites of the Muskrat Falls reservoir area. On the north-central Labrador coast, a small, subtly-defined shallow oval housepit of the partly-contemporary Daniel Rattle Complex was defined at Kamarsuk Area II, and at Daniel Rattle Area IV, a linear hearth feature was set within a surrounding structure estimated at 4 m x 8 m, based on artifact drop-offs (Loring 1992). At the later Point Revenge Complex (Late Precontact) site at Winter Cove 4 in Groswater Bay, a quite different structure was encountered: a 4 m x 8 m subrectangular stone tent-ring of almost bilobate form (Fitzhugh 1978; for a review of the structural evidence from these sites, see Hull 2002).

Recovery work at Gull Lake in 2017, however, has given us a clearer-than-usual glimpse of the nature and construction of dwelling structures in the late-Intermediate/early Late Precontact periods. Perhaps the clearest example is Structure 1 at FgCh-01, defined by a dense, “hard-edged” polygonal scatter of quartzite debitage and artifacts measuring approximately 6.75 m by 5.5 m. This polygonal scatter was in tum surrounded by a 60 cm-wide subtle circular ring of low,
irregular hummocks and depressions, including one clearly-defined postmold, interpreted as a ring of disturbance resulting from the emplacement of tent poles enclosing a circular tent perimeter approximately 5.5 m in diameter. Evidence for polygonal dwelling structures is found on historic-period Beothuk housepits along the Exploits River in central Newfoundland (e.g. Devereux 1970) but is not normally associated with precontact dwellings in Newfoundland and Labrador. Moreover, the juxtaposition of polygonal and circular outlines at FgCh-01 is difficult to explain; it may reflect a double-walled tent structure with an interior wall anchored on a few (5 or 6) principal tent poles, surrounded by a circular exterior wall composed of numerous tent poles.

The relatively complex site at FfCh-02 Locus A also preserves evidence of tent construction, although the site may be a palimpsest of overlapping structures, and as a result, the tent perimeters themselves are less clearly delineated. They are outlined by a variety of features, including “hard-edged” lithic scatters, rock alignments, and also redeposited soils atop a buried sod defining a semi-circular earthen berm that, if complete, would enclose an interior space of approximately 6 m in diameter. The apparent structure dimensions are closely comparable to those at FgCh-01, but the use of an earthen wall to enclose the tent interior is not a feature evident at the latter site.

Earthwalled tent-rings are a characteristic feature of historic 19th century Innu tent sites in northern Labrador and Quebec (see Lee 1966, 1967; Loring 1992), and a 19th century Innu earthwalled tent ring was excavated on Gull Lake at the FfCi-02 site in 2015 (Stantec 2016). Earthwalled structures are also characteristic of historic Beothuk sites on the Island of Newfoundland (e.g. Pastore 1983). However, they are not normally associated with purely precontact Amerindian sites in Newfoundland and Labrador and have not previously been identified at precontact sites within the Churchill Valley.

In terms of archaeologically-documented precontact structures, both the earthwalled structure(s) at FfCh-02 and the subtle tentpole ring at FgCh-01 may find their closest parallels not in Labrador or Newfoundland but in the Late Precontact sites excavated in the Caniapiscau region of Québec in the deep interior of Labrador-Ungava, where late precontact structures are occasionally defined by low, subtle “bourrelets de tentes” (as at FgCh-01), and in places by earthen walls (“double couches noires”), as at FfCh-02 (see Denton 1989, especially Figures 3-4).

### 12.2.2 Site Distribution and Settlement Patterns

Previous assessment work indicated that precontact settlement within the Project Area was strongly clustered in three locations: Muskrat Falls, the Sandy Banks area, and Gull Lake. These three site clusters are spaced apart approximately one day’s (upstream) canoe-travel or one day’s travel on foot. Previous recovery work completed in 2012-2016 focused primarily on excavation of sites in the Muskrat Falls and Sandy Banks clusters (Stantec 2014a, 2014b, 2015, 2016, 2017), although one very large multi-component site in the Gull Lake site cluster (FfCi-02) was recovered in 2015 (Stantec 2016), and another (FgCh-04), the only precontact site identified on
the south side of the lake, appears to be completely deflated by erosion (see Stantec 2015). The remaining seven sites excavated in the Gull Lake cluster in 2017 are the subject of this report.

The Gull Lake site cluster of nine precontact and historic-period sites, comprising 17 distinct occupation loci, is relatively large. One of these sites (FfCi-05) is actually situated upstream from Gull Lake, just below Gull Rapids, and strictly-speaking, may be considered as part of a nearby but separate cluster of sites distributed above and below Gull Rapids. The remainder of the recovered precontact sites (excepting the eroded site at FgCh-04, investigated in 2014), are distributed along the north shore of Gull Lake, a pattern that, based on historic Innu settlement, may reflect predominantly cold-season periods of occupation (see Amitage 1990).

The relative density, and generally large size, of the sites in the Gull Lake site cluster, are consistent with a high intensity of settlement reflecting prolonged and extensive occupation and harvesting, rather than merely short-term travel stops. Two of these sites (FfCi-01 and FfCi-02) are associated with a possible ashkui, a small cove that presently becomes ice-free relatively early in the spring, and with the extensive sandbars and flats at the western end of Gull Lake. Other sites (including FgCh-02, FgCh-03, and to some extent, FfCh-02) are associated with a less extensive mid-lake sandbar just offshore. All of these sandbars serve as staging areas for migratory waterfowl in the spring and fall, and indeed, in historic and contemporary Innu Nation land-use data (Amitage 1990), Gull Lake is identified primarily as a harvesting area for migratory waterfowl. The sites near the eastern end of Gull Lake (FgCh-05, the deflated FgCh-04, and possibly FgCh-01), do not lie near sandbars but are associated with Kak'paushtik (Porcupine Rapids), a minor rapids at the outflow of Gull Lake above the mouth of Pinus River. Kak'paushtik is no longer a conspicuous rapids, but in the historic and precontact periods, may also have been the site of an ice-free ashkui, attractive to migratory waterfowl in the spring. The outflow of Gull Lake is also an attractive source of relatively high-quality quartzite cobbles. The location of FgCh-01, some 300 m from the lakeshore, is unusual and more difficult to explain. The site does lie along the margins of a relict river channel and may once have been located on a backwater channel along the lakeshore behind an island at the outflow of Gull Lake, or alternatively, it may have been situated to extract quartzite cobbles from the old river channel at times of year when the active beach along the lake shore was inaccessible due to ice-rafting.

In any event, the sites on Gull Lake appear to have seen intensive settlement. Aside from the ubiquitous fish and small game, and the occasional caribou, the most obvious resource specifically associated with Gull Lake would have been migratory waterfowl, available in spring and/or fall. The southern exposures of most of these sites, and, and their association with ice-free ashkui, would make most of these sites particularly suitable for occupation in spring. Access to local river cobbles for primary reduction of quartzite may have been a secondary factor influencing site locations in the Gull Lake area.
12.2.3 Typology, Chronology, and Regional Comparisons

Broadly-speaking, the quartzite-dominated precontact lithic assemblages from six of the seven sites recovered in 2017 are comparable to the assemblages recovered previously from quartzite-dominated precontact sites in the Churchill Valley (Stantec 2014a, 2014b; 2015; 2016; 2017). The asymmetric bifaces and cobble-spall scrapers in particular are frequently encountered on these sites, and these forms are also attributable to the late Intermediate Period quartzite-dominated North West River Phase at North West River, defined as the terminal phase of the Intermediate Period and dated approximately 1800 BP (Fitzhugh 1972). Radiocarbon dates from Churchill Valley sites ranging from ca. 1900 ± 39 radiocarbon years BP (UOC-1134) for a sample recovered from FgCg-01 Locus B in 2015, and 1490 ± 30 BP (Beta-373505) recovered from a quartzite-dominated site (FhCe-25) at Muskrat Falls (Stantec 2014a) are broadly compatible chronologically with the North West River Phase, and with the very earliest dates for the (Late Precontact) Daniel Rattle Complex on the north-central Labrador coast (Loring 1992). These sites are also contemporary with the Flèche Littorale Complex on the Lower North Shore of the St. Lawrence (Pintal 1998), and with the Cow Head Complex in Newfoundland (Hartery 2007).

Nevertheless, there are differences between the Churchill Valley sites and the North West River Phase as defined in upper Lake Melville. The wide-stemmed, narrow-stemmed, and waisted projectile points recovered particularly from FgCh-01, FgCh-03, and FfCh-02 do not closely resemble the few known points from the North West River Phase. The linear flake industry so prevalent at all quartzite-dominated sites in the Churchill Valley is also not normally associated with the North West River Phase, although it is found in most Intermediate-period complexes (Fitzhugh 1972); it is also found in the Cow Head Complex in Newfoundland (at least, in the Spearbank Site; Hartery 2007: 15-16). In addition, there are some differences in raw material use; although the sites are overwhelmingly dominated by quartzite tools and debitage, vitreous cherts which appear to derive from the west coast of Newfoundland are present in low frequencies, particularly on finished tools, and debitage which resembles Iceberg Chert was recovered at FfCI-01; this last material is best known from one site in the Strait of Belle Isle, but the source is unknown, and may potentially lie in western Labrador (see Section 10.2.2.1 above).

One important element distinguishing the precontact assemblages of the Churchill Valley from those of the North West River Phase (and indeed, from all precontact culture-historical units at North West River) is the presence of precontact Aboriginal ceramics. Precontact ceramics are generally rarely encountered on precontact sites in Labrador and Newfoundland, but with the recovery of ceramics in 2017 at FgCh-02 and FfCh-02, grit-tempered precontact ceramics have now been recovered from ten sites in the Churchill Valley: five at Muskrat Falls, two in the Sandy Banks area, and three on Gull Lake. Particularly noteworthy is the large assemblage of ceramics recovered in 2017 from FfCh-02 Locus A. Many of these sherds are decorated with linear dentate stamping applied in horizontal lines along the exterior surface. The few decorated rim sherds that were recovered show a series of slightly diagonal notching along the lip. This represents the most significant assemblage of decorated sherds yet recovered in the Churchill Valley. Dentate-stamped ceramics are also known from the Cow Head Complex Gould Site at Port-au-Choix
(Stapelfeldt 2009:60; 2013), and finds of dentate-decorated ceramics have also been reported at Shipiskan Lake in the north-central Labrador interior (Loring 2013). Based on well-established precontact ceramic sequences elsewhere in the Northeast, the attributes present on the ceramics from FfCh-02 (thin walls, grit temper, dentate stamped decoration) are consistent with those on ceramics from the early part of the Middle Woodland period (2200-1800 BP) (Petersen and Sanger 1991; Bourgeois 1999; Stapelfeldt 2009), at least partly contemporary with the North West River Phase in central Labrador or the very beginning of the Daniel Rattle Complex on the north-central coast.

A minor element in the artifact assemblages recovered in 2017 is the presence of at least two Palaeo-Eskimo artifacts, including a ground burin-like tool from FgCh-05 and a chert end-of-blade scraper recovered from FfCi-01. The latter piece had been coated with red ochre, suggesting that it may have been an object of some spiritual significance. Palaeo-Eskimo artifacts have previously been encountered on at least one Amerindian site in central Labrador (FjCa-51 in Sheshatshiu; Neilsen 2017), and one site at Muskrat Falls yielded three artifacts that appear to be imitations in quartzite of Palaeo-Eskimo endblades (Stantec 2014b).

Despite some correspondences in lithic raw material use, some artifact forms, and dating, there are thus notable differences between the quartzite-dominated assemblages from the Churchill River and the North West River Phase. As has been argued previously (Stantec 2014a, 2014b, 2015), the culture-historical sequence for central Labrador in the later Intermediate and early Late precontact periods may be rather more complex than the original type-sequence from North West River suggests.

While the six sites recovered on Gull Lake in 2017 clearly belong to the class of quartzite-dominated assemblages previously recovered within the Muskrat Falls reservoir area, the seventh site, situated above Gull Lake at the bottom of Gull Rapids, is clearly unusual. This site, FfCi-05, yielded a small but unique debitage assemblage consisting almost entirely of chert re-sharpening flakes, along with an artifact collection consisting in large part of identical slender, thin, basally-thinned, finely-made lanceolate points. Bifaces of this style have not previously been encountered on precontact sites in the Churchill Valley, and there are few comparable specimens from Labrador in general. The closest analogues may be a few atypically slender and lanceolate examples of triangular bifaces excavated at Daniel Rattle on the north-central Labrador coast. Slender lanceolate triangular bifaces have been found both within the Point Revenge component at Daniel Rattle Area II (Loring 1983: Figure 2E), and within the linear hearth feature of the Daniel Rattle Complex at Daniel Rattle Area IV (Loring 1989: Figure 2, top right).

### 12.3 Stage 3 Recovery: Historic Components

Aside from three kaolin tobacco pipe fragments at FgCh-03 and one sherd of clear glass from FfCh-02, evidence for occupation in the historic period is restricted to the small (42 piece) historic assemblage at FfCi-01. The historic artifacts recovered from FfCi-01 generally duplicate types and
classes of artifacts recovered from other historic sites in the Churchill Valley, particularly those from FfCi-02, just across the brook from FfCi-01 (Stantec 2016).

The prevalence of ammunition in the historic component at FfCi-01 suggests that the site functioned in the historic period primarily as a hunting stand. In terms of dating, most of the assemblage indicates a minimum date of occupation in the first quarter of the 20th century. The musket ball, on the other hand, suggests use of the site earlier in the 19th century, and it is plausible that rather than a single historic occupation, FfCi-01 saw intermittent use as a campsite and hunting stand through much of the 19th and 20th centuries.

12.4 Artifact Conservation Status

Conservation treatment of the remaining 2016 and few 2017 metal artifacts recovered is ongoing. Treatment is focused exclusively on the changeover of the remaining ferrous materials in solution. The remainder of the 2017 artifact collection is currently housed at the Stantec Torbay Road location for the purpose of labeling and report preparation. Following the submission of the report and completion of the labeling, all material will be submitted with the final Specimen Record Form spreadsheets to the NL Provincial Archaeology Office.

12.5 Site Status at the Close of the 2017 Field Season

The status of the Historic Resources Management Program for the Lower Churchill Project on completion of the 2017 field program may be summarized as follows:

- Stage 2 assessment is considered to be complete at FgCh-06 and the nearby quartzite scatter observed along the forwader path. The former now appears to be of late 20th century date, while the latter appears to have been created by the passage of heavy equipment across natural quartzite cobbles within the last four years. No Stage 3 recovery work is recommended at either location;
- Stage 3 (SDR) recovery operations are complete at FgCh-01;
- Stage 3 (SDR) recovery operations are complete at FgCh-02;
- Stage 3 (SDR) recovery operations are complete at FgCh-03;
- Stage 3 (SDR) recovery operations are complete at FgCh-05;
- Stage 3 (SDR) recovery operations are complete at FfCh-02;
- Stage 3 (SDR) recovery operations are complete at FfCi-01; and
- Stage 3 (SDR) recovery operations are complete at FfCi-05.

The archaeological sites assessed and recovered along Gull Lake in 2017 represent the last of the known sites scheduled for recovery within the Muskrat Falls development and reservoir areas.
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12.6 Summary

The 2017 Historic Resources Management Field Program for the Lower Churchill Project commenced in June 2017 and was completed in September 2017.

Stage 2 assessment in 2017 was relatively limited and focused primarily on verifying the nature and significance of cultural material at two sites, one a registered archaeological site (FgCh-06), and the other an unanticipated find-spot of quartzite shatter encountered north of FgCh-06 during routine Historic Resources Management work. Metal detector survey at FgCh-06 indicate that the site is of late 20th-century date and that no further work is warranted. The quartzite scatter identified to the north was assessed by subsurface shovel-testing which indicated that the scatter was a recent product of heavy equipment traffic along the forwarder path. Again, no further work appears to be warranted.

Stage 3 Systematic Data Recovery (SDR) operations were completed at six sites on Gull Lake and a seventh at the bottom of Gull Rapids. The six sites on Gull Lake yielded quartzite-dominated collections of artifacts and debitage comparable to assemblages excavated previously at sites within the Muskrat Falls reservoir area. Artifacts recovered from these precontact occupation areas included projectile points, bifacial knives, scrapers, preforms, linear flakes and retouched/utilized flakes, with large quantities of primary, secondary, and tertiary debitage from quartzite knapping. Some sites and site loci appear to have served primarily as lithic reduction areas (e.g. FgCh-02, possibly FgCh-03, FgCh-05 Locus B, and FfCh-02 Locus C). The remainder (FgCh-01, FgCh-05 Locus A, FfCh-02 Locus A and Locus B and FfCi-01) also contained evidence for hearths, indicating settlement and food-processing activities along the north shore of Gull Lake. This area has been identified as a traditional Innu harvesting area for migratory waterfowl, along with fish and small game, in spring and fall. One of these sites (FgCh-01) is situated in an unusual location 300 m from the present lakeshore.

On two precontact sites (FgCh-01 and FfCh-02), the outlines of dwelling structures are evident around the hearths. The remarkably clear structure at FgCh-01 is defined by a hard-edged polygonal debitage scatter enclosed within an apparently circular ring of tent-pole emplacements approximately 6 m in diameter. The more complex evidence from FfCh-02 (Locus A) suggests a palimpsest of structures of similar size, but with earth-walled perimeters. This latter site also yielded a large collection of precontact ceramics. Precontact ceramics have now been recovered from ten sites between Muskrat Falls and Gull Lake, but the assemblage from FfCh-02 represents the most significant collection of decorated (dentate-stamped) ceramics yet recovered from the Churchill Valley. Two other sites (FgCh-05 and FfCi-01) additionally yielded Palaeo-Eskimo artifacts, presumably collected by Amerindian peoples from Palaeo-Eskimo sites on the coast of Labrador.

The westernmost precontact site recovered in 2017 was FfCi-05, situated west of Gull Lake at the bottom of Gull Rapids. The collection recovered from this site was unique and did not resemble the quartzite-dominated assemblages collected from other sites within the Muskrat Falls reservoir.
area, being dominated by sharpening flakes of vari-coloured fine-grained cherts. The collection of slender, finely-worked lanceolate points associated with this site has no close parallels with other sites in the Churchill Valley, and few with other Intermediate or Late Precontact Period Amerindian sites in Labrador.

Relatively few historic artifacts were recovered in 2017, but the small historic artifact assemblage collected from FFCi-01 suggests that this location served as a hunting stand, not only in the precontact period, but in the 20th century as well.

The archaeological sites assessed and recovered along Gull Lake in 2017 represent the final sites scheduled for recovery within the Muskrat Falls development and reservoir areas. Assessment and recovery work for the Lower Churchill Project Historic Resources Management Program is now complete.
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