

**DUFFERIN COUNTY COUNCIL
ADDENDUM**



**Thursday, June 14, 2012
7:00 p.m.**

4. PRESENTATIONS, DELEGATIONS AND PROCLAMATIONS

4.5 Delegation – Wellington Dufferin Guelph Health Unit

Listed on
Agenda

Dr. Nicola Ross to address Council with respect to the Wellington Dufferin Guelph Health Unit facility in Guelph. Resolution wording attached.

6. REPORTS

6.6. CAO Report - Proposed Utility Easement along the Rail Corridor Lands – Dufferin Wind Power (DWP)

Listed on
Agenda

6.6.3 Correspondence from area residents. (Additional comments received)

Not Listed
on Agenda

6.6.6 Resolution from Town of Shelburne dated June 11, 2012 with respect to an alternative transmission route that moves west to the available utility corridor manager by Hydro One.

7. CORRESPONDENCE

Listed on
Agenda

7.3 Community Association to Save the Stanton Hotel

Correspondence dated June 6, 2012 from Community Association to Save the Stanton Hotel (CASSH) requesting permission to erect signage on the Stanton Hotel. (Omitted from original agenda document)

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the Board of Health for the Wellington-Dufferin-Guelph Health Unit has entered into a long-term lease of land with the University of Guelph for lands located in the City of Guelph (the “Leased Lands”);

AND WHEREAS the Board of Health for the Wellington-Dufferin-Guelph Health Unit passed a motion on June 6th, 2012 to lease an additional 0.78 acres of land at \$28,700 per annum to allow for greater expansion of up to 35,000 sq. ft. while still meeting the parking requirements associated with increased building size and maintaining the 40% green space requirement;

AND WHEREAS The Board of Health for the Wellington-Dufferin-Guelph Health Unit passed a motion on June 6th, 2012 to obtain the consent of the councils of the majority of the obligated municipalities within the Health Unit served by the Board of Health in accordance with section 52 (4) of the *Health Protection and Promotion Act* to lease an additional 0.78 acres of land at \$28,700 per annum to allow for future potential expansion of up to 35,000 square feet while still meeting the parking requirements associated with the increased building size and maintaining the 40% green space requirement for the new Guelph Facility on the University of Guelph site;

AND WHEREAS in an effort to eliminate the disputed issue of consent under section 52(4) of the *Health Protection and Promotion Act*, the Board of Health has requested, notwithstanding that it does not believe that such consent is required, that the Corporation of the County of Dufferin consent to the Board of Health entering into a long term lease for the Leased Lands with the University of Guelph and building premises on the Leased Lands from which to operate in the City of Guelph;

NOW THEREFORE LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Corporation of the County of Dufferin consents to the Board of Health for the Wellington-Dufferin-Guelph Health Unit entering into a long-term lease of an additional 0.78 acres of land at \$28,700 per annum to allow for the future potential expansion of up to 35,000 sq. ft. while still meeting the parking requirements associated with the increased building size and maintaining the 40% green space requirement for the new Guelph facility on the University of Guelph site.

From: **Trudie Mike**
Date: Apr 26, 2012
Subject: Dufferin Wind Power Project Proposed Power Line
To: warden@dufferincounty.on.ca

Good evening Mr. Kolodziechuk,

I am writing to you to express our concern regarding the 230KV power line Dufferin Wind Power Inc. has proposed to run through Amaranth down the rail line. I live at 474222 County Road 11, on the Phillips farm. The rail line runs through our property and is close to our house, recreation area and work shop.

We attended the public meeting at the Amaranth Township building on April 18th. DWP inc. has proposed two options.

Option 1:

To run a 69kV line on existing power lines along road side.

Option 2:

To run a 230kV line down the rail line.

Option 2 is a huge concern for us; the size of power line, close proximity of our home, work area and recreation area, and potential noise and EMF levels from a power line of this size. We asked the representatives for DWP Inc. if they would consider burying the power line as they will do through the town of Shelburne. Their response was that it is too expensive, it would be less money for them to build us a new home.

This type of response is unacceptable. You can appreciate that our property has been in our family for over 100 years. Building a new home or moving our property is not an option. Dufferin Wind Power should provide options, regardless of the cost, to ensure the safety and satisfaction of the residents of Dufferin County. Rural residents should not be treated any different than the residents in the Town of Shelburne. If money is an issue, then I would have to think that DWP Inc. did not take the time to properly plan this project from start to finish.

I am not convinced that the feedback provided by the residents of Dufferin County to DWP Inc. will be taken seriously. I can only hope that we can count on you and our representatives at the County to ensure the best possible solution to ensure a safe environment for the residents living in Dufferin.

Regards,

Trudie Phillips
Mike Fendert

From: **Gail Gaskin**

Date: May 14, 2012

Subject: Sale of land to Dufferin Wind Power

To: warden@dufferincounty.on.ca <warden@dufferincounty.on.ca>

Dear Sir:

We have been residents of Melancthon Township for 22 years and moved here to enjoy a peaceful, rural property and raise our family. Over the past few years we have observed many changes to the township in the form of industrialization. First, there was a wind turbine development in southern Melancthon, second, precious farmland was bought up for the second largest limestone quarry in North America and thirdly, there are plans for a 50 turbine wind farm in northern Melancthon. This industrialization is so de-personalized, that the massive turbines are referred to as "inflictors" (of what?) and the residences in close proximity are referred to as "receptors" (of what)?

At first glance, these industrial projects may appear very different, however we have noticed many similarities:

- Both projects are owned by foreign companies: the quarry by a US hedge fund and the wind turbine's by a Chinese company.
- Both projects relied on secrecy and the signing of contracts and property purchases behind closed doors.
- Both projects were based purely on profits leaving Melancthon Township: quarry profits to the US and wind turbine profits to China.
- Both projects have a negative impact on the landscape: the quarry when the limestone is depleted and the turbines after their 20 year lifespan.
- Both projects have a negative impact on wildlife: the quarry disrupts nesting sites of birds and impacts predator/prey and fish; the wind turbines kill entire flocks of migratory birds and bats.
- Both projects may negatively impact human health; the quarry with dust, blasting, water pollution; the wind turbines with air pressure changes, noise and shadows, flickering lights, migraines and heart palpitations.
- Both projects negatively impact adjacent homes; the quarry owners demolished homes and the wind turbines people to abandon homes.
- Both projects may negatively impact property values and the ability to sell at all.

We feel that both projects will have short term gain for a few at the expense of long term pain for many. In addition, we do not support the sale of public county lands for either project. We feel that the county government has a responsibility to protect these land for future generations.

Sincerely,

Gail Gaskin and Shawn Sands

From: Debra Friendly

Sent: June-11-12 9:26 PM

To: Pam Hillock

Subject: Leasing of Rail Beds for Transmission Lines - June 14th agenda of council

Please consider this another piece of correspondence for the June 14th meeting. Unfortunately, I am out of town and will be unable to attend. I won't make this any longer than it has to be as I know you have received many pieces of correspondence on this issue.

Please vote NO to the leasing of the rail beds for transmission lines. Please do not sell us out further to corporations that do not care about the residents. Decisions are being made that are not well thought out and the residents are the ones to suffer with no mitigation measures in place to help them.

**Debra Friendly and Richard Lemoine
Municipality of Grey Highlands**

Who will soon be in the shadow of up to 10 wind turbines

From: Lori Bryenton

Sent: June-12-12 7:42 AM

To: Rob Adams

Cc: Ken Bennington; Rhonda Campbell Moon; Ed Crewson; Bill Hill; Walter Kolodziechuk; Don MacIver; Warren Maycock (External); ken.mcghee@townofmono.com; pmills@mulmur.com; jkoosterhof@gmail.com; Laura Ryan (External); Allen Taylor (External); Darren White (External)

Subject: EASEMENT OF RAIL BED TO DUFFERIN WIND POWER

Dear Council Members,

I am writing this to ask you to please vote no to selling the easement of the rail bed to Dufferin Wind Power for the transmission line. My husband and I have just finished building a home on a beautiful piece of property. It took us almost two years to accomplish, on weekends and we've just moved in this week. A neighbor contacted us and told us about the wind turbines. We had no idea!! We have been saving for this for close to 20 years and decided on Melancthon Township for our location. We were never told that there would be 4 wind turbines going in approximately 500 meters from our bedroom window. I am fraught over what's going to happen when they are installed. It's most likely that it will affect the value of our home but even worse, how will it affect our health? Will we have to move out?

In doing some research on this subject, I have noticed that farmers that receive free money taken in part from the taxpayers, wind companies getting millions in subsidies and companies that lobby for wind are the biggest supporters of wind. Human behavior being what it is, I suppose it's natural that those who get "free" money would indeed support whatever source it came from. However, Canadian energy policy should not be based on what group can grab the most tax money.

I have also found that supporters of wind turbines say that they are safe and should not be cause for concern. Opponents say that they cause adverse health effects. People are abandoning their homes due to these health issues!! Am I to be the next guinea pig?

Locally, there is a farmer who wanted to build his daughter a house on his land but cannot due to living in a protected forest area. Yet he can lease land, the trees can be cut and turbines put in, all while paying him a tidy sum. So did environmentalists lie about the need to protect biodiversity before?

Please vote no. Our future, it seems, depends on it.

Thank you,

Lori Farquhar-Bryenton - Melancthon Twp. Resident

From:

Sent: June-12-12 3:58 PM

To: Michelle Dunne

Subject: Dufferin Wind Power Railway Line Easement

As a concerned resident of Dufferin County I urge you to vote "NO" to Dufferin Wind Powers proposal for an easement to run a power line on the old rail line property..

I think the old rail line property should be used for recreational purposes only and not for an industrial use such as a power line for their wind farm.

Our area has more than their fair share of wind turbines now & this power line would only open the way for more that many residents do not wish to deal with.

Jim McTaggart

RR 2, Shelburne.

From: Roy Thomas
Sent: June-03-12 8:26 PM
To: rcrump@dillon.ca
Cc: Michelle Dunne; bhill@melancthontownship.ca
Subject: 230kV Power Line proposal NO vote
Importance: High

Rebecca Crump/Dufferin County/Melancthon Mayor,

I live at 396234 Fifth Line, Melancthon.

My house is within 70 feet to the South of the old Railway Line and I am already concerned and disappointed with the new usage of this right of way. It is now being used for ATV's in summer and Snowmobiles in winter. My once peaceful existence has been transformed into a constant wave of traffic and noise and I did not move here 8 years ago for this existence. It has been pushed through by Dufferin County as a source of revenue, not as an improvement for the local residents who live next to this access.

Now I am informed that your company wishes to use the same right-of-way for a 230kV power line to be situated down the old rail line, right behind my house.

I must object and state that this would be unsafe for my wife and myself, the EMF field alone at this kind of voltage would be a serious health hazard so close to my house.

I have recently been diagnosed with Cancer and have had some Radiation therapy for a metastasized tumour on my liver, Sunnybrook Hospital to date cannot find the source of the cancer. I am now gravely concerned for my health which could deteriorate with a power line of this nature behind my home. It very likely would promote an increase of the cancer in my system because of the ionizing effect of these fields from power lines. There has been significant studies regarding EMF and the effect on both animals and humans, not least of which is Leukemia and miscarriages in pregnant women.

My brother-in-law, who visits me every year, has a pacemaker and from the studies it is not recommended for anyone with such a device to go anywhere close to the EMF areas of power lines. This would make it impossible for him to visit me ever again.

How can the County of Dufferin and your company even suggest that a 230kV power line be constructed anywhere close to any dwellings.

All high voltage lines are, and should be, constructed with a defined corridor of open space with no dwellings within prescribed distances.

I demand that you do not continue with or pass this ridiculous Proposal, it needs to be re-evaluated respecting the safety and healthy lifestyles that we are all living in this area for.

It has been accepted that a windmill must now have a 500m setback, how can you justify this installation within 70 ft of my dwelling, what should be the appropriate set-back be for this? certainly not 70 feet.

My house would also become **unsellable**, nobody would want to move to a house so close to such a health hazard.

I am enclosing a copy of FAQ's about these power lines and they certainly suggest that they should not be as close as you are suggesting this construction would be to my home.

My wife and I vote a definite **NO to this Proposal**.

Respectfully
Roy & Linda Thomas

FAQ for Health Effects of Transmission Power Line Magnetic and Electric Fields

This FAQ is designed to answer in a brief and readily accessible format questions frequently asked about the dangers associated with exposure to magnetic and electric fields emitted by transmission power lines.

The questions contained herein confined only to issues associated with the extremely low frequency electro magnetic fields (ELF-EMF) associated with transmission power lines. Similar issues have been raised concerning the high frequency magnetic fields associated with cell phones. These high frequency fields have impacts that differ from those associated with power lines and, therefore, this FAQ does not apply to them.

1. What are transmission power lines?

- a. They are those high voltage lines that carry power from power plants to substations or between substations. Generally, they carry voltage greater than 35 to 65 kV (kilovolts). Lines that carry power from substations to the ultimate users are called distribution lines. They generally use voltages under 35 kV. Transmission power lines radiate magnetic and electric fields that pulse sixty times per second. This is called extra-low frequency EMF (ELF-EMF).

2. How can I determine if a line is a transmission or distribution line?

- a. One rule of thumb is to count the number of mushroom shaped insulators between the line and the structure that holds the line. If there are more than three such insulators, it is likely to be a transmission line. If there are around 7-12 insulators, the line probably carries 115 kV. Twelve or more suggests the line carries more than 300 kV.

3. I feel nothing unusual when I am near a transmission power line. Why might they be dangerous?

- a. Transmission power lines emit two types of fields, electric and magnetic. Together they are called electro-magnetic fields, EMF. Magnetic fields are known to interact with animal tissues, and are therefore potentially dangerous. While a tiny minority can sense magnetic fields, most of us can detect neither magnetic nor electric fields.

4. Are magnetic fields from power lines dangerous to human health?

- a. There is substantial evidence that exposure to extra-low frequency magnetic fields of an average intensity greater than 2 milligauss doubles the risk of a child contracting leukemia. There is very good evidence that even momentary exposure to ELF fields greater than 16 mG increase by a factor of 5 a woman will have a spontaneous abortion within the first 10 weeks of pregnancy. There is also evidence that these fields are associated with other diseases (see below). Exposures below 2 mG appear to have no adverse health effects. High frequency magnetic fields emitted by cell phones and TV station antennas are a different phenomena.

5. *How common is magnetic field exposures at the dangerous levels.*

- a. Not very common. Less than 2% of the population experiences ELF magnetic fields that average more than 2 milligauss. Average US exposure is around 0.5-0.75 mG. The number of those who experience momentary exposures greater than 16 mG is not known.

6. *Are electric fields from power lines dangerous to human health?*

- a. There is little evidence that electric fields at the intensities associated with power lines directly impact human health. However, these fields have the potential for indirectly inducing harmful reactions. It is undisputed that fields above 1 mV/m (millivolt per meter) can disrupt heart pacemakers and defibrillators. Electric fields of this intensity, while rare in general, are common immediately adjacent to transmission power lines. Also, one researcher claims that electric fields from power lines ionize particles in the air, and these particles are carcinogenic. This research has been validated by epidemiological evidence.

7. *I live near a transmission power line. How do I know if I am in danger?*

- a. When assessing danger, distance is all-important. The current research seems to suggest that living further than 400 feet from a transmission line will provide an adequate margin of safety from magnetic fields. However, the very latest research suggests that pregnant women should *never* venture anywhere near a transmission power line, for even momentary exposure to high magnetic fields sharply enhances the risk of a miscarriage. They should avoid even driving under a transmission power line.
- b. Those utilizing pace makers or automatic defibrillators should similarly avoid even momentarily venturing near transmission power lines.
- c. Those concerned about the less-documented risks associated with particles ionized by electric fields should avoid outdoor exposures with 2000 feet downwind from transmission power lines.

8. *Are lower voltage power lines (say 115 kV) safer than high voltage (345kV and above) lines?*

- a. The risks associated with electric fields directly correspond to a line's voltage. Therefore, the risks associated with electric fields increase in tandem with the line's voltage.
- b. The better documented risks associated with a line's magnetic field are associated with the current going through a line rather than its voltage. To deliver a given amount of power, utilities must push more current thorough low voltage lines than high voltage lines. Therefore, in-field measurements show the magnetic field under a 115 kV line is often greater than the field immediately under a 345 kV line. Also, high voltage lines are customarily built on wider rights of way than low voltage lines. Therefore, people tend to live closer to low voltage lines than they do to high voltage lines. For these reasons, low voltage transmission power lines generally pose a greater risk to human health than do high voltage lines. Lines with 65 kV or less usually emit very low levels of magnetic fields.

9. Can magnetic fields be reduced by physical barriers?

- a. Not usually. Walls, houses, trees and the like are no impediment to magnetic fields. Field measurements indicate occupants of the front seats of cars experience an approximate 30% reduction in magnetic fields.

10. Can electric fields be reduced by physical barriers?

- a. Yes they can. Furthermore, particles ionized by electric fields pose a danger only to those, like children, who are outside a good part of the day.

11. How strong is the evidence identifying an association between ELF magnetic fields and human disease?

- a. There is extremely strong evidence finding a relationship between ELF magnetic fields greater than 2 mG and childhood leukemia. This relationship has been a matter of scientific inquiry since 1979. Sixteen out of nineteen studies conducted since 1995 are now viewed as identifying a statistically significant relationship between magnetic fields greater than 2 to 4 mG and a two to four-fold increase in a child's risk of contracting that disease.
- b. There is very strong evidence finding a relationship between maximum ELF magnetic field exposure greater than 16 mG and a 6-fold increase in miscarriages.
- c. There is strong evidence linking ELF magnetic fields and Alzheimer's and Lou Gehrig's disease (ALS).
- d. There is substantial evidence linking ELF magnetic fields greater than 12 mG and breast cancer and strong evidence linking magnetic fields and the suppression of the therapeutic effects of the anti-cancer drug, tamoxifen.

12. How strong is the evidence linking electric fields and cancer?

- a. There is only one source of studies linking ELF electric fields to the creation of cancer causing particles through ionization. However, a mechanistic process has been identified. It has been verified by in-field measurements, and validated through epidemiological studies.

13. Why have there not been follow up studies on the link between electric fields and cancer?

- a. There is no constituency to promote the funding such studies. This is a big problem in this field (see below).

14. Why is there not more intensive research in the US on the link between ELF-EMF and cancer?

- a. Only a small percentage of the population lives near enough to transmission power lines to be exposed to the dangerous magnetic fields of intensities greater than 2 mG. A far greater percentage may be exposed to dangerous fields from the lower voltage distribution lines, but, as far as we know, there has been no studies on the incidence of magnetic field exposures from distribution power lines. Furthermore, the utility industry aggressively acts to minimize such dangers through the issuance of

exculpatory statements and its funding of research that downplays the dangers (See [EPRI discussion below](#)).

15. *There are those who suggest non-ionizing radiation such as ELF-EMF contains too little energy influence animal tissues.*

- a. This formerly popular argument has largely fallen into disuse. Ionizing radiation (such as X-rays) contains sufficient energy to knock electrons out of their valiances, thereby creating chemically active ions. By-in-large, ELF-EMF does not contain sufficient energy to create ions. It was therefore argued ELF-EMF must be biologically inactive. The argument has largely fallen into disuse (except by John Muller-see the next question) because all knowledgeable scientists agree that magnetic fields have biological impacts. They clearly promote bone growth at high intensities, suppress melatonin production, and induce cells to emit stress proteins. The argument revolves around whether these recognized biological impacts imply potential human harm. (The electric fields immediately adjacent to power lines are ionizing, which is the genesis of the argument that electric fields are associated with cancer.)

16. *Who are John Moulder and Peter Valberg, and why are they so vociferous in decrying the dangers of EMF?*

- a. John Moulder and Peter Valberg both earn substantial incomes from testifying for power companies that ELF-EMF is not dangerous. John Moulder is the most active, having been under retainer from five utilities simultaneously. Valberg is associated with Harvard University (although not a full-time faculty member). He has not done work in the field for at least five years.

17. *Moulder and Valberg seem to be able to cite significant evidence that suggests there is no danger. How can that be?*


- a. In September of 2000, there was an extraordinary event, the publication of the British Journal article. In that article, the prime authors of all the significant epidemiological research of the past five years came together and admitted their original research has come to invalid conclusions. Whereas they had originally concluded there was not a statistically significant relationship between ELF-EMF and cancer, they now conceded that their original research should have recognized the existence of such a significant relationship. These results were confirmed by two additional research groups. Moulder and Valberg, while aware of the new research, justify their assertions by pointing both to invalidated research and to “blue panels” that, relying upon the now-invalidated research, had found insufficient evidence for such a relationship. In addition, Moulder frequently distorts the findings of his references by pejoratively picking sentences out of context.

18. *While Moulder and Valberg are biased by their personal financial considerations, are you not equally biased by your personal concern over EMF's deleterious impact?*

- a. Yes.

19. *Bodies such as the UK National Radiological Board and the comparable German authorities, while finding a link between ELF-EMF and cancer, have said it's not worth worrying over. How can that be?*
- a. Europe employs on average higher voltages than does the US. Because of the physics, this means that European transmission power lines emit lower levels of magnetic fields than do US lines. Furthermore, most European countries, including the UK and Germany have prohibited the construction of transmission power lines near homes for many years. The US has no comparable restriction. As a result, only a negligible number of European homes experience high levels of ELF-EMF. However, such high-level exposures are common in the US. Accordingly, European conclusions on the low level of exposures do not apply to the US.
20. *The IARC, a division of the World Health Organization has found a link between cancer and ELF-EMF. Yet, it seems extraordinarily cautious in its pronouncement of this link. Similarly, the National Radiological Board and the National Institute of Health seem to be very cautious in pronouncing the existence of a link. Why is this?*
- a. Electricity is essential to a modern society. Top level government bodies such as the IARC are concerned that issuing pronouncements will improve the welfare of the relatively small number exposed to high intensity fields, while endangering the prosperity of the majority of those who are not threatened by these fields. We should also not overlook the role of the utilities. As members of a regulated industry, the electric utilities have developed and deployed advanced lobbying tools. They have become very effective lobbyists who are able to influence policymakers on such matters.
21. *Do FHA regulations allow the issuance of insured mortgages for homes when transmission power lines are so close to homes that, even in theory, the supporting polls could fall on the house?*
- a. No. FHA regulations prohibit the issuance of insured mortgages for houses very close to transmission power lines.
22. *What is the current status of research?*
- a. Research funding is a problem. One logical source for such funding would be the utilities' own research arm, the EPRI (formerly, the Electric Power Research Institute). However, there is evidence the EPRI declines to fund follow-up research when the original research uncovers evidence of magnetic field's potential to cause disease. It fails to fund the follow-up research even when its own analysts suggest the additional research should be conducted.
 - b. The federal government completed in mid-1999 its \$45 million EMFRapid study that recommended passive actions in general, but did recommend transmission power lines be sited so as to reduce magnetic field emissions. However, the EMFRapid study based many of its findings upon research that is now recognized to be invalid. Had it been based upon valid research, it is likely its recommendations would have been much stronger. Nevertheless, there has been little federal research since that date.

- c. The California EMF project is just winding up. It has now released its findings. In its evaluation, it concludes magnetic fields *likely cause* childhood and adult leukemia, adult brain cancer, spontaneous abortions ,and ALS. The evaluation further concludes that magnetic fields *possibly cause* childhood brain cancer, female and male breast cancer, Alzheimers disease, suicide, and heart problems.



TOWN OF SHELBURNE

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

No. 8a

Date: June 11, 2012

Moved by: Cavey

Seconded by: Bennington

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Dufferin Wind Power consider an alternative transmission route for their 230 KV line that moves west to the available utility corridor managed by Hydro One to be named "option 3".

CARRIED: K. Bennington

Requested Vote to be recorded	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
	Yea	Nay
Councillor Walter Benotto	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Councillor A.J. Cavey	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Councillor Randy Chambers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Councillor Geoff Dunlop	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Councillor Tom Egan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deputy-Mayor Ken Bennington	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mayor Ed Crewson	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

County of Dufferin
51 Zina St.
Orangeville, ON
L9W 1E5

June 6, 2012

Dear members of Council,

This letter is written to request permission to erect signage on the Stanton Hotel. The request is for two signs, the first sign will advertise the facebook page which informs the community of the features and significance of the hotel and of the initiative to move, preserve and restore the hotel.

www.facebook.com/savethestantonhotel. The second sign will be a sign which replicates an original sign from 1860 from the local Sheldon post office, using an Engravers Roman Bold Font which is common for signage of that time, and identifies the 1863 Stanton Hotel. (Attached)

I am of the understanding that this request will be on the agenda at the council meeting on June 14. I look forward to your reply.



Richard Byford
CASSH Member
Community Association to the Save the Stanton Hotel
Mulmur Township
519-925-5251

STANTON

HOOPER

1863