

# **GREENSVILLE COMMUNITY SUBWATERSHED STUDY**

## **PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #1 SUMMARY REPORT**

November 21, 2007  
Christ Church, 92 Highway #8  
Hamilton, Ontario



Hamilton  
Public Works

This public information centre (PIC) summary was prepared by Lura Consulting. Lura is providing third-party public consultation services as part of the Greensville Community Subwatershed Study. This summary captures the key discussion points from the November 21, 2007 PIC #1. It is not intended as a verbatim transcript, and is subject to review by PIC participants. If you have any questions or comments regarding the summary, please contact:

**Elizabeth Panicker, P.Eng**  
Project Manager  
**Water & Wastewater Division**  
**Public Works Department**  
**City of Hamilton**  
P: 905.546.2424 Ext. 6393  
F: 905.546.4491  
[greensvillestudy@hamilton.ca](mailto:greensvillestudy@hamilton.ca)

**Dave Maunder, P.Eng.**  
Project Manager  
**Aquafor Beech Ltd.**  
P: 905.790.3885 Ext.290  
F: 905.790.4090  
[maunder.d@aquaforbeech.com](mailto:maunder.d@aquaforbeech.com)

**Susan Hall**  
Senior Consultant  
**Lura Consulting**  
P: 416.410.3888 x.3  
F: 416.536.3453  
[shall@lura.ca](mailto:shall@lura.ca)



# **GREENSVILLE COMMUNITY SUBWATERSHED STUDY PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #1: SUMMARY REPORT**

NOVEMBER 21, 2007, 5:00-9:00 P.M.  
HAMILTON, ONTARIO

---

## **1. ABOUT THE GREENSVILLE COMMUNITY SUBWATERSHED STUDY**

The November 21<sup>st</sup> Public Information Centre (PIC) was the first PIC hosted by the City of Hamilton Water & Wastewater Division to receive feedback from the public as part of the Greensville Community Subwatershed Study. Specifically, PIC #1 was designed to provide a forum for community members to learn about the project, clarify their interests and potential concerns, meet members of the Project Team, and provide input about their concerns and interests related to the project.

This summary report focuses primarily on the feedback and comments made by the meeting participants. It provides a high level summary of the key presentation points, group discussions and feedback received following the PIC.

Approximately 160 people attended PIC #1, including City staff, members of the Project Team, members of local community groups, and members of the general public. The PIC agenda is attached as Appendix A and the list of participants who registered is included in Appendix B.

## **2. ABOUT THE PROJECT TEAM**

The Project Team is being lead by the City of Hamilton Water and Wastewater Division, with input from the City Planning Department and other departments as needed. The consultant team for the project is being lead by Aquafor Beech Ltd., a local engineering and environmental services firm with expertise in watershed planning, environmental restoration, stormwater management, fluvial geomorphology, environmental assessment/permitting, water resources engineering and municipal infrastructure design. Additionally, the Project Team includes Waterloo Hydrogeologic Inc., The Planning Partnership, and Lura Consulting, whose role is to facilitate the public consultation component of the project, including the organization of PICs.

## **3. PIC #1 FORMAT**

The PIC was organized into three segments: an open house, a presentation and a workshop. Each segment is described below.

**OPEN HOUSE.** The open house began at 5:00 p.m. Boards explaining the Greensville study were provided and Project Team staff were available to answer questions and receive feedback. As well, displays and representatives from the following organizations were available to provide information about septic systems, water quality, the Clean Water Act and related topics: Hamilton-Halton Watershed Stewardship Program, Halton-Hamilton Source Protection Region and Ontario Rural Wastewater Centre. Participants were free to walk around the hall and read the project boards and displays, speak to City and other Project Team representatives, and speak to the community groups present.

**PRESENTATION.** The presentation segment of the evening began at 7:00 p.m. The presentations are described in more detail in Sections 4 and 5 below. In addition to the presentations about the Greensville Subwatershed Study specifically, two presentations were made by members of local conservation organizations. The presenters shared information and expertise about wastewater, septic systems and water conservation to help provide residents with the tools they need to maximize the efficiency and health of

their water, wastewater and septic systems. The complete PowerPoint presentations are available on the Greensville project website at <http://www.hamilton.ca/greensville>.

**WORKSHOP.** Following the presentation, participants were asked to stay to participate in the workshop. Individuals formed small groups and discussed the questions posed in the workshop booklets that were handed out upon arrival. Those who did not stay for the workshop were invited to fill out a booklet either at the event or at home and mail it in. Due to a shortage of booklets, participants were instructed to visit the website to download a booklet if they wished to submit their comments following the PIC. After discussing their issues and the booklet questions, group members submitted a group workshop booklet that represented the group's collective concerns. As well, individuals submitted their feedback via their individual booklets.

#### **4. PRESENTATION WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS**

##### **Elizabeth Panicker, City of Hamilton**

Elizabeth Panicker welcomed participants to the meeting and thanked them for coming. She briefly explained the purpose of the PIC, which was to present existing conditions information, clarify the interests and concerns of interested parties, and obtain feedback about the study. Ms. Panicker also described the format of the evening.

##### **Susan Hall, Lura Consulting, Facilitator**

Ms. Hall welcomed participants and explained that Lura Consulting has been retained to assist the City and the consulting team with the public consultation and communications component of this project. She reviewed the agenda and indicated that copies of the agenda and workshop booklet would be made available for participants following the meeting. Ms. Hall explained that there would be several presentations and that time would be permitted for questions, answers and comments.

#### **5. OVERVIEW PRESENTATION**

The consultant team, lead by project manager Dave Maunder of Aquafor Beech, began the presentations by providing an overview of the Greensville Subwatershed Study.

Mr. Maunder began with an overview of the Subwatershed Study's goals and objectives:

- **Study Goal.** "to protect, maintain and enhance the ecological processes, functions and significant natural features of the area, providing a framework through which future growth may be established and undertaken in a manner which is environmentally sound and socially and economically sustainable."
- **Study Objective.** To provide a basis for the protection, maintenance and enhancement of surface water and groundwater quality.

Mr. Maunder stated that the resulting plan will provide recommendations as to where and how future development activity can safely occur so as to minimize flood risks, stream erosion, degradation of water quality and negative impacts on natural systems, including groundwater.

As Mr. Maunder explained, PIC #1 corresponds with the second step in the study process, *Determination of Existing Conditions*, which included field and technical studies. (The first step involved background data collection and interpretation.) The next step will be to formulate and evaluate alternative management strategies for the area. After a preferred alternative has been selected, a second PIC will be held to inform

the public about the alternatives and receive feedback to help select a preferred alternative. Then the draft and final reports will be prepared.

At this point in the project, background data collection and existing conditions analysis have been completed. As Mr. Maunder explained, the scope of the data collection and existing conditions assessment included the following:

- Groundwater (hydrogeology)
- Surface Water (Flooding, erosion)
- Aquatic Resources (fisheries)
- Terrestrial Resources (plants, animals, amphibians and birds)

Water well records, geology and soils maps were reviewed to characterize the groundwater system within the Greenville Rural Settlement Area (RSA). In addition, a total of 10 wells were drilled into the ground at representative locations within the RSA in order to assist in the characterization. Groundwater levels, quality and temperature were monitored.

The presentation map illustrated the flow direction of groundwater below the surface together with the water table elevation within the RSA. Also shown were the locations of two hydrogeological cross sections. These graphics are provided in Mr. Maunder's presentation, which is available online at the City's Greenville project website (see website addressed noted above).

To conclude his presentation, Mr. Maunder summarized the key findings of the existing conditions analysis as follows:

#### **Terrestrial Resources**

- Abundant natural heritage features – ANSI's, PSW's, ESA's –30% of watershed
- Limited natural features within the RSA, except Christie Mills and Escarpment lands
- Significant portions of natural heritage features are in private ownership

#### **Aquatic Resources**

- Mid Spencer Creek supports a diverse warm/cool water fish community
- Christie Mills Reservoir supports a warm water fishery
- Intermittent tributaries provide limited seasonal fish habitat

#### **Groundwater Resources**

- The groundwater flow direction is from north to south
- There are two aquifers; a shallow overburden aquifer and deeper bedrock aquifer
- A majority of the wells (85%) are located in the deeper bedrock aquifer
- The groundwater table, at a given location, fluctuates throughout the year
- The groundwater monitoring program suggests that groundwater quality in both aquifers is good. The one exception would be at MW4 in the shallow overburden well.

#### **Surface Water Resources**

- Water quality in streams fair to good –nutrient enrichment, high nitrates and chloride, low trace metal levels
- Hydrologic modeling of subwatershed completed to characterize surface water –groundwater inter-relationships
- Floodplain mapping through Greenville updated to identify areas of flooding and undersized culverts

### **Stream Morphology**

- Most Tributaries are ephemeral and/or intermittent, poorly defined
- Mid Spencer Creek is cobble-bed or bedrock controlled downstream of Christie Mills
- Mid Spencer Creek is low gradient with vegetated banks upstream of Christie Mills
- Main creek generally stable with limited evidence of erosion problems; tributaries within the Rural Settlement Area are generally stable with only minor local/gradual adjustments;
- Urban tributaries show some instability with minor erosion concerns.

As Mr. Maunder explained, the next steps in the project will be to summarize and incorporate findings from the PIC and identify and evaluate alternative Subwatershed Management Strategies.

### **6. SOURCE WATER PROTECTION ISSUES: PRESENTATION #1**

The second presentation at PIC #1 was given by Sheila O'Neal, Hamilton-Halton Watershed Stewardship Program (HHWSP) .. She was the first of two speakers who were invited to speak about source water protection issues as a means of providing valuable educational information, particularly about septic systems and well water decommissioning, to area residents.

Ms. O'Neal provided a brief overview of source water protection and well decommissioning in Ontario in the last 15 years. Of particular relevance to the Greensville community are the activities of Hamilton Conservation Authority through the HHWSP and the provincial Clean Water Act.

Since 2003, the HHWSP, along with the City of Hamilton and other partners, has been operating the Decommissioning Abandoned Water Wells Program. In 2004, a Septic Awareness Survey and Open Houses were conducted and two key recommendations resulted. These are summarized below, along with their relevance to the Greensville community:

- Landowners should have their septic system treatment or holding tanks inspected every one or two years and pumped out every three to five years. This is especially applicable to the community of Greensville where the highest number of older treatment/holding tanks was reported.
- Landowners should become familiar with signs of a failing septic system or leaching bed in order to identify when a treatment tank or leaching bed needs to be replaced. This is especially applicable in Greensville where the highest number of leaching beds between the ages of 25 and 50 was reported.

In 2006, the Ontario government passed the Clean Water Act as the government's commitment to implement all of the recommendations of the Walkerton Inquiry. For the first time, communities will be required to create and carry out a plan to protect the sources of their municipal drinking water supplies.

As such, the City of Hamilton (lead partner) and the HHWSP will be offering:

- Open houses in four municipal well areas and one in the intake protection zone
- Presentations on Septic System Management
- Septic Tanks Pump out - Raffle
- Informational brochures
- Providing Well Aware and Septic System Management DVDs to local libraries
- On-site visits to some landowners in 100 m radius zone

Ms. O'Neal explained that two landowners in the Flamborough area would be in the inaugural winners of the first free pumping of their septic tank from Rankin's Septic Tank Pumping and Environmental Services. In the interest of knowledge sharing and community building, the winners would invite a

neighbour or two to come and learn the importance of septic system maintenance – demonstration opportunity. The winners was announced following the presentations.

Ms. O’Neal noted that Ministry of the Environment funding would be available shortly to landowners of properties within 100 m radius of a municipal well or within 200 m radius of a municipal surface water intake to decommission or upgrade wells. The funding details are provided in the presentation slides available on the City’s website noted above.

Ms. O’Neal concluded the presentation with a reminded of the safety and water quality hazards of well systems that are abandoned and not properly maintained.

## **7. SOURCE WATER PROTECTION ISSUES: PRESENTATION #2**

Katherine Rentsch of the Ontario Rural Wastewater Centre made the second presentation related to source water protection issues. The focus of the first part of her discussion was “At Home Solutions for Your Onsite System.”

Ms. Rentsch began with an overview of the basics of onsite systems, including the components (e.g., leaching bed) and basic operation. She noted that most rural residences are serviced by on-site systems and that there are over a million of such systems in Ontario (or 30% of the province). These systems discharge about 100 billion L/yr to the environment and generally last about 25 to 30 years.

Septic systems should be of concern to residents, Ms. Rentsch noted, for several reasons including: Once systems are in place, they are largely unmanaged and unmonitored

- Reaction to failure, if known, is the responsibility of the owner
- Most studies of existing systems show a high % of failures (30-60%)

To assist well-owners to make informed decision, Ms. Rentsch explained how the Ontario Rural Wastewater Centre could help and provided some operation and maintenance tips. The full list of tips can be found in the presentation slides on the City’s website noted above. To help explain why these tips should be followed, Ms. Rentsch discussed the potential impacts of impaired systems, including groundwater contamination and its effect on human health. She provided a list of signs to look for to assess the health of systems and explained what to do in case of failure.

For the second part of her presentation, Ms. Rentsch focused on private well testing and maintenance. She began by noting that 3 million Ontarians rely on groundwater for their water supply (private and municipal supply) and that many of these people are not testing their wells regularly for bacteria and few are testing for anything beyond the Ministry of Health complimentary bacterial test. Not surprisingly, many wells have levels of bacteria and/or nitrogen above drinking water standards.

To help well owners better care for their systems, Ms. Rentsch provided a list of well maintenance tips, which are available in the presentation slides posted on the City’s website. As well, she explained why it is important to decommission wells properly and how well maintenance relates to source water protection. In conclusion, Ms. Rentsch provided an overview of the Well Aware Program and provided resources that people could contact for more information.

## **8. PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK**

This section provides an overview of the feedback received from participants at the PIC and through written comments following the PIC. This summary is a collection of comments obtained following the presentations, from table discussions, and from individual feedback provided through workbooks.

### **General Questions, Comments and Concerns:**

Immediately following the presentations, and prior to commencing the small table discussions, Susan Hall asked participants if they had any questions or comments directly related to the presentation. The following identifies the participants' area of concern and response provided.

**Q1:** Is the City going to put future development on hold? Does that include current applications?

**Response:** City Planner replied that he was not aware of any current applications in the area and that the Greenville study is not a precursor to a planned development. Rather, it is a study to develop a preferred management strategy for the area, with the interest of protecting water resources to the extent possible.

**Q2:** Will neighbouring areas be affected by the study?

**Response:** Neighbouring areas outside of Greenville are not in the catchment area and would need to undergo their own studies.

**Q3:** Were nitrate levels measured in data collection?

**Response:** Mr. Maunder noted that nitrates can affect drinking water potential and result in blue baby syndrome. He noted that in the next phase of the study, they will sample other parameters.

**Q5:** What were the depths of borings for the test wells?

**Response:** Mr. Maunder stated that 10 test wells were drilled and that the depths varied depending on location; some locations had to go deeper than others to get appropriate testing.

**Q6:** Why does HHWSP funding only apply to homes near municipal wells?

**Response:** Ms. O'Neal noted that since it is the first year of program and funding is limited, the decision was made to begin with those residences. In time, as the program grows, additional residences are expected to be added.

**Q7:** How do you know when your septic system is ready to be pumped?

**Response:** Ms. Rentsch replied that you should have your system pumped when it is 1/3 full; every 2-5 years; when sewage is backing up into your house; when there is odour near the leaching bed; when you see wet, mushy areas near the bed; or when you see patchy growth of grass. She recommended that landowners call contractors to have an assessment done.

**Q8:** How bad are toilet pucks for septic systems?

**Response:** Since they usually contain bleach, Ms. Rentsch said that some pucks are bad because you're adding bleach slowly to your septic. Everyday bleach use (e.g., Tide) is not good for the systems.

**Q9:** What's the alternative to putting laundry water down septic system?

**Response:** Ms. Rentsch suggested spreading your laundry loads out over time so that the system is not overloaded all at once. Septic systems can absorb better over a week than all in one day.

**Q10:** What is your opinion on septic additives?

**Response:** Ms. Rentsch said that no independent research has been conducted to verify manufacturing claims that they work. She doesn't think we need to add more bacteria. If you do use an additive, she says to use an Environment Canada approved product.

**Q11:** Who does system testing?

**Response:** Ms. Rentsch replied that haulers, home inspectors and some cities do testing but she was unsure of Hamilton's policy. She said whoever is issuing system permits would likely send out staff to inspect. Her understanding is that City of Hamilton is not doing that.

**Q12:** Can you explain more about when to be concerned about lawn striping?

**Response:** Ms. Rentsch said that sandy soils in summer can be striped. Striping in wetter parts of the year or in winter is of greater concern because it means that water is not getting away from pipes.

**Q13:** Is 2-ply or 1-ply tissue better for septic systems?

**Response:** Ms. Rentsch said that she was not aware of any studies proving that one is better than the other for septic systems. She added that baby wipes don't biodegrade and thus should not be flushed.

**Q14:** Comment about septic beds and that the presentation should be made to the tax assessment board. Since the City isn't doing anything, it should be reflected in the taxes.

## **9. WORKSHOP BOOKLET QUESTIONS**

### **QUESTION 1: WHAT FEATURES, RESOURCES OR ELEMENTS DO YOU VALUE IN THE GREENSVILLE SUBWATERSHED?**

Ten responses to the first question were submitted by workshop participants. The responses indicate that the features, resources and elements of value to the participants include the following:

- rural setting
- clean (no chemicals) and uncontaminated (bacterial) water for people and the wildlife
- unchlorinated water
- nature and wildlife amenities of Christie Falls
- birds, animals, nature, in general
- nature trails
- natural features of the Niagara Escarpment
- space for organic food saving
- waste disposal which doesn't degrade the ecology
- Crooks Hollow Dam and Christie Dam
- Sustainability
- My well/well water

### **QUESTION 2: SOME POTENTIAL ISSUES THAT HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED IN THE GREENSVILLE SUBWATERSHED ARE LISTED BELOW. PLEASE RANK EACH ISSUE WHICH IS IMPORTANT TO YOU ON A SCALE FROM 1 TO 5 (1 - MOST IMPORTANT, 5 – LEAST IMPORTANT). TELL US WHY THIS ISSUE IS IMPORTANT TO YOU.**

For this question, participants were asked to rate issues on a scale from "most important" to "least important." The number of responses per issue varied. Not all respondents rated all issues. A list of the issues and a summary of the number of responses received for each is provided in the table on the following page.

**QUESTION 3: WHAT RECOMMENDATIONS (IF ANY) DO YOU HAVE TO ADDRESS THE KEY ISSUES YOU'VE IDENTIFIED AS IMPORTANT?**

Formatted: Keep with next, Keep lines together

Respondents provided a range of responses to this question. Generally, the responses can be grouped into the following categories. A brief description of the recommendation follows:

- **Development Control.** Suggestions included a moratorium/stop on development, development that minimizes pollution, and limiting new development to minimum 2 acre lots.
- **Open Process.** Ongoing dialogue with the Greenville community about the project and development planned in the area.
- **Access to Data.** Make groundwater data (historical and current) available to the public.
- **Recording of Data.** Home owners keep a log of well water levels and provide this information to the Ministry of the Environment annually.
- **Limits on Water Bottlers.** Limits on the activities of water bottling companies in the watershed and north of the project area.
- **Municipal Water.** Installation of municipal water systems.
- **Quarries.** Suggested looking at the effects of quarry water use on surrounding area.
- **Promotions.** Promotion and subsidization of low flow toilets and shower heads.
- **Maintenance/Operation Assistance.** Assistance with installing backup water cisterns and digging deeper wells. The form of assistance (e.g., financial, informational) was not specified.

**QUESTION 4: WHICH RECOMMENDATIONS (IF ANY) WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO IMPLEMENT?**

Respondents indicated that they would be willing to implement a variety of actions towards their recommendations. These include the following:

- Participate on the Community Liaison Committee
- Upgrade their septic system
- Drill a new deeper well
- Install municipal water
- Provide information/data to the Ministry of the Environment for tracking purposes
- Lobby local councillor and health department regarding development limits
- Install low flow shower heads and toilets (respondent has done this already)

	Most Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Not Very Important	Least Important	Don't Know	
Quality of water for domestic consumption	15	4	0	0	0	0	-simply water fit -important resou -can be treated -health, econo -health, person -life
Quantity of water for domestic consumption	16	1	0	0	0	0	-no water, no li -property drain -health, person -life -well becoming
Erosion and sedimentation of watercourses	6	3	6	1	0	0	-I cannot impa -property drain -health, person -environmenta
Private property flooding/erosion	4	5	3	2	2	0	-I don't think t -property drain -health, person
Stormwater management	6	2	5	0	2	0	-I don't think t -Property drain -health, person
Development impacts to well water quality	15	3	2	0	0	0	-Need to ensur -properties first -health density -health, person -have gone dry
Development impacts to well water quantity	15	3	0	0	0	0	-Need to ensur -properties first -health, person
Groundwater recharge/wells running dry	13	1	1	0	0	0	-neighbours us -conditions (wat -No water! -health, person
Well contamination from urban runoff (e.g., streets, roofs, lawn pesticides)	10	3	2	0	1	0	-I don't think t -(2) health
Well contamination from agricultural runoff	10	4	1	0	1	0	-I don't think t -Runoff -Health
Watercourse contamination from suburban development	10	2	4	0	1	0	-Septic system

	Most Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Not Very Important	Least Important	Don't Know	
Watercourse contamination from agricultural practices	8	5	2	0	1	0	- health
Groundwater contamination from existing septic systems	11	4	1	0	1	0	- (2) health con
Groundwater contamination from upstream aggregate quarries	8	3	2	1	1	0	- quality of life
Loss of riparian and stream habitat	8	5	1	1	1	0	- quality of life
Loss of natural stream functions	11	4	1	0	1	0	- impact to mai
Sustainability of municipal water supply	9	1	3	0	2	0	- n/a we are on - Does not affe - Don't want m

**QUESTION 5: WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE BARRIERS TO IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS YOU SUGGESTED IN QUESTION 3?**

Respondents indicated several barriers to implementing their recommendations:

- politics/lack of political will/overcoming political interest in businesses over individuals
- City of Hamilton/City Council
- developer lobbying/pressure on Council and City staff
- protest by local industry/quarry operations
- urban sprawl
- cost/lack of funds
- lack of unity among residents
- lack of professional help
- regulations and inspections needed

**QUESTION 6: WHAT TOOLS OR INFORMATION DO YOU NEED TO HELP YOU IMPLEMENT YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS?**

Only 5 responses to this question were received. These respondents indicated they needed the following forms of assistance and tools:

- information about best location and depth to drill new wells
- a reporting system – possibly via web, for homeowners to report to the Ministry of the Environment
- more information on water quality
- McMaster Professors (respondent was not specific about how professors could be involved)
- help installing backup water cistern in basement and with drilling a deeper well
- municipal assistance

**QUESTION 7: DO YOU HAVE ANY LOCAL INFORMATION OR DATA THAT YOU BELIEVE WOULD BE USEFUL FOR THE GREENSVILLE SUBWATERSHED STUDY?**

The responses received to this question included notes about available data, suggestions and comments about personal circumstances:

- Data: EAs (Steeley Landfill) and hydrogeological studies; a report examining the water resources of the Greenville area prepared by Gartner Lee sometime in the 1970s
- Suggestion: do something with the Crooks Hollow Water Reservoir (e.g., replace the dam, keep water in reservoir all year, stock with fish)
- Suggestion: check with the former G.A.S.P Association of Greenville
- Personal Circumstance: well is gradually running dry

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

The additional comments received included a series of questions and comments, as listed below.

**Questions:**

- 1) How many new wells have been dug in the area by local businesses?
- 2) Are there regulatory means to limit local businesses from taking too much water?
- 3) Why are we having such low levels in the past 3-5 years?

- 4) If the aquifer runs north to south and if the neighbour to the north runs their wash water into the stream between our properties should we be concerned?
- 5) What are the future plans for the area?
- 6) If we continue to experience summers of drought, what are the options?
- 7) Is there enough water in the aquifer for a deeper well?
- 8) Is a cistern my only other option?
- 9) Will City water be brought in and what kind of cost will this incur?
- 10) If there is a plan to install municipal sewers and/or water in the next 5-7 years, why do inspections on septic systems with resulting costs?

**Comments:**

- We have had to purchase water 3 times per year even though we have a well, cistern, and third holding tanks.
- There are only two people living at this house, and we conserve water diligently.
- Developers have huge resources and no consideration for residents. Developers have recontoured land, removed trees, added pavement and not planned for drainage, causing havoc on community. Complaints to City have gone unheard.
- New residents to Greenville have no restraint regarding water consumption and in the summer use automatic irrigation systems daily and pesticides. Neighbour's behaviour is appalling.
- Issues: Groundwater contamination from agriculture, quarries and domestic pesticide/septic systems
- Any future development must take into account the limited and finite supply of groundwater provided by the aquifer, especially since the city is not required to provide the community with municipal water.

## APPENDIX A: AGENDA

### Greensville Community Subwatershed Study & Act for Clean Water Public Information Centre #1

Wednesday, November 21, 2007

5:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.

Christ Church, 92 Highway #8  
Hamilton, Ontario

---

## AGENDA

### *Purpose of the Public Information Centre:*

- *Introduce Greensville Community Subwatershed Study and the planning team*
- *Share ideas on issues, goals and objectives for the future of the subwatershed*
- *Share information on Septic System Management Awareness and the Clean Water Act*
- *Build awareness of the Abandoned Water Well Decommissioning Program, water conservation and other best management practices, and funding opportunities*

**5:00 pm      Open House**

**7:00 pm      Welcome to Participants**  
Elizabeth Panicker, City of Hamilton

**Meeting Purpose and Agenda Review**  
Susan Hall, Lura Consulting

**7:05 pm      Overview of the Greensville Community Subwatershed Study**  
Dave Maunder, Aquafor Beech  
Question and Answer

**7:20 pm      Source Water Protection Issues**  
Sheila O'Neal, Hamilton Conservation Authority  
Katherine Rentsch, Ontario Rural Wastewater Centre  
Question and Answer

**8:00 pm      Workshop – Roundtable Discussions**

**8:55 pm      Closing Remarks/Next Steps**  
Susan Hall, Lura Consulting

**Raffle Draw**

**9:00 pm      Adjourn**