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1.0 Introduction

In September 2014, Manitoba Infrastructure and Transportation (MIT) through Tetra Tech retained Landmark Planning and Design Inc. to undertake a public consultation process for the First Street Bridge Project. The objectives of the process were to communicate project information to key stakeholders and gain feedback concerning the project.

The public consultation process consists of the following components:

- Preliminary internal and external stakeholder meetings to review project parameters and understand stakeholder concerns or ideas
- A public open house to review project information

This report describes the consultation program components in terms of format, purpose, event notification, attendance and participant feedback/input¹, and summary remarks.

2.0 Stakeholder Meetings (Preliminary)

2.1 Format and Purpose

Key stakeholder meetings were carried out in order to discuss key project parameters with identified stakeholders, and to understand stakeholder concerns or ideas. Meetings were held with the following stakeholders:

- City of Brandon (Mayor and CAO)
- CP Rail Utilities
- Emergency Services
- Brandon Transit
- Brandon School Division
- Brandon Chamber of Commerce
- Recreation Development Department
- Community Services Department
- Manitoba Trucking Association

2.2 Participant Feedback/Input

At each of the stakeholder meetings, project representatives informed participants of the proposed project parameters. Participants shared information concerning their respective interests and concerns.

The following notes summarize key discussion points from various stakeholders (see Appendix A for copy of the meeting minutes):

- City of Brandon – There was discussion about the options to rehabilitate or replace the existing bridge. Participants inquired about the cost and design of a new bridge and made suggestions about elements they thought should be considered during the design process. The consultation process was reviewed. Details on how Council and

¹ Results presented in this report should not be considered scientifically derived or statistically relevant. Input received is from a non-random participant group.
the general public would be involved and informed were discussed. Further conversations included how the bridge design and construction would impact the Pacific Avenue intersection.

- RCMP, Brandon Transit, Brandon Recreation and Community Service Departments – Discussions focused on the design of a new bridge and what safety measures would be implemented for cyclists and the general public. Further design considerations were noted relating to maintenance of the bridge and impact on surrounding park areas.
- Police Service, School Division and Chamber of Commerce – Justification for prioritizing this project over other bridge projects (Daly Overpass) was clarified. Matters of design such as flood protection, impact on surrounding park areas and the potential need to acquire addition lands were discussed.

### 3.0 Public Open House

#### 3.1 Format and Purpose
A Public Open House was held on November 17, 2014 at the Royal Oak Inn in conjunction with a Public Open House for the PTH 110 Westerly Extension Route Planning project (also an MIT project). The Open House was held in traditional open house format, with a series of display boards illustrating various project parameters. Project representatives were available to respond to questions and to talk with participants. Participants were asked to register their name and address and to fill out a written response form prior to leaving the open house. The display boards provided the following information (see Appendix B for a copy of the display boards):

- Welcome
- Context Plan
- Existing Structure
- Current Project Status
- Alternatives
- Existing Cross Section
- Rehabilitation Option Cross Section
- Replacement Option Cross Section
- Replacement Option Pier Adjustments
- Evaluation
- Project Timing
- Public Information Sessions
- Daly Overpass
- Thank You

#### 3.2 Notification and Attendance
The Public Open House was advertised in the *Brandon Sun* on two occasions leading up to the event. Approximately 20 people attended the Public Open House. Open House invitations were provided to businesses and homes directly in the vicinity of the bridge. Copies of notification materials are provided in Appendix C.

#### 3.3 Information Session Participants
The Public Open House dealt with two important MIT projects which are in close proximity to one another in the Brandon Area. Attendance was recorded as a whole as all participants took time to consider the information on both projects. Of the 20 attendees, approximately half indicated that they were primarily interested in the First Street Bridge Project. Several
attendees completed comment sheets, the results of which are presented in this report. A copy of the comment sheet is provided in Appendix D. Participants were advised that the display materials were available upon request to be emailed to them and comment sheets could be returned via fax or email as an alternative to returning them at the meeting.

Figure 1.0 illustrates that the majority of respondents resided in Brandon (7). A couple of respondents noted either residing in the RM of Cornwallis (1) or other areas not specifically identified on the comment sheet (1).

Figure 1.0  Respondents – Residence

Figure 2.0 illustrates that the majority of respondents (56%) used the bridge a few times per week. Fewer respondents (22%) used the bridge several times a day and another 22% of respondents reported using the bridge at a different frequency than had been suggested.

Figure 2.0  Frequency of Bridge Use
Figure 3.0 illustrates respondent’s primary interest in the project. Approximately 42% (5) of respondents reported either living in Brandon or in the project vicinity. 17% (2) of respondents used the bridge for active transportation. The majority of respondents (42%) reported other interests in the project such as an interest in city development, the impact the project might have on flooding and the bridge being used as an alternative exit from the city or for commuting to and from work.

**Figure 3.0 Project Interest**

![Chart](chart.png)

3.4 Bridge Replacement vs. Bridge Rehabilitation

Participants were asked if they understood the reason why MIT would prefer to replace the First Street Bridge rather than rehabilitate it as outlined in the materials presented.

Figure 4.0 illustrates that eight respondents (89%) understood MIT’s preference to replace the bridge rather than to rehabilitate it. Only one respondent somewhat understood the reasoning to replace the existing bridge. No respondents indicated that the selection rational was unclear.

**Figure 4.0 Understanding Need to Replace Bridge**

![Chart](chart.png)
3.5 Participant Feedback/Input

3.5.1 Bridge Design

Participants were asked if they had suggestions for the study team to consider when completing a detailed design for the bridge.

The two most common suggestions made by respondents were to ensure that active transportation and flood prevention measures were addressed sufficiently. One respondent proposed better overhead lighting be installed.

Comments included:
- Raise the 1st Street so that when we do have flooding the bridge is not closed.
- Build it strong.
- Make the walking and bicycle paths wide.
- Have PTH1 traffic access both ways during construction - as indicated on your plans.
- Better overhead lighting.
- Increase the river cross-section.
- Connections on all four corner to active transportation paths. Future bike lane on Pacific Avenue will be essential.
- Make sure the access to the new bridge is planned during bridge design and that it is flood proof for constant use during flooding. The bridge rebuild is appropriate but lane access to and from the bridge also needs to be re-designed.
- Ensure there are walking and biking lanes on both sides of the bridge.

3.5.2 Other Comments

Participants were asked to provide any other comments they had regarding this project.

Comments included:
- Replace the existing bridge; in the long run it will save taxpayers money.
- Solve flooding of roadway.
- Look forward to the project being completed.
- Hope to see the project move forward quickly.
- Replacement is the correct option. This plan should be designed to add a new route in the field that is flood proof. The existing lanes along the river can then be abandoned and turned into a walkway.

3.5.3 Process Efficacy

Participants were asked if the information session was helpful in improving their understanding of the project.

All respondents reported that the information session was helpful.

Comments included:
- Very helpful.
- Great explanations from project representatives.
4.0 Summary Remarks

The public consultation process is considered both thorough and adequate for a project of this scale and nature. Feedback from specific stakeholders groups and members of the general public will be incorporated into project decision making.
## RECORD OF MEETING

### Title:
PTH 1A Bridge (City of Brandon, MIT)

### Date of Meeting:
Sep 22, 2014

### Time:
1:00-2:00 PM

### Location:
Brandon City Hall

### In Attendance:
- Scott Hildebrand, City of Brandon, City Manager
- Patrick Pulak, P. Eng, City of Brandon, Director of Engineering Service & Water Resources
- Alexia Stangherlin, P. Eng, City of Brandon, Manager of Infrastructure
- Vaibhav Banthia, P. Eng, Tetratech
- Dan McIntosh, P. Eng, MIT
- Denise Jubenville, P. Eng, MIT
- Randy Fingas, P. Eng, MIT
- Bob Kurylko, P. Eng, Stantec
- Donovan Toews, Landmark Planning
- Dan Penner, Landmark Planning

### Item | Description
--- | ---
1. | **Introductions and Project Overview**
   - Introductions were made and DT explained the reason for meeting. After a feasibility study was conducted, it was determined that it may be better to replace the First Street bridge instead of the original plan to rehabilitate it.
   - DT explained the two bridge alternatives, one for rehabilitation and one for replacement. DT then provided the evaluative criteria that showed the pros and cons of each alternative. DT stated that a key consideration is the long-term functional benefits of replacement over rehabilitation, especially considering that the life cycle costing is almost equal.
### 2. General Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q: What are the financial implications?</td>
<td>A: Both options are estimated at $35m based on a life-cycle cost analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: How do you replace the bridge without stopping traffic?</td>
<td>A: Reconstruction would be done in two phases, keeping one lane of traffic open both ways throughout construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: What is the difference between replace and remediate?</td>
<td>A: Replacing would mean construction of a completely new bridge (two separate spans), while remediation would mean repairing the existing infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: How is the intersection at Pacific likely to be affected?</td>
<td>A: This will have to be considered as part of the bridge design process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: Have you considered the implications for utilities?</td>
<td>A: Yes, there will be ongoing discussion with utilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: Will you consider re-grading the intersection and street grade coming into Pacific St. in the bridge design?</td>
<td>A: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: How much higher will the new bridge be over the tracks?</td>
<td>A: That’s not determined yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: Was the First Street bridge chosen over the Daly Overpass because of current condition?</td>
<td>A: Yes. The Daly Overpass work will follow the First Street Bridge work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: Will you incorporate river monitoring into the bridge design?</td>
<td>A: It is something that we can pass on to the design team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Public Consultation

DT described the consultation process and mentioned the importance of communicating to residents on why this project is being undertaken prior to the Daly overpass.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q: Will you reach out and connect with City council?</td>
<td>A: Yes, we will connect with them in the near future, with the current election in consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: Will you include the Brandon public in the consultation process?</td>
<td>A: Yes, we will plan a consultation event targeted at the Brandon general public in the form of an open house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: At these meetings, will you provide a background on why the First Street bridge is a priority?</td>
<td>A: We will make sure that this is considered in the content of the open house.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# RECORD OF MEETING

**Title:**  
PTH 1A Bridge Meeting (Tier 1 stakeholders)

**Date of Meeting:**  
Oct 14, 2014

**Time:**  
10:00-11:30AM

**Location:**  
Brandon Provincial Building

**In Attendance:**  
- Greg Anderson, Brandon Police Service  
- Ron Harkness, Brandon School Division  
- Jordan Ludwig, Brandon Chamber of Commerce  
- Dan Burns, Brandon Chamber of Commerce  
- Tyler Rice, Brandon Chamber of Commerce  
- Bob Kurylko, P. Eng, Stantec  
- Denise Jubenvill, P. End, MIT  
- Brian Kayes, City of Brandon, Director of Emergency Coordination  
- Donovan Toews, Landmark Planning  
- Dan Penner, Landmark Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.   | **Introductions and Project Overview**  
Introductions were made and DT explained the reason for meeting. After a feasibility study was conducted, it was determined that it may be better to replace the First Street bridge instead of the original plan to rehabilitate it.  
DT explained the two bridge alternatives, one for rehabilitation and one for replacement. DT then provided the evaluative criteria that showed the pros and cons of each alternative. DT stated that a key consideration is the long-term functional benefits of replacement over rehabilitation, especially considering that the life cycle costing is almost equal. | |
2. **General Questions**

Q: How does that capital cost for the First St. bridge compare to the 18\textsuperscript{th} St. bridge?
A: The capital cost for the 18\textsuperscript{th} St. bridge was not known by those attending the meeting. We will look for an answer.
Q: Would you stop construction on the bridge if seasonal flooding occurs?
A: Probably, depending on water levels.
Q: 18\textsuperscript{th} Street has a bottlenecking issue, why was this not put first?
A: The condition of the First Street bridge has made it a priority for MIT – since rehabilitation is required immediately and replacement is about the same cost, it makes sense to replace the bridge even though Daly Overpass also needs attention. MIT will look at Daly next.
Q: How accurate is the $38 million figure for replacement, will there be overruns?
A: It is a draft high-level estimate. MIT does not plan on overruns.
Q: What will the replacement alignment look like; will there be flood protection on First Street?
A: Floor protection priority is on 18\textsuperscript{th} St. and PTH 110. Raising First Street is not a part of this project.
Q: How does the replacement option affect Pacific Avenue?
A: There will likely be a grading change that will be considered in the design.
Q: Will there still be North and South access on Pacific after completion?
A: Yes.
Q: Will land acquisition be required?
A: Property acquisition may be required, but the project team will try to avoid this.
Q: Could land acquisition delay the project?
A: No, land expropriation could be used as required.
Q: Could higher than average soil moisture levels delay construction?
A: This will not be an issue with construction.
Q: How does recreation in surrounding parks have an impact on the bridge design?
A: The design team will try to avoid using existing park land and will generally maintain existing access to the parks.

6. **Next Steps**

DT explained that the next steps involve finalizing the stakeholder list and scheduling consultation sessions with them. An open house will also be scheduled for the Brandon general public in November.

Recorded by: Dan Penner

October 14, 2014
RECORD OF MEETING

Title: PTH1A Bridge (City of Brandon) (Tier 1 stakeholders)

Date of Meeting: Oct 14, 2014

Time: 12:00-1:30PM

Location: Brandon Provincial Building

In Attendance: Mike Boychuk, Blue Hills RCMP, Brandon Detachment
Bryce Wilson, City of Brandon, Manager of Recreation Development
Perry Roque, City of Brandon, Community Services Director
Carla Richardson, City of Brandon, Brandon Transit Manager
Bob Kurylko, P. Eng, Stantec
Denise Jubenville, P. Eng, MIT
Donovan Toews, Landmark Planning
Dan Penner, Landmark Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Introductions and Project Overview</strong>&lt;br&gt;Introductions were made and DT explained the reason for meeting: After a feasibility study was conducted, it was determined that it may be better to replace the First St. bridge instead of the original plan to rehabilitate it. DT explained the two bridge alternatives, one for rehabilitation and one for replacement. DT then provided the evaluative criteria that showed the pros and cons of each alternative. DT stated that a key consideration is the long-term functional benefits of replacement over rehabilitation, especially considering that the life cycle costing is almost equal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **General Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q: Will the bridge design ensure that the sidewalks are wide enough for maintenance (i.e. snow clearing)?</th>
<th>A: The replacement design has sidewalks wide enough to accommodate maintenance equipment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q: Will you look at the transition from the North side of the bridge onto pathways below the bridge?</td>
<td>A: Yes, that will be a consideration in the design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: How will cyclists transition onto the bridge?</td>
<td>A: We will work with AT planners at the City of Brandon to address this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: Will First Street be raised north of the bridge for flood protection?</td>
<td>A: That will not be considered in the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: Will you look at the safety issue of potential jumpers?</td>
<td>A: We will look at handrail protection in the design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: How will the construction phase accommodate cyclists and pedestrians?</td>
<td>A: The construction phase would see half of the bridge being used at a time, including one sidewalk for pedestrians and cyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: Will the replacement option have the same footprint as the current bridge?</td>
<td>A: It would be very close to the current footprint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: Will the South entrance of the bridge affect Errol Black park?</td>
<td>A: The design team will try to limit building on the park lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: Will the funding for this project come only from the Province?</td>
<td>A: Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Next Steps**

DT explained that the next steps will include finalizing the stakeholder list and scheduling meetings with them. An open house for the Brandon general public will be held in November.

---

Recorded by: Dan Penner
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First Street Bridge Project
Bridge Site No. 2582-00
November 2014

WELCOME

The information displayed around the room will help explain the project.

• Please feel free to view the information and speak with anyone wearing a name tag with questions, concerns, or thoughts you may have.

• The project team has been speaking with stakeholder groups such as City of Brandon, CP Rail, Manitoba Trucking Association, landowners, emergency services, utilities, school divisions, and others to hear how the project might affect them and what can be done to address any concerns.

• Our goal for today is to explain the project and provide an opportunity to answer questions and listen to any feedback you may have.

Before leaving, please take a minute or two to fill out a comment sheet. Thank you.
CONTEXT PLAN

EXISTING STRUCTURE

- The bridge was built over 40 years ago in 1972.
- The existing bridge deck, railing, and sidewalk need to be replaced.
- Substructure conditions are poor.
- There is extensive scour within river channel.
CURRENT PROJECT STATUS

- The bridge work was planned as a major rehabilitation (girder strengthening and deck/railing replacement).
- The preliminary design work has revealed much more extensive pier modifications needed:
  - 3 river piers on spread footings (susceptible to scour and undermining in large flood events)
  - 2 piers adjacent to the railway need extensive strengthening to meet current code
  - 2 abutments need extensive modifications to meet current code
  - 1 land pier needs to be replaced (on timber piles)
- As a result, a replacement option has also been reviewed.

ALTERNATIVES

- Rehabilitate Existing Bridge:
  - Replace the bridge deck (two 3.7m lanes in each direction plus 2.0m shy distance)
  - Install new pedestrian railing and median barrier
  - Strengthen the existing girders and add another girder line
  - Widen, strengthen, and repair the existing piers
  - Tie in the roadworks at each end of the bridge
- Replace Existing Bridge:
  - Construct two new structures (one for each direction)
  - Design the bridge for greater clearance over the CP tracks and wider distance between piers and the tracks
  - Tie in roadworks at each end of the new bridges
PRELIMINARY DESIGN

REPLACEMENT OPTION
CROSS SECTION

Full Standard Sidewalk
(Up to 4.2m)

2 – 3.7m Lanes (9.8m total)

Possible Second Sidewalk

Minimum Standard ‘Shy’ Distances

Separate Structures

PRELIMINARY DESIGN

REPLACEMENT OPTION
PIER ADJUSTMENTS

New piers are further apart than existing piers.
All new piers are on piled foundations.
EVALUATION

- This chart is a comparison of the two options.
- Replacing the bridge is the preferred option because there are more benefits than with the rehabilitation option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Replacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lifespan</td>
<td>40 years</td>
<td>75 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Period</td>
<td>2 – 2.5 years</td>
<td>2 – 2.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Construction Stages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access During Construction</td>
<td>1 lane open each direction</td>
<td>1 lane open each direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Risk</td>
<td>Many unknown factors</td>
<td>Few unknown factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearances (maintenance and operation)</td>
<td>Minimum current standards</td>
<td>Fully meets current standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bridge Width (overall)</td>
<td>9.4m</td>
<td>9.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Inspection (dual structure)</td>
<td>Harder (single structure)</td>
<td>Easier (dual structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs (preliminary only; to be refined at detailed design stage)</td>
<td>Initial Capital Cost $27M</td>
<td>$40M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life Cycle Cost (Net Present Value) $41M</td>
<td>$40M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT TIMING

- **Stakeholder consultation**: September 2014 – November 2014
- **Finalize a decision on bridge option**: November 2014
- **Detailed Design**: December 2014 – September 2015
- **Project Tender**: Fall 2015
- **Construction Period**: Late 2015 – Late 2017
# Public Information Sessions

## Meetings with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Brandon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP Rail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent landowners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Groups</td>
<td>September 2014 – November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba Trucking Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Public Open House             | November 2014               |

---

# Daly Overpass

- The construction of Daly Overpass will begin following completion of First Street Bridge.
THANK YOU

Our next steps will be to:

• Review the feedback provided
• Respond to questions as they arise
• Carry out detailed design of new bridges and receive environmental approvals
• Continue working on plans for the Daly Overpass
• Issue a public construction tender
• Carry out construction

Thank you for attending this information session.

Please feel free to fill out a comment sheet before you leave.

Contact Information:
Director of Structures
Manitoba Infrastructure and Transportation
Phone: 204-945-5058
Email: ruth.eden@gov.mb.ca

Project Website:
www.gov.mb.ca/mit/wcs/constructionproj.html
Open House

Share your views
on two provincial projects in the Brandon area

The Manitoba government invites you to attend an open house to share your views on two important projects in the Brandon area:

- identifying a future route to extend PTH 110 westerly from PTH 10 to PTH 1, west of the City of Brandon
- the replacement of the First Street Bridge over the Assiniboine River and CP Rail lines

This event will provide you an opportunity to learn about basic project information for both projects and for you to provide specific input for the PTH 110 project that will assist the study team in identifying route options.

The open house will be held in Brandon:
Monday, November 17, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m. and 6:30 – 8:30 p.m.
Royal Oak Inn, 3130 Victoria Avenue.

For more information please contact:
Donovan Toews at MCIP at 204-453-8008 or email: dtoews@mts.net

Manitoba
OPEN HOUSE COMMENT SHEET
First Street Bridge Project

1. I reside in: □ RM of Cornwallis □ RM of Whitehead
   □ City of Brandon □ Other: ____________________________

2. I use this bridge: □ 1-2 times per day □ Several times per day
   □ A few times a week □ Other: ____________________________

3. I am interested in this project mainly because:
   □ I own a business in the area on ________________________(street name)
   □ I live in the immediate vicinity on ________________________(street name)
   □ I cycle or walk over this bridge
   □ I live in Brandon and use this bridge regularly
   □ Other: ____________________________

4. I understand the reasons why MIT would prefer to replace the First Street bridge rather than rehabilitate it as outlined in the materials presented.
   □ Yes □ No □ Somewhat Comments: ____________________________

5. Do you have any suggestions for the study team to consider when completing the detailed design for the bridge?
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________

6. Do you have any other comments about this project?
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________

7. Was this information session helpful in improving your understanding of this project?
   □ Yes □ No Comments: ____________________________
   ____________________________