

Report to Council

Report Title: Durham Street Bridge Replacement

Prepared By: Nicholas Schnurr, Director of Operations

Department: Operations

Date: June 6, 2023

Report Number: PW2023-14

File Number: C11PW, T11DU

Attachments:

Recommendation:

That the Council of the Municipality of Brockton hereby receives Report Number PW2023-14 – Durham Street Bridge Replacement, prepared by Nicholas Schnurr, Director of Operations and in doing so directs staff to engage in communications with the County of Bruce staff to obtain additional information and further advance option number _____ and in doing so, indicates Brockton Council’s support for said option.

Report:

Background:

The County of Bruce identified the Durham Street Bridge as requiring replacement within the next 1-5 years. The County proceeded with the Environmental Assessment Process that requires the input of residents, businesses, first nations and the lower tier municipality. Bruce County has held multiple public meetings to present the options and seek input from members of the public, local businesses, first nations and the lower tier municipality prior to coming to a final decision on the preferred detour and structure replacement options. The County staff have also met with Municipal staff on various occasions as they proceed with various aspects of the plan related to roads infrastructure, emergency services and the business community.

The County has been invited to attend the Municipality of Brockton June 6, 2023 Council meeting to present to Council and seek input on the proposed options.

Analysis:

Residents and businesses alike, have been actively providing feedback on the county project to assist the county in the EA process to determine the most suitable solution during the disruption of the bridge replacement.

Options that have been talked about include the construction of an additional permanent structure at a different location, a temporary traffic bridge and a temporary or permanent pedestrian bridge. Other

alternatives that are being discussed include a shuttle service from one side of the river to the other along a proposed detour route that takes traffic outside of town with no temporary or additional permanent structure identified.

The current, county proposed detour would come with certain improvements to municipal roads. In the event that the proposed detour on Yonge Street North by lobbies park, up to Concession 2 and over to County Road 19 would be utilized, the roads would be rehabilitated to Brockton standards (half load roads). While improvements were being planned for due to flooding concerns along Yonge Street North some of these improvements would otherwise not be undertaken at this time and would be advanced as a result of this project. Overall the improvements will benefit the Municipality long-term. Bruce County would be responsible for road widening, intersection improvements and the top lift of asphalt at no cost to Brockton along this route. Speed limits are proposed to be reduced during the detour period. The County and Brockton are in discussions that if this detour is utilized, intersection signals and crosswalk are being considered for the intersection of Yonge and Durham Streets. Further discussion will continue as this project advances.

While the Brockton portion of the upgrades to the proposed detour route are not considered imminent, staff acknowledge that the benefit of the County contributions to the proposed route and traffic signals are significant to Brockton and would greatly benefit the residents and businesses alike during construction of the new bridge and beyond.

It is important that council consider all of the options presented by the county. These options come at costs of varying degrees, but will inevitably come from the residents own pockets. The replacement of the Durham Street Bridge is an unavoidable cost that is required to maintain safe transportation from one side of the river to the other. The other options such as a permanent or temporary vehicle bridge, while not considered a requirement, are costly options that are funded by the tax payers and will increase the overall levy to the county, paid by our residents and businesses alike.

Should council wish to have County staff seek further information on options in place of, or in addition to the detour, three options are laid out below for consideration.

Option 1 - Temporary pedestrian bridge (Least cost prohibitive)

This option notes that the county has provided for the transportation of pedestrians from one side of the bridge to the other by way of shuttle. While this may be effective, there is concern from residents and businesses that the shuttle may not be able to operate for long enough hours to accommodate all resident needs and still limits residents freely accessing the other side of the community on their own time. Staff could further this conversation with county staff to impress the need for residents to cross on foot. This option was previously presented at a cost of \$2.6M plus engineering costs.

Option 2 - Contribute to the construction of a permanent pedestrian bridge

While this option has not necessarily been presented by the county, it has been communicated by staff as a priority over a temporary pedestrian bridge and would result in a great improvement for the town's overall trail network. Having a permanent structure in the right location could link up walking trails throughout Walkerton. It is important to recognize that this would be a permanent improvement that benefits the town long term and could result in a cost sharing request to pursue. This cost is anticipated to be higher than the

temporary pedestrian structure and would require additional investigation on best location if Brockton Council was in favour of this option.

Option 3 - Temporary Traffic Bridge (Most cost prohibitive)

This option has been presented by the county as a detour alternative, with an estimated cost of \$6.3 million plus the cost of engineering. It is important to note that while this option would allow traffic to detour through town, it would still require a complete closure of the bridge for an anticipated two months with no in town detour.

We seek a consensus from Council to provide direction to the County staff related to the preferred alternative for the EA Process.

Strategic Action Plan Checklist:

What aspect of the Brockton Strategic Action Plan does the content/recommendations in this report help advance?

- | | |
|---|-----|
| • Recommendations help move the Municipality closer to its Vision | Yes |
| • Recommendations contribute to achieving Heritage, Culture, and Community | Yes |
| • Recommendations contribute to achieving Quality of Life | Yes |
| • Recommendations contribute to achieving Land Use Planning and the Natural Environment | N/A |
| • Recommendations contribute to achieving Economic Development | Yes |
| • Recommendations contribute to achieving Municipal Governance | Yes |

Financial Impacts/Source of Funding:

- Do the recommendations represent a sound financial investment from a sustainability perspective?
N/A

Potential impact on future budget years if council decides to contribute, indirect financial increase to the residents of Brockton as their tax dollars will fund the costs through the County levy.

Reviewed By:



Trish Serratore, Chief Financial Officer

Respectfully Submitted by:



Nicholas Schnurr, Director of Operations

Reviewed By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sonya Watson", with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Sonya Watson, Chief Administrative Officer