

APPROVED BY MUNICIPALITY

Question	Response
<p>1. How will the bridge closure (regardless of whether temporary or permanent) affect emergency services response time and/or fire services response time to the 129 residents (which swells to >200 seasonally) of Dean Lake Road, Chevis Road, Willis Road, Woodside Road, Lakeview Road, Mississauga Bay Road, Ferris Road, Jerome Road, and Hartt Road? Please also identify how the Emergency Management Program Committee and the Emergency Control Group will determine this.</p>	<p>Municipality Since 2020, municipal emergency services have relied on Chevis Road as the primary access route, with the Iron Bridge Fall Hall located 10 km away resulting in a 13-minute response time. In comparison, using the highway reduces the distance to 7km and the response time to 6 minutes. The EMPC and ECG will assess these impacts through scenario planning and contingency measures to ensure response times remain within acceptable limits.</p>
<p>2. For the purposes of roadway design, construction, and/or maintenance, please advise if the roadways under jurisdiction of the Municipality are classified in similar fashion to the classification system prescribed by the MTO. If not aligned to the MTO system, please advise as to what process is employed by the Municipality for classification. Conversely, If aligned with the MTO classification system, please confirm whether Chevis Road specifically is considered a Class C Gravel Road, and if so, please confirm that the current maintenance program associated with a Class C Gravel Road is being implemented for Chevis Road specifically. If not, why not, and will this be corrected given the increasingly unsafe conditions.</p>	<p>Kresin Engineering Road classifications for Minimum Maintenance Standards O.Reg.239/02 are numbers 1 through 6. MTO functional classifications are: local, collector, arterial, freeway. Some typical industry terminology: Class A pavement is asphalt with curb and gutter; Class B is asphalt with ditches; Class C is surface treatment with ditches.</p> <p>Municipality The Municipality adheres to the Ontario Regulation 239/02 Minimum Maintenance Standards for Municipal Highways (MMS) for the classification and maintenance of all municipal roadways. Road classifications are determined based on factors such as Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) and posted speed limits. Based on the Average Daily Traffic and posted speed limit, Chevis Road is classified as a Class 5 road under O. Reg. 239/02 which includes the following maintenance standards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Snow accumulation: must be cleared to ensure road is passable within 24 hours after the end of a snow event 2. Icy Road Conditions: Must treat the road (e.g. sanding, salting) within 48 hours of becoming aware of icy conditions 3. Potholes: on gravel roads, surface irregularities must be addressed within 30 days after being identified.

APPROVED BY MUNICIPALITY

APPROVED BY MUNICIPALITY

Question		Response
3.	Please advise as to how Council will determine the required actions or steps to address the impact of increased traffic on Chevis Road in consideration of the bridge closure (regardless of whether temporary or permanent).	Municipality Council will assess the impact of increased traffic on Chevis Road through a combination of consultation with the Public Works Department and input from Engineers. PW Staff have monitored road conditions to identify areas requiring immediate maintenance or upgrades and recommendations for mitigating the impact, such as road improvements and improved signage will be presented to Council for consideration. These actions are currently underway and will be incorporated into the 2025 budget, upon Council approval.
4.	How will public input be incorporated into the decision-making process for the bridge's future?	Kresin Engineering In accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) process, or as otherwise directed by Council. Municipality Council may wish to hold an information session following Kresin's detailed inspection report to present findings, potential rehabilitation options, and to seek feedback for consideration alongside technical and financial analyses to ensure decisions reflect priorities and concerns of the community as a whole.
5.	How will Council ensure reasonable transparency and communication with the public throughout this period of evaluation and decision-making?	Kresin Engineering In accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) process. Municipality Further, Council will maintain transparency through regular updates at Council meetings which are open to the public and documented in meeting minutes. Additionally, the Municipality's website and social media platforms will be used to share updates, key documents, and timelines. Public Notices may also be issued to ensure widespread awareness of significant developments.

APPROVED BY MUNICIPALITY

APPROVED BY MUNICIPALITY

Question	Response
6. After Council representatives met with residents on June 21, 2023, what efforts were made to secure alternative funding (e.g., grants, provincial envelopes, etc.) based on the pricing estimates prepared by the engineer under contract with the Municipality at the time? Will a similar process and/or new efforts be made? If so, by who? Has the Municipality considered reaching out to grant application specialists as was suggested at the June 2023 meeting?	Municipality Following the June 21, 2023, meeting with residents, the Municipality undertook several initiatives to explore potential funding sources for the Dean Lake Bridge. The Municipality reached out to GrantMatch to research available grants or funding opportunities for large infrastructure projects, such as roads and bridges. In addition, Council requested a delegation with the Minister of Infrastructure at the Ontario Good Roads Association (OGRA) Conference to specifically discuss the condition of the Dean Lake Bridge and to advocate for financial support. Despite these efforts, no additional funding opportunities were identified through this delegation. Future efforts will include re-evaluating available grant programs based on updated cost estimates provided by Kresin Engineering following direction from Council.
7. What funds does the Municipality have now and/or as part of the upcoming budget that can be allocated to the costs associated with any of the potential rehabilitation options and how will allocation of these monies be determined.	Municipality The Municipality's current reserves and potential budget allocations for 2025 will be reviewed to determine available funding for bridge rehabilitation. Allocation decisions will be based on Kresin Engineering feasibility studies and preliminary cost estimates. In addition to the internal budget review process, the Municipality has scheduled meetings with Infrastructure Ontario to discuss the Dean Lake Bridge and explore potential funding opportunities or financial support mechanisms to assist with rehabilitation costs. Council will review staff recommendations in open public council as part of the annual budget deliberations, considering both internal financial capacity and any external funding options identified through discussions with Infrastructure Ontario
8. What funds does the Municipality have now and/or as part of the upcoming budget that can be allocated to the costs associated with any of the potential roadway upgrades and/or increased maintenance requirements and how will allocation of these monies be determined.	Municipality Funds for roadway upgrades and increased maintenance due to traffic changes will be identified through the budget process. Public Works staff will provide cost estimates for necessary improvements, which will be incorporated into the draft 2025 budget. Council will determine the final allocations in open public council based on priority needs and financial capacity.

APPROVED BY MUNICIPALITY

APPROVED BY MUNICIPALITY

Question		Response
9.	Are there any legal or regulatory considerations that could influence the choice of rehabilitation strategy? For example, permits, the provincial Environmental Assessment process, engagement with other interested stakeholders (e.g., Mississauga First Nation), etc.?	Kresin Engineering The MCEA lists requirements for compliance with the EA Act. Permits may be necessary for in-water work – DFO and MNR. Municipality Consultation requirements with Indigenous communities will also be required. Staff will coordinate with regulatory bodies to ensure all legal requirements are met before proceeding with any rehabilitation or replacement option.
10.	Will contingency plans be developed if the interim repairs do not allow for the bridge to be reopened as anticipated (should this rehabilitation option be selected)? If so, by who and what will the considerations be?	Municipality If interim repairs are not feasible or do not allow the Dean Lake Bridge to be reopened, the primary contingency plan will focus on maintaining and upgrading Chevis Road to accommodate the increased traffic resulting from the bridge closure. Specifically, these contingency measures may include ongoing assessment of Chevis Road conditions, roadway upgrades, and increased maintenance. Council will review and approve these contingency measures based on recommendations by staff and engineers, ensuring that public safety and road reliability remain a priority in the absence of the Dean Lake Bridge access.
11.	What precipitated the decision to engage a new engineering firm (through a public RFQ process) and what was the intent of this procurement?	Municipality The decision to engage Kresin Engineering through an RFQ process was influenced by recommendations made during the 2023 public information session, where it was suggested that the Municipality either obtain a second set of eyes on the Dean Lake Bridge or have Tulloch Engineering’s report peer-reviewed. Council agreed that having a fresh set of eyes would provide an objective, comprehensive evaluation of the bridge’s condition and potential solutions.
12.	KRESIN LETTER (January 10, 2025):	

APPROVED BY MUNICIPALITY

APPROVED BY MUNICIPALITY

Question	Response
12.a) What specific observations or factors related to the deterioration of the bridge led to the recommendation for immediate closure? Further, could mitigations have been implemented sooner to avoid closure?	<p>Kresin Engineering</p> <p>Review of historical inspection and investigation reports coupled with observations made in the late fall of 2024 led to the closure recommendation. The condition of the structure appears to have deteriorated to an extent where the load carrying capacity of some critical elements is likely reduced to a level where the safety of bridge users is at risk.</p> <p>In order to re-open the bridge, the extent of deterioration needs to be detailed and a repair plan implemented.</p>
12.b) The letter suggests that KRESIN will provide pricing for a detailed inspection. However, it is understood that KRESIN has already been retained to undertake a Feasibility Study (as documented in the “Regular Meeting Minutes; 24-28; September 11, 2024), a component of which includes an evaluation of the current truss configuration. It is assumed that this evaluation included a detailed inspection given the recent bridge closure recommendation. As such, what specific and “new” components will be included? Is the cost estimate to be provided associated with “Task 1” referenced in the January 10 KRESIN letter?	<p>Kresin Engineering</p> <p>The scope of work for the feasibility study did not include the completion of a detailed inspection of the entire structure, rather the study was intended to focus on alternatives for deck rehabilitation. An evaluation of the trusses was proposed as part of the feasibility study to compare the impacts of alternative deck technologies.</p> <p>A detailed inspection is required (Task 1) in order to obtain the necessary measurements and information required to accurately model the structural performance of the entire bridge under various load scenarios. This will identify the limiting components (weak links) and guide the extent of repairs needed.</p>
12.c) What is the delta between the Option 3 cost and the cost for the interim repair strategy suggested in Task 2?	<p>Kresin Engineering</p> <p>The extent of interim repairs needed cannot be confirmed until the modelling and analysis is complete following the detailed inspection. Costs for the interim repairs will be estimated once the designs have been completed.</p>

APPROVED BY MUNICIPALITY

APPROVED BY MUNICIPALITY

Question	Response
12.d) What is an anticipated timeline for Option 3 vs Task 2 (if these are , in fact, different)?	<p>Kresin Engineering</p> <p>The intent of Task 2: Interim Repair Strategy is to implement immediate temporary repairs to enable the safe reopening of the bridge for passenger vehicles. It is hoped that temporary repairs could be completed quickly and economically to provide a short-term reprieve during which the Municipality can finalize an approach to rehabilitate the bridge.</p> <p>Option 3 is intended to be a long-term rehabilitation maintaining the current load 10 tonne limit.</p>
12.e) How did KRESIN arrive at the cost estimates identified for each of the options and would these estimates be considered Class E (i.e., rough order of magnitude and +/- 30%-40%)?	<p>Kresin Engineering</p> <p>The cost estimates provided were based largely on values presented in previous reports as well as consideration of our team’s experience on other similar projects. Cost estimates are to be considered intermediate with a very low level of project definition, suitable for concept/feasibility discussions.</p>
12.f) Could Option 3 be considered a Schedule A or a Schedule A+ (as related to the provincial Environmental Assessment process)?	<p>Kresin Engineering</p> <p>It is our understanding that Option 3 may be considered “Exempt” or “Eligible for Screening” in accordance with the MCEA.</p>
12.g) For Option 5, what would that cost be reduced by if attempting to install new bridge on existing foundation (based on whatever metric was used to develop the currently stated estimated cost of \$15 million for Option 5)?	<p>Kresin Engineering</p> <p>The cost estimate presented in Option 5 includes reusing existing, repaired foundations.</p>
12.h) Are there any potential environmental impacts associated with each of the proposed rehabilitation options? Will this evaluation form a portion of the “Task 1” activities to be undertaken by KRESIN?	<p>Kresin Engineering</p> <p>Task 1 is solely focused on short-term repairs needed to reopen the bridge as quickly as possible.</p> <p>Environmental impacts of the rehabilitation alternatives will be assessed during Task 3.</p>

APPROVED BY MUNICIPALITY

APPROVED BY MUNICIPALITY

Question		Response
12.i)	Are there any potential environmental impacts associated with roadway upgrade tasks that will be required regardless of which rehabilitation option is selected? Will this evaluation form a portion of the “Task 1” activities to be undertaken by KRESIN?	Kresin Engineering Roadway upgrade impacts will be evaluated during Task 3.
12.j)	What are the long-term maintenance plans and costs associated with each option presented by KRESIN? If not determined yet, how will this be determined, and will this be evaluated as part of Task 1?	Kresin Engineering These items will be addressed during the completion of Task 3.
13.	What is the timeline for Task 1? While it is acknowledged that there is much to evaluate, spring will be upon us soon and likely presenting an even greater challenge as related to the Chevis Road detour.	Kresin Engineering It is anticipated that modelling and analysis will be completed during the month of February. A progress update will be provided in early March.
14.	What is the timeline for decision-making overall? If this is not currently understood, how will this be determined?	Municipality The timeline will depend on the time required for Kresin Engineering to complete its report, including interim repair feasibility and long-term options for Council’s consideration.
15.	Will contingency plans be developed if the interim repairs do not allow for the bridge to be reopened as anticipated (should this rehabilitation option be selected)? If so, by who and what will the considerations be?	Kresin Engineering We recommend considering this level of planning once the modelling and analysis component of Task 1 is complete; at that time the extent and feasibility of interim repairs will be much better understood.

APPROVED BY MUNICIPALITY
