

## OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

Tuesday, April 13, 2021 9:30 a.m.

## AGENDA

1. Call to order.
2. Roll call.
3. Disclosure of pecuniary interest and general nature thereof.
4. Adoption of minutes of previous meeting held on March 1 , 2021 (attached).
5. Delegations: None at time of mailing
6. Public Works and Engineering Department

## Page

(a Department Report 3
(b Infrastructure Division Report 61
(c Operations Division Report 87
7. New Business.
8. Closed Meeting - None at time of mailing.
9. Date of next meeting (Tuesday, May 11, 2021) and ad ournment.

NOTE: (a) County Council: Wednesday, April 28, 2021.
(b Submissions received from the public, either orally or in writing may become part of the public record.

## Strategic Plan

Strategic Plan Goal \# 1: To inform the Federal and Provincial government on our unique needs so that Renfrew County residents get their "fair share".

Initiatives:
(a) Create a strategic communications plan
(b) Identify and advocate for issues important to the County of Renfrew.

Strategic Plan Goal \# 2: Fiscal sustainability for the Corporation of the County of Renfrew and its ratepayers.

Initiatives:
(a) Commitment from Council supporting principles within the Long-Term Financial Plan
(b) Establish Contingency Plan to respond to provincial and federal financial pressures and opportunities beyond the Long-Term Financial Plan.

Strategic Plan Goal \# 3: Find cost savings that demonstrate our leadership while still meeting community needs.

Initiatives:
(a) Complete community needs assessment
(b) With identified partners implement plan to optimize service delivery to the benefit of our residents.

Strategic Plan Goal \# 4: Position the County of Renfrew so that residents benefit from advances in technology, to ensure that residents and staff have fair, affordable and reasonable access to technology.

Initiatives:
(a) Ensure that the County of Renfrew is top of the list for Eastern Ontario Regional Network funding for mobile broadband
(b) Lobby for secure and consistent radio systems for first responders and government
(c) Put a County of Renfrew technology strategy in place.

COUNTY OF RENFREW
PUBLIC WORKS AND ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT REPORT

TO: Operations Committee
FROM: Lee Perkins, C.E.T., MBA, Director of Public Works and Engineering
DATE: April 13, 2021
SUBJECT: Department Report

## INFORMATION

## 1. 2020 Unaudited Financial Statements

Attached as Appendix I is a copy of the 2020 Unaudited Financial Statement for the Public Works and Engineering Department as at December 31, 2020.
Mr. Jeffrey Foss, Director of Corporate Services will provide an overview at Committee.

## 2. Capital Program Variance Report

Attached as Appendix II is the Capital Program Variance Report.

## 3. Monthly Project Status Report

Attached as Appendix III is the Monthly Project Status Report.

## RESOLUTIONS

## 4. Arnprior Intersection of County Road 2 (Daniel Street), Edey Street \&

 Galvin Street - Fairgrounds SubdivisionRecommendation: THAT the Operations Committee not approve the request for assistance in financing of the construction of the intersection of Edey Street and County Road 2 (Daniel Street) in the Town of Arnprior;

AND FURTHER THAT staff be directed to review the policy positions of other upper tier municipalities with respect to growth and the upper and lower tier responsibilities for this growth managing and provide a draft policy for review and discussion at a future meeting of the Operations Committee.

## Background

Attached as Appendix IV is a request from the Town of Arnprior for assistance with financing the construction of the intersection of Edey Street and County Road 2 (Daniel Street). An Intersection Review, attached as Appendix V, was completed by Stantec Consulting Ltd. and the Town has approved Option 1 - Realigned Signalized Intersection. The Town is requesting $23 \%$ of the project cost, to a maximum upset limit of $\$ 292,860$ from the County of Renfrew. The County has offered a solution to the situation of right in and right out as this intersection is developer driven and as such should be funded from other sources.

Also, attached as Appendix VI is a presentation by Mr. John Steckly, General Manager of Operations with the Town of Arnprior, which fully explains the timeline of the Development Permit process for the developer and the discussions between the Town and County Staff.

County Staff have several options for Committee to consider:
(a) No funding to be assigned. (Staff recommendation)

- Due to the fact this would be precedent setting where an improvement to a County Road is being driven by a development, the past practice of the County of Renfrew is to not fund these requests.
(b) Combine this project with current Asset Management Plan for 2025.
- In 2025 the County of Renfrew has planned to shave and pave County Road 2 (Daniel Street) from County Road 1 (Madawaska Boulevard) to County Road 10 (Baskin Drive) and a total of $\$ 501,897$ has been budgeted for this. This project could be advanced to 2023 with the additional $\$ 292,860$ forwarded to the Town of Arnprior in 2022 and funded from Capital Reserves. The consequence of moving this project forward would move County

Road 6 (Gillan and Lochwinnoch Road), from Highway 60 to Miller Road to 2025. This potentially could have an impact on the schedule in the Asset Management Plan.
(c) Postpone funding until 2025.

- With this option the County has already revised the conditions of the development permit to accommodate a right in right out only entrance thus allowing development to occur. It is assumed that full development would take several years thus the intersection improvement could be postponed. The funding of the $\$ 292,860$ would come from Capital Reserves in 2025.
(d) Fund from Capital Reserves
- Supply an agreement to the Town of Arnprior in the requested amount of $\$ 292,860$. This would be a one-time funding request with the Town of Arnprior taking the lead with no responsibilities or liabilities to the County of Renfrew. Once the intersection is completed to the satisfaction of the County of Renfrew, the signals and road segments of County Road 2 would be added to the Asset Management Plan.


## Further Discussion

In researching this issue, staff contacted other Eastern Ontario Counties that have experienced similar issues with small to medium size lower tier municipality's growth in keeping with the Municipal Act, Section 55 which provides the framework for the responsibilities of both upper and lower tier as it relates to roads, sidewalks, snow removal, and storm drainage. Staff are seeking direction to develop a Policy for the County of Renfrew and bring it to a future meeting of Committee for review.

## 5. Infrastructure Division

Attached as Appendix VII is the Infrastructure Division Report, prepared by Mr. Taylor Hanrath, Acting Manager of Infrastructure, providing an update on activities.

## 6. Operations Division

Attached as Appendix VIII is the Operations Division Report, prepared by Mr. Richard Bolduc, Manager of Operations, providing an update on activities.

FULL YEAR BUDGET
CAPITAL PROGRAM - EXPENSES
Salaries
Benefits
COVID
Capital Projects - Under Threshold
Legal - Right of Way
Misc
Purchased Services
Recoveries
Infrastructure Management
Supplies

| $\mathbf{5 2 6 , 8 8 4}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{5 4 7}, \mathbf{6 3 4}}$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 3 3 , 0 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 9 , 1 8 8}$ |
| 53,159 | 61,696 |
| 63,548 | 0 |
| 53,221 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 3,121 | 6,000 |
| 0 | 0 |
| $(1,829)$ | 0 |
| 114,199 | 196,250 |
| 8,386 | 24,500 |

1,121,294

| 525,265 | 7,990 | 525,265 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 141,781 | 5,116 | 141,781 |
| 10,000 | 25,355 | 10,000 |

10,000

4,500
13,000
70,000
61,900
7,100
750

41,000
105,448
30,000
5,000
20,000
8,300
4,000
13,500
4,200
450
Recoveries
Recoveries - Federal
Recruitment

| 15,000 | 1,489 | 15,000 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |

Surplus Adjustment - Capital
Staff Training
Telephone
Travel
20,000
11,000
$(10,145)$
$(1,713)$
20,000
11,000
9,100

| MAINTENANCE | 5,324,663 | 5,576,361 | $(251,698)$ | 5,576,361 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salaries | 1,849,803 | 1,895,094 | $(45,291)$ | 1,895,094 |
| Benefits | 469,933 | 513,917 | $(43,984)$ | 513,917 |
| Bridges and Culverts | 31,999 | 20,000 | 11,999 | 20,000 |
| Roadside Maintenance | 110,233 | 200,000 | $(89,767)$ | 200,000 |
| Hard Top Maintenance | 224,214 | 360,000 | $(135,786)$ | 360,000 |
| Loose Top Maintenance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## TREASURER'S REPORT - Operations Committee <br> December 2020

|  | YTD ACTUAL |  |  | FULL YEAR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | YTD BUDGET | VARIANCE | BUDGET |
| Winter Control | 2,183,574 | 2,117,350 | 66,224 | 2,117,350 |
| Safety Devices | 519,718 | 570,000 | $(50,282)$ | 570,000 |
| Misc | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Recoveries | $(64,812)$ | $(100,000)$ | 35,188 | $(100,000)$ |
| EQUIPMENT | 1,279,753 | 1,180,577 | 99,176 | 1,180,577 |
| Salaries | 212,490 | 208,374 | 4,116 | 208,374 |
| Benefits | 60,505 | 61,510 | $(1,005)$ | 61,510 |
| Salary Allocations | $(87,329)$ | $(88,689)$ | 1,360 | $(88,689)$ |
| Small Equipment, Misc | 40,081 | 65,600 | $(25,519)$ | 65,600 |
| Vehicle Operating Costs - Fuel | 368,174 | 425,000 | $(56,826)$ | 425,000 |
| Vehicle Operating Costs - Insurance | 41,586 | 39,782 | 1,804 | 39,782 |
| Vehicle Operating Costs - Licence | 60,293 | 55,000 | 5,293 | 55,000 |
| Vehicle Operating Costs - Repairs \& Supplies | 485,964 | 444,000 | 41,964 | 444,000 |
| Vehicle Operating Revenue | $(17,600)$ | $(20,000)$ | 2,400 | $(20,000)$ |
| Surplus Adjustment - Capital Equipment | 1,018,613 | 889,700 | 128,913 | 889,700 |
| Surplus Adjustment - Trf To Reserves | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Surplus Adjustment - Trf From Reserves | $(889,700)$ | $(889,700)$ | 0 | $(889,700)$ |
| Recoveries | $(13,323)$ | $(10,000)$ | $(3,323)$ | $(10,000)$ |
| HOUSING | 243,445 | 186,550 | 56,895 | 186,550 |
| Operating Expenses | 121,009 | 162,000 | $(40,991)$ | 162,000 |
| COVID | 5,233 | 0 | 5,233 | 0 |
| Major Repairs | 18,184 | 24,550 | $(6,367)$ | 24,550 |
| Surplus Adjustment - Capital | 284,740 | 185,525 | 99,215 | 185,525 |
| Surplus Adjustment - Trf From Reserves | $(185,525)$ | $(185,525)$ | 0 | $(185,525)$ |
| Misc | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Recoveries | (194) | 0 | (194) | 0 |
| OTHER | 20,279,243 | 22,398,888 | $(2,119,645)$ | 22,398,888 |
| Depreciation | 9,507,822 | 9,200,000 | 307,822 | 9,200,000 |
| Surplus Adjustment - Depreciation | $(9,507,822)$ | $(9,200,000)$ | $(307,822)$ | $(9,200,000)$ |
| Surplus Adjustment - Capital Construction | 20,029,243 | 22,398,888 | $(2,369,645)$ | 22,398,888 |
| Surplus Adjustment - TRF to Reserves | 250,000 | 0 | 250,000 | 0 |
| CONSTRUCTION - LABOUR CLEARING ACCOUNT | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ |
| Salaries | 441,292 | 431,493 | 9,799 | 431,493 |
| Benefits | 79,635 | 105,642 | $(26,007)$ | 105,642 |
| Charge to Capital Construction above | $(520,927)$ | $(537,135)$ | 16,208 | $(537,135)$ |
| TOTAL EXPENDITURES | 28,793,420 | 31,011,304 | $(2,217,884)$ | 31,011,304 |

ROADS REVENUES

| Municipal Contribution | $15,689,627$ | $16,899,091$ | $(1,209,464)$ | $16,899,091$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Donations $\ln$ Kind | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

## TREASURER'S REPORT - Operations Committee

December 2020

| $1,357,505$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Provincial Grants \& Subsidies | $1,357,505$ | $1,357,505$ | 0 | $9,914,708$ |
| Surplus Adjustment - TRF from Reserves | $9,533,449$ | $9,914,708$ | $(381,259)$ | $2,750,000$ |
| Surplus Adjustment - Temp Loan | $2,121,974$ | $2,750,000$ | $(628,026)$ | 15,000 |
| Federal Grants \& Subsidies | 0 | 15,000 | $(15,000)$ |  |
| Other Revenue - Capital Asset | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15,864 |
| Misc | 90,864 | 75,000 | 75,000 |  |
| TOTAL REVENUES |  |  |  |  |


| Road Reconstruction/Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Note: Limits and Length of projects are approximate and subject to revision based on final design and budgets |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Road No. | Location | From | To | Length (km) | $\begin{gathered} 2021 \\ \text { BUDGET } \end{gathered}$ | March Projected |
| 1 | Elgin Street West Arnprior \& McNab/Braeside | Madawaska \& Elgin | County Road 3 (Usborne Street) | 1.32 | 890,609 | 890,609 |
| 1 | River Road McNab/Braeside | Mast Road | Henry Crescent | 1.83 | 600,240 | 600,240 |
| 5 | Stone Road <br> Admaston/Bromley | Berlanquet Road | 1574 Stone Road | 3.36 | 1,168,736 | 1,168,736 |
| 7 | Foresters Falls Road Whitewater Region | County Road 4 (Queens Line) | Harriet Street | 2.74 | 672,836 | 672,836 |
| 20 | Bruce Street Renfrew | Highway 60 | Urban Limit | 0.48 | 60,000 | 60,000 |
| 21 | Beachburg Road Whitewater Region | County Road 49 (Lapasse Road) | Hila Road | 7.77 | 474,009 | 474,009 |
| 51 | Petawawa Boulevard Petawawa | County Road 26 (Doran Street) | Military Camp Road | 0.98 | 800,000 | 800,000 |
| 52 | Burnstown Road Horton | Fraser Road | Graham Avenue | 4.90 | 986,840 | 986,840 |
| 52 | Raglan St. S Renfrew | Graham Avenue | Hwy 60 (Combes Street) | 1.22 | 557,217 | 557,217 |
| 65 | Centennial Lake Road Greater Madawaska | Deer Mountain Road | Chimo Road North | 4.10 | 1,078,300 | 1,078,300 |
| 67 | Simpson Pit Road <br> Killaloe, Hagarty and Richards | Byers Creek Road | Buck Hill Road | 2.45 | 921,200 | 921,200 |
| 71 | Matawatchan Road Greater Madawaska | 4877 Matawatchan Road | County Road 65 (Centennial Lake Rd) | 3.19 | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| 508 | Calabogie Road McNab/Braeside | Hutson Road | Goshen Road | 1.40 | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| 512 | Foymount Road Bonnechere Valley | County Structure B257 | Miller Road | 6.57 | 3,039,300 | 3,039,300 |
| 635 | Swisha Road | Highway 17 | Interprovincial Bridge S Exp. Joint | 2.58 | 100,000 | 100,000 |
|  | Laurentian Hills |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Scratch Coat Paving | Various Locations |  |  | 716,431 | 716,431 |
|  | Active Transportation | Various Locations |  |  | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| ROAD RECONSTRUCTION/REHABILITATION TOTALS |  |  |  | 44.89 | 12,365,718 | 12,365,718 |
| Bridge/Culvert Reconstruction/Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Structure No. | Structure Name |  | ation |  | $\begin{gathered} 2021 \\ \text { BUDGET } \end{gathered}$ | March Projected |
| B002 | Bonnechere River Bridge | Admaston/Brom | (Bonnechere Road) |  | 400,000 | 400,000 |
| B095 | Hyland Creek Bridge | Greater Madawa | (Hyland Creek Road) |  | 200,000 | 200,000 |
| B180 | Hurds Creek Bridge | Bonnechere Valley ( | th Algona/Grattan Line) |  | 850,000 | 850,000 |
| B202 | Cameron Street Breidge | Killaloe, Hagarty and | chards (Cameron Street) |  | 170,000 | 170,000 |
| B240 | Fourth Chute Bridge | Bonnechere Vall | (Fourth Chute Road) |  | 400,000 | 400,000 |
| B319 | Bucholtz Bridge | Laurentian Valley | 588, Round Lake Road) |  | 432,000 | 432,000 |
| C003 | Moores Creek Culvert | Admaston/Bror | y (CR5, Stone Road) |  | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| C058 | Constant Creek Culverts | Greater Madawa | (Ferguson Lake Road) |  | 715,000 | 715,000 |
| C099 | Colton Creek Bridge | Greater Madawa | (Matawatchan Road) |  | 280,000 | 280,000 |
| C116 | Dunlop Crescent Culvert | Head, Clara \& M | ia (Dunlop Crescent) |  | 400,000 | 400,000 |
| C142 | Quade Creek Culvert | North Algona Wi | rforce (Burchat Road) |  | 225,000 | 225,000 |
| C197 | Etmanskie Swamp Culvert | Madawaska Val | (CR62, John Street) |  | 300,000 | 300,000 |
| C201 | Broomes Creek Culvert | Whitewater (CR7 | Foresters Falls Road) |  | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 |
| C222 | Pleasant Valley Steel Arch | Whitewater ( | asant Valley Road) |  | 200,000 | 200,000 |
| C252 | Vanderploegs Culvert | McNab/Brae | (Russett Drive) |  | 200,000 | 200,000 |
| сз00 | Wolfe Road Twin Pipes | Bonnechere | ley (Wolfe Road) |  | 200,000 | 200,000 |
|  | General Bridge Repairs | Various Locations |  |  | 200,000 | 200,000 |
|  |  | BRIDGE/CULVERT RECO | RUCTION/REHABILITATION TOTALS |  | 6,222,000 | 6,222,000 |
| Roads/Bridge/Culvert Future Engineering |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asset ID | Structure Name |  | ation |  | $2021$ <br> BUDGET | March Projected |
| B005 | Scollard Bridge | Admaston/Br | ey (Pucker Street) |  | 40,000 | 40,000 |
| B022 | Indian River Bridge | Laurentian Valle | (Sandy Beach Road) |  | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| B057 | Mount St. Patrick Bridge | Greater Madawask | (Mount St. Patrick Road) |  | 60,000 | 60,000 |
| B064 | Pilgrim Road Bridge | Brudenell, Lyndoc | Raglan (Pilgrim Road) |  | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| B203 | Petawawa River Bridge | Petawawa (CR5 | Petawawa Boulevard) |  | 130,000 | 130,000 |
| C012 | Farquharson's Culvert | Admaston/Bromley | (south McNaughton Road) |  | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| C025 | Borne Road Culvert | Laurentian V | ey (Borne Road) |  | 30,000 | 30,000 |
| C037 | Bagot Creek Culvert | Greater Madawaska | wer Spruce Hedge Road) |  | 38,000 | 38,000 |
| C040 | Snake River Culvert | Admaston/Brom | (CR8, Cobden Road) |  | 12,000 | 12,000 |
| C134 | Campbell Drive Culvert | McNab/Braes | (Campbell Drive) |  | 65,000 | 65,000 |
| C137 | Hanson Creek Culverts | McNab/Braes | (Robertson Line) |  | 18,000 | 18,000 |
| C152 | Wadsworth Lake Culvert | Madawaska Valley | Old Barry's Bay Road) |  | 28,000 | 28,000 |
| C269 | Jacks Lake Culverts | Killaloe, Hagarty \& Rich | (CR58, Round Lake Road) |  | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| С302 | Wingle Creek Twin Culverts | Killaloe, Hagarty \& | hards (Rochfort Road) |  | 20,000 | 20,000 |
|  |  |  | FUTURE ENGINEERING TOTALS |  | 596,000 | 596,000 |
| Safety Devices |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Signals - Upgrades |  | Various Locations |  |  | 200,000 | 200,000 |
|  |  |  | SAFETY DEVICES TOTALS |  | 200,000 | 200,000 |
|  |  |  | CAPITAL PROGRAM TOTAL |  | 19,383,718 | 19,383,718 |

Appendix III

Department of Public Works \& Engineering
Capital Monthly Project Status Report - April 2021

| Project Name/Municipality |  | Location |  | Lengths | Description | Status/Schedule |  |  |  |  |  |  | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ROAD RECONSTRUCTION/REHABILITATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | Bruce Street | Highway 60 | Urban Limit |  |  | 0.48 | Intersection Upgrades by Town at HWY 60 | 100\% | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | Overseen by Town of Renfrew |
|  | Renfrew |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 52 | Raglan St. S | Pucker Street | Hwy 60 (Combes Street) | 1.22 | Reconstruction by Town | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |  |  |  | Overseen by Town of Renfrew |
|  | Renfrew |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 71 | Matawatchan Road | 4877 Matawatchan Road | County Road 65 (Centennial Lake Rd) | 3.19 | Cross-Culvert Replacement | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |  | March | March | Completed by County Patrol forces to align with lower water levels |
| 508 | Greater Madawaska |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Calabogie Road | Hutson Road | Goshen Road | 1.40 | Cross-Culvert Replacement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | CoR Day Labour Project |
|  | McNab/Braeside |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 512 | Foymount Road | County Structure B257 | Miller Road | 6.57 | Property Purchases, Utility Relocation, \& Reconstruction | 100\% | 100\% | 95\% |  |  |  |  | Property purchases ongoing. Close-Cut-Clearing planned once agreements in place. Utility relocations to follow. |
|  | Bonnechere Valley |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BRIDGE/CULVERT RECONSTRUCTION/REHABILITATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| B002 | Bonnechere River Bridge | Admaston/Bromley (Bonnechere Road) |  |  | Rehabilitation | 100\% | 100\% | 90\% | May | June | July | October | Design by Stantec |
| B095 | Hyland Creek Bridge | Greater Madawaska (Hyland Creek Road) |  |  | Rehabilitation | 100\% | 50\% | 50\% | April | May | July | October | CoR Day Labour project. Subcontract for cleaning \& painting |
| B180 | Hurds Creek Bridge | Bonnechere Valley (South Algona/Grattan Line) |  |  | Superstructure Replacement | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | April | April | May | September | Design by Ainley |
| B202 | Cameron Street Bridge | Killaloe, Hagarty \& Richards (Cameron Street) |  |  | Superstructure Replacement | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 2020 | 2020 | May | May | Completion of 2020 project |
| B240 | Fourth Chute Bridge | Bonnechere Valley (Fourth Chute Road) |  |  | Rehabilitation | 100\% | 100\% | 90\% | May | June | July | October | Design by Stantec |
| B319 | Bucholtz Bridge | Laurentian Valley (CR58, Round Lake Road) |  |  | Rehabilitation | 100\% | 100\% | 50\% | May | June | July | October | Design by McIntosh Perry |
| C003 | Moores Creek Culvert | Admaston/Bromley (CR5, Stone Road) |  |  | Repairs | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |  | August | August | CoR Day Labour project. Design by HP. |
| C058 | Constant Creek Culverts | Greater Madawaska (Ferguson Lake Road) |  |  | Replacement | 100\% | 100\% | 60\% | April | May | September | September | Internal Design, CoR Day Labour project |
| C099 | Colton Creek Bridge | Greater Madawaska (Matawatchan Road) |  |  | Replacement | 100\% | 100\% | 60\% | May | June | July | August | Design by $H P$ |
| C116 | Dunlop Crescent Culvert | Head, Clara \& Maria (Dunlop Crescent) |  |  | Replacement | 100\% | 100\% | 35\% | May | June | August | September | Design by WSP. CoR Day Labour project. |
| C142 | Quade Creek Culvert | North Algona Wilberforce (Burchat Road) |  |  | Replacement | 100\% | 100\% | 60\% | April | May | August | August | Internal Design, CoR Day Labour project |
| C197 | Etmanskie Swamp Culvert | Madawaska Valley (CR62, John Street) |  |  | Rehabilitation | 80\% | 40\% | 40\% | March/June | June | July | August |  |
| C201 | Broomes Creek Culvert | Whitewater (CR7, Foresters Falls Road) |  |  | Rehabilitation of Culvert \& Replacement of Dam | 90\% | 90\% | 60\% |  |  |  |  | MCEA being finalized by JL Richards |
| C222 | Pleasant Valley Steel Arch | Whitewater (Pleasant Valley Road) |  |  | Replacement | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | February | March | July | July | Internal Design, CoR Day Labour project |
| C252 | Vanderploegs Culvert | McNab/Braeside (Russett Drive) |  |  | Rehabilitation | 80\% | 40\% | 40\% | March/June | June | July | August |  |
| C300 | Wolfe Road Twin Pipes | Bonnechere Valley (Wolfe Road) |  |  | Replacement | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | February | March | July | July | Internal Design, CoR Day Labour project |
| FUTURE ENGINEERING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| B005 | Scollard Bridge | Admaston/Bromley (Pucker Street) |  |  | Design for Rehabiliation | 10\% | 10\% | 0\% | May |  | 2022 |  | Consultant Design |
| B022 | Indian River Bridge | Laurentian Valley (Sandy Beach Road) |  |  | Design for Rehabiliation | 10\% | 10\% | 0\% | May |  | 2022 |  | Consultant Design |
| B057 | Mount St. Patrick Bridge | Greater Madawaska (Mount St. Patrick Road) |  |  | Design for Replacement | 10\% | 10\% | 0\% | March |  | 2022 |  | Consultant Design - MCEA Schedule B may be needed. |
| B064 | Pilgrim Road Bridge | Brudenell, Lyndoch \& Raglan (Pilgrim Road) |  |  | Design for Rehabiliation | 10\% | 10\% | 0\% | May |  | 2022 |  | Consultant Design |
| B203 | Petawawa River Bridge | Petawawa (CR51, Petawawa Boulevard) |  |  | Design for Rehabiliation | 10\% | 10\% | 0\% | March |  | 2022 |  | Consultant Design |
| C012 | Farquharson's Culvert | Admaston/Bromley (South McNaughton Road) |  |  | Design for Replacement | 10\% | 10\% | 0\% | April |  | 2022 |  | Consultant Design |
| C025 | Borne Road Culvert | Laurentian Valley (Borne Road) |  |  | Design for Rehabiliation | 10\% | 10\% | 0\% | March |  | 2022 |  | Consultant Design |
| C037 | Bagot Creek Culvert | Greater Madawaska (Lower Spruce Hedge Road) |  |  | Design for Replacement | 10\% | 10\% | 0\% | June |  | 2022 |  | Geotech \& Potential Internal Design |
| C040 | Snake River Culvert | Admaston/Bromley (CR8, Cobden Road) |  |  | Design for Rehabiliation | 10\% | 10\% | 0\% | May |  | 2022 |  | Consultant Design |
| C134 | Campbell Drive Culvert | $\mathrm{McNab} / \mathrm{Braeside}$ ( (Campbell Drive) |  |  | Design for Replacement | 10\% | 10\% | 0\% | April |  | 2022 |  | Consultant Design |
| C137 | Hanson Creek Culverts | $\mathrm{McNab} / \mathrm{Braeside}$ (Robertson Line) |  |  | Design for Replacement | 10\% | 10\% | 0\% | June |  | 2022 |  | Geotech \& Potential Internal Design |
| C152 | Wadsworth Lake Culvert | Madawaska Valley (Old Barry's Bay Road) |  |  | Design for Replacement | 10\% | 10\% | 0\% | June |  | 2022 |  | Geotech \& Potential Internal Design |
| C269 | Jacks Lake Culverts | Killaloe, Hagarty \& Richards (CR58, Round Lake Road) |  |  | Design for Replacement | 10\% | 10\% | 0\% | June |  | 2022 |  | Geotech \& Potential Internal Design |
| C302 | Wingle Creek Twin Culverts | Killaloe, Hagarty \& Richards (Rochfort Road) |  |  | Design for Replacement | 10\% | 10\% | 0\% | June |  | 2022 |  | Geotech \& Potential Internal Design |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type |  | Description | Term (Years) | Type | Specification | Tender | Award | Start | Complete | Status/Comments |
| 1 | Pavement Marking | Paint/Glass Beads//Lines/Symbols | 1+(+1+1+1+1) | Equipment/Material | March | April | April | May | November | Tendered |
| 2 | Street Sweeping | Winter/Debris Removal | 1 | Equipment | March | April | April | May | June | Tendered |
| 3 | Catch Basin/MH Hole Cleaning | Winter/Debris Removal | 1 | Equipment | March | April | April | May | June | Tendered |
| 4 | Roadside Brushing | Tree/Brush Removal | 1 | Equipment | May | June | June | July | November | Tendered |
| 5 | Sign Post Tender | Sign Installation Hardware | 1 | Material | March | April | April | August | August | Tendered |
| 6 | Weed Control | Wild Parsnip/Poison Ivy | 5 | Equipment/Material | Complete | 2019 | 2019 | July | July | Waiting Start |
| 7 | Signs \&Traffic Control Equipment | Road Signage | 1 | Material | May | April | April | July | July | Tendered |
| 8 | Winter Sand | Winter Abrasives | 1 | Supply/Delivery/Process | May | June | July | August | November |  |
| 9 | Loader Rental | Winter Operations | 1 | Equipment | July | August | August | November | April |  |
| 10 | Culverts | Drainage | 1 | CSP/HDPE | February | March | April | May | November | Tendered |
| 11 | Equipment Rental | Construction Equipment | 1 | Various | January | Rebruary | March | March | November | Complete |
| 12 | Fuel | Diesel/Gas/Coloured Diesel | 1 | Materials | Contract | Renewal | August | August | August |  |
| 13 | AVL Service Renewal | Automatic Vehicle Location | 10 | Application/Network/Data | May | 2020 | 2020 | June | June |  |
| 14 | Shouldering | Granular/Sealing | 1 | Material/Installation | June | July | August | September | September |  |
| 15 | Calcium Chloride | Winter Operations | 1 | Material | July | July | July | August | April |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EQUIPMENT TENDERS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Tender | Description | Quantity | Type | Specification | Tender | Award | Delivery |  | Status/Comments |
| 1 | HDT (Heavy Duty Truck) | Combination Plow/Spreader | 1 | Replace | February | March | April | November |  | Tendered |
| 2 | LDT (Light Duty Truck(s)) | ( $\mathbf{3}-1 / 2$ ton \& 1-3/4 ton 4WD) | 4 | Replace | March | April | April | November |  | Tendered |
| 3 | HDT (Heavy Duty Truck) | Water Truck | 1 | Replace | February | April | May | November |  |  |
| 4 | Mower Attachment | Tractor Mounted | 1 | Replace | March | March | April | July |  | Tendered |
| 5 | Tag Along Float | 30 Ton | 1 | Replace | March | March | April | July |  | Tendered |
| 6 | Service Vehicle | 4x4-PW | 1 | New | March | April | April/May | November |  | Tender Circulation |
| 7 | Service Vehicle | 2 wheel drive - High Roof - PW - ES | 1 | New | March | April | April/May | November |  | Tender Circulation |
| 8 | Equipment Refurbishment(s) | As per Spring Inspection | Varies | Existing | March | April | April | October |  | Ongoing |
| 9 | AVL (Automatic Vehicle Location) | AVL/Telematics | Varies | New | May | June | June | November |  | Ongoing |
| 10 | Retroreflectometer |  | 1 | Replace | April | April | April | June |  | Ongoing |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HOUSING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Tender | Location | Type | Type | Design | Tender | Award | Start | Complete | /Comments |
| 1 | Repair - Salt Storage Dome | Southwest Patrol | Construct | Rehabilitation | 2020 | March | April | June | November | Ongoing |


| ROAD MAINTENANCE AGREEMENTS/FACILITY AGREEMENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Service Provider | Location | Year | Type | Start | Complete | Term | Status/Comments |
| 1 | Town of Arnprior | County Road 1, County Road 2 | 2020 | Winter Road Maintenance | October | October | 10 | Town of Arnprior Review |
| 2 | Town of Deep River | County Road 72, County Road 73 | 2021 | Winter Road Maintenance | October | October | 10 | Complete |
| 3 | Town of Renfrew | County Road 20, County Road 52 | 2020 | Winter Road Maintenance |  |  | 10 | Complete |
| 4 | Township of Carlo Mayo | County Road 517 | 2020 | Winter Road Maintenance | August | August | Annual | Complete |
| 5 | Contractor | County Road 635 | 2020 | Winter Road Maintenance | July | July | Annual | Complete |
| 6 | Algonquins of Pikwakanagan | Golden Lake | 2017 | Use of facilities and materials | Navember 1 | March 31 | 5 | Complete |
| 7 | Bonnechere Valley | Foymount | 2017 | Use of facilities and materials | Navember 1 | March 31 | 5 | Complete |



## Subject:

Draft Plan of Subdivision - Draft
Conditions - Daniel/Edey/Galvin Intersection

Arnprior Fairgrounds Subdivision
File No: 47-T-18004

Report Number: 20-11-23-01

Department: Community Services/ Operations

Report Author: Robin Paquette/ John Steckly

Title: CAO/Planner / GM, Operations
Meeting Date: November 23, 2020

## Recommendations:

1. That Council support Option \#1 Realigned Signalized Intersection as outlined in the Edey Street \Galvin Street \Daniel Street Intersection Review, prepared by Stantec, dated September 9th, 2020 as the preferred option for the future of the intersection; and
2. That Council direct staff to amend draft conditions 2. v) for the Arnprior Fairgrounds Subdivision File No: 47-T-18004, as follows:

The Owner shall contribute a portion of the cost of the Realigned Signalized Intersection (Option \#1) as outlined in the Edey Street \Galvin Street \Daniel Street Intersection Review, prepared by Stantec, dated September 9 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2020$, in the amount of $\$ 50,000$; and
3. That Council direct staff to submit a written request to the County of Renfrew Operations Committee and County Council, requesting that the County of Renfrew contribute a portion of the cost of the Realigned Signalized Intersection (Option \#1), in the amount of $23 \%$ of the total project cost, to a maximum upset limit of $\$ 292,860$; and
4. That Council direct staff to include the estimated cost to undertake the design in the 2021 draft capital budget and include the Town's portion of the estimated costs required to undertake the project in the 2021 draft Long Range Capital Forecast.
5. That Council direct staff to provide a copy of this report and approved recommendation to any residents who provided comments at the Public Meeting dated September 10, 2018 in regard to the Draft Plan of Subdivision.

## Background:

Owner:
Description of Subject Lands:
Legal Description:
Area of Land:

Juliada Holdings Inc.
(See Attachment \#1 - Key Plan)
Part Lot 3, Concession B, Town of Arnprior
8.05 ha (19.9 acres)

The owner of the lands received Draft Approval on the proposed Plan of Subdivision (47-T-18004) and are working towards clearing the draft conditions. Once draft conditions have been satisfied, the Owner can receive final approval from the County of Renfrew and register the Plan. Draft Approval lapses on November 19, 2021.

The draft approved conditions for this development included two traffic related conditions as follows:
2. u) The Owner shall update the Transportation Impact Study (Former Arnprior Fairgrounds - 10 Galvin Street - Revision 1, prepared by Parsons, dated June 15, 2018, 47647701000 ) to provide traffic calming recommendations, including cost estimates to assist in mitigating cut-through traffic concerns from the proposed subdivision north/east via Thomas Street. Further, the Transportation Impact Study shall be updated to include recommendations for installation of traffic signals at Daniel Street and James Street. Recommendations shall include warrant analysis, forecasted timing, conceptual design considerations and cost estimates. The Transportation Impact Study shall be to the satisfaction of, and approved by the Town of Arnprior and the County of Renfrew.
v) The Owner shall amend the Transportation Impact Study (Former Arnprior Fairgrounds - 10 Galvin Street - Revision 1, prepared by Parsons, dated June 15, 2018, 47647701000) to include an engineering analysis and functional design for a signalized intersection at the offset intersections on Daniel St. between Galvin St. and Edey St. to the satisfaction of the County of Renfrew and Town of Arnprior. Upon approval of the functional design by the County of Renfrew and the Town of Arnprior, the Owner shall design and front end the capital construction of the intersection signalization pursuant to the Development Charges Act. Upon completion of construction of the signalization of the intersection noted herein and upon receipt of final acceptance by the County of Renfrew and the Town of Arnprior, the General Manager, Client Services/Treasurer shall reimburse the Owner, within one calendar year, for the capital construction costs of the front ended works up to an upset Development Charge reimbursement limit of $\$ 300,000.00$ subject to provision of final progress payment certificates and other required documentation as determined by the General Manager, Operations.

There were several reasons for these conditions to be imposed. A Transportation Impact Study has been provided in support of the application. The assessment addresses the potential impact of the proposed development on Daniel Street, County Road 2. As County Road 2 is under the jurisdiction of the County of Renfrew, staff at the County had also reviewed and commented on the Assessment.

After their initial review, the County of Renfrew Department of Public Works and Engineering provided the following comment: "Left turn movements from Galvin Street to Daniel Street will not be permitted. The study is to be updated to distribute the left turn movements to James Street or Michael Street."

The developer revised the Transportation Impact Study to reflect this requirement and provided the following conclusions:

1. At full occupancy, all study area intersections are projected to operate with acceptable delays of 18 seconds or less (LoS 'B' or better), and therefore no modifications are required to the existing intersections to support the proposed development.
2. Traffic volumes along James Street and to/from the site are relatively low, and as such, signalization of the intersection of Daniel Street / James Street is not warranted based on projected vehicle volumes.
3. The Daniel Street / Galvin Street intersection traffic volumes to/from the site are relatively low and the delays are $15-20$ s. Based on the foregoing traffic impact analysis a southbound left turn lane is not recommended.

Further to discussions with both the applicant and the County Public Works staff with regard to restricting the access from the development to Daniel Street raised some significant concerns with the impact of this restriction on the existing residents on both Michael and James Streets, as well as the intersections of those streets with Daniel Street. Furthermore, it would appear that, even with the proximity of the two intersections, there might have been some opportunity to increase the signalization at the intersections of Galvin/Daniel and Edey/Daniel to alleviate the concerns regarding the left turn movement from Galvin onto Daniel Street.

On September 10 th , 2018, Council held a required Public Meeting to consider the comments and concerns raised by the public. The meeting was well attended by residents of the surrounding community. Traffic concerns were raised, specifically with the current volumes of traffic and perceived need for additional signalization on Daniel Street, as well as the flows from Michael, Havey, William, Edey and Galvin Streets onto what is perceived to be a very busy Daniel Street.

As a result of this review and the public comments, staff recommended that the two draft conditions, 2. u) and v), whereby the developer is required to update the Transportation Study to:

- provide traffic calming recommendations, including cost estimates to assist in mitigating cut-through traffic concerns from the proposed subdivision north/east via Thomas Street;
- include recommendations for installation of traffic signals at Daniel Street and James Street;
- include an engineering analysis and functional design for a signalized intersection at the offset intersections on Daniel St. between Galvin St. and Edey St.

Furthermore the developer is required to design and front end the capital construction of the intersection signalization pursuant to the Development Charges Act.

## Discussion:

## Staggered Intersection Review

In undertaking the required review of the engineering analysis and functional design of the proposed offset intersections signalization, Partham Engineering, a specialized engineering firm focused on providing design and installation of Traffic Control Signals and Street lighting, provided the following opinion on the proposed signalization at Daniel Street and Galvin Street:
"This is not an ideal location to implement traffic signals. If traffic signals are added at Daniel St and Galvin St, they would need to operate from one controller at Daniel St and Edey St. Ideally the controller setup would provide an extended green signal on Daniel St EB at Galvin St and on Daniel St WB at Edey St. This is required to reduce the number of rear-end collisions caused by closely spaced signals. But this setup would cause an "amber trap" situation on Daniel St eastbound at Edey St and Daniel St westbound at Galvin St. The eastbound direction is shown an amber while the opposing westbound direction is still shown an extended green signal. Motorists facing the eastbound amber signal assume westbound motorists also have an amber signal and that traffic will stop. This leads to a potential for angle type accidents. This same condition would exist for Daniel St eastbound at Galvin St.

The second option would be to eliminate the extended green operation and display amber to all directions on Daniel St at the same time. Due to the close spacing of signals motorists may react differently. Some may try to stop between signals while other will try to clear the intersection. This can lead to rear-end type collisions.

Closely spaced signals such as these will always cause traffic related issues. If traffic signals are not warranted at Daniel St and Galvin St then consideration should be given to not install signals."

## Daniel/James Streets Intersection Review

Having determined that a staggered intersection at Daniel/Edey/Galvin Streets is not recommended, CGH Transportation Inc. proceeded to evaluate the intersection at Daniel/James Streets per condition 2.4 ) with the assumption that the development would be restricted to a right-in, right-out only intersection configuration at Daniel/Galvin Streets, per the County's original condition of development. The conclusions provided are as follows:

1. A right-in, right-out intersection configuration is proposed for the development access at Galvin Street and Daniel Street.
a. This configuration will be enforced by the addition of a concrete median between the northbound and southbound lanes of Daniel Street at this intersection.
b. Site-generated traffic will be redistributed to the second site access at the intersection of Daniel Street and James Street.
2. Using the Ontario Traffic Manual Book 12 - Traffic Signals methodology, a signal warrant was examined and indicated signalization at the intersection of James Street and Daniel Street is not required.
3. A Level of Service analysis using Synchro models indicated the LOS of the movements at the intersection of James Street and Daniel Street in the signalized scenario will remain generally the same as the LOS of those movements in an unsignalized scenario. However, by signalizing this intersection, the northbound and southbound movements no longer operate as free flow movements.

## Stantec Edey Street \Galvin Street \Daniel Street Intersection Review

In September of 2020, Stantec provided staff with a review of options for the improvement of the Edey / Galvin / Daniel Street Intersection to assist in understanding the options available for the improvement to the traffic flows in this area, recognizing the developments which have and are occurring in the vicinity, impacting the existing signalization and intersections, and the future traffic impacts. A copy of the review form Document \#1 to this Report.

The Project objectives included:

- Develop realigned signalized intersection option
- Discuss other intersection options
- Identify and discuss constraints and impacts of option
- Determine Class Environmental Assessment (EA) requirement

Four Options have been identified at this intersection:

- Option 1 - Realigned signalized intersection. Stantec will review and develop an option for the realignment and signalization of this intersection.
- Option 2A - Right-in, Right-out access to Galvin St. Signals at Edey St to remain as is.
- Option 2B - Right-in, Right-out access to Galvin St. Signals at Edey St to remain as is. As part of this option, new signals will be added at Daniel St $\backslash$ James St.
- Option 3 - Offset signalized intersection at Edey St \Galvin St \Daniel St.
- Option 4 - Roundabout at Edey St \Galvin St \Daniel St.

The review of the options included six criteria:

1. Safety Improvements
2. Traffic Operations
3. Site Access
4. Utility Impacts
5. Land Requirements
6. Cost/Implementation

Table 2 in Appendix $D$ to the report provides a comparative review and summary of the intersection design options. It should be noted that a functional design study has not been completed for each option. This review identifies the strengths and weaknesses for each option and provides magnitude of costs for each.

Staff have reviewed the Stantec options report and are of the opinion that Option \#1 Realigned Signalized Intersection is the best option for the future operation of this intersection when considering all of the criteria outlined in the report. The report suggest that option \#1 provides the best solution for three main long term criteria being safety improvements, traffic operations, and site access, however unfortunately the cost impacted criteria being utility impacts, land requirements and other costs to implement the works all come at a significant cost totaling an estimated $\$ 1,171,440.00$. A further review and breakdown of the potential funding sources that may be available to fund this option are discussed under the financial considerations section below.

Staff have also circulated a copy of the Stantec options report to the County of Renfrew Public Works Department for their comment. The response from the County's Public Works Department was as follows:
"Option 1 is the preferred proposal to avoid any future liabilities for the County of Renfrew. It has been the past practice of the County of Renfrew that situations such as these are not a County responsibility and that it is the sole obligation of the Town and the developer. With that said, should the Town of Arnprior wish to submit a proposal to the Operations Committee and County Council, approved by Resolution from the Arnprior Town Council outlining any cost sharing agreement, will be required."

Appreciating that the design and construction of Option \#1 could take several years to complete, staff have also initiated discussions with the County of Renfrew's Public Works Department as to what temporary measures, if any, might be required in the interim. These discussions are ongoing and any requirement for temporary measures will be largely driven by the speed at which the Fairgrounds development is built out.

## Impacts on Subdivision Draft Conditions 2. u) and v)

As a result of the various reviews undertaken, it would appear that draft condition 2. v) as identified is no longer applicable or achievable by the developer. As such, Council is asked to give consideration to the removal of this condition. The County of Renfrew, per their original comments on the proposed subdivision, would be expected to add a condition requiring the restriction of a right-in, right-out only movements from Galvin Street to Daniel Street. This would address their traffic impact concerns. However, staff note that during the public meeting, there were concerns raised with traffic impacts on adjacent, existing residential streets, namely Thomas, Michael and James. The imposition of a right-in, right-out only on Galvin would suggest that the traffic impacts on these streets would only increase without the left turn movements at Galvin and Daniel Streets.

Recognizing the need for a long-term solution to the traffic issues on Daniel in the vicinity, and with the information from the Stantec Review concluding that a realigned intersection is the best long-term option for this area, staff would suggest that the County may consider a 'temporary right-in, right-out' in the interim.

The future implementation of Option \#1 Realigned Signalized Intersection as outlined in the Edey Street \Galvin Street \Daniel Street Intersection Review, prepared by Stantec, dated September 9th, 2020, would address the public's concerns raised during the public meeting of September 10, 2018, which as indicated above, specifically raised the current volumes of traffic and perceived need for additional signalization on Daniel Street, as well as the flows from Michael, Havey, William, Edey and Galvin Streets onto what is perceived to be a very busy Daniel Street. As such, staff recommend that this report be provided to those members of the public who provided comments at the public meeting. This will allow for transparency in the final recommendations to address the traffic concerns raised.

## Options:

## Long-term Intersection Improvements

Per the Stantec Review, four options are provided for Council's consideration in the longterm.

## Subdivision Draft Conditions

Council could refuse to consider the proposed revised Draft Conditions however, staff are of the opinion that the proposed changes are necessary and appropriate for the development.

## Policy Considerations:

The proposed development of a vacant lot within the settlement area of the Town of Arnprior is a positive investment supporting the Town's strategic vision of robust sustainable growth with new residential development. The units will provide a housing option for our residents. Furthermore, timely and efficient processing of requests provides effective service delivery and shows the Town is business friendly. By supporting this request, the development is permitted to proceed in a suitable and expeditious manner.

## Financial Considerations:

The estimated costs to undertake each of the options listed in the Stantec report are outlined in appendix $C$ of the attached report.

The estimated total cost to undertake the recommended Option \#1 is $\$ 1,171,440.00$. This estimated cost however does not include the potential cost to acquire any necessary property beyond the Town and County road allowances. For the purposes of this estimate, an additional $\$ 100,000$ has been added as the estimated cost of the required land.

Staff have had preliminary discussions with the Town's development charge consultant Watson and Associates Economists Ltd and this project could be funded up to 50\% through the provision for roads line item currently included in the Town's development charge bylaw, with the remaining percentage of the project being considered a benefit to existing.

Staff have also had preliminary discussions with the Fairgrounds developer and have advised them that the Town will expect them to contribute towards this project on the basis that their original draft condition required them to construct a right-in-right-out and the current revised draft condition requires them to undertake the functional design of an offset intersection.

Each of these previous draft conditions would have been valued in the range of $\$ 50,000$, therefore staff believes it is a reasonable amount to require as their developer contribution. It should be noted that the developer will also be contributing towards this project through the cost of development charges on their future building permits as well.

Based on the original Transportation Impact Study prepared by Parsons, dated June 15, 2018, over $88 \%$ of the traffic that currently approaches the Daniel/Edey/Galvin intersection is travelling along the north-bound and south-bound approaches of Daniel Street. With Daniel Street being a County road under the authority and control of the County, staff believe that it is reasonable to request that the County contribute $50 \%$ of the remaining cost to implement Option \#1 once the development charges and developer contribution amounts have been subtracted. This results in a County contribution in the estimated amount of $\$ 292,860$. As indicated above, the County of Renfrew has advised that should Council wish to request a funding contribution from the County that it will need to be sent to County Council by way of a Council resolution.

In summary, staff believe that there are currently four potential funding sources available to fund the total cost of this project as follows:

| Projected Funding Source | Percent of Total <br> Cost | Estimated Total <br> Contribution <br> Amount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Arnprior Development Charge Reserve Fund <br> (Provision for Roads) | $50 \%$ | $\$ 635,720$ |
| Arnprior Capital Expenditure Reserve Fund | $23 \%$ | $\$ 292,860$ |
| County of Renfrew contribution | $23 \%$ | $\$ 292,860$ |
| Developer contribution (design) | $4 \%$ | $\$ 50,000$ |
| Estimated Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\$ 1, \mathbf{2 7 1 , 4 4 0}$ |

Should Council be supportive of the proposed option \#1 for the future of the intersection, Staff will endeavor to include the estimated cost to undertake the design in the 2021 draft capital budget and incorporate the Town's portion of the remaining estimated costs required to undertake the project in the years 1-5 range of the 2021 Long Range Capital Forecast while giving consideration to the projected timeframe for full build out of the subdivision.

## Meeting Dates:

August 27, 2018 - Staff Report - Draft Plan of Subdivision
September 10, 2018 - Public Meeting - Council Meeting
October 9, 2018 - Staff Report - Draft Plan Conditions
November 13, 2018 - Staff Report - Rezoning Application
December 10, 2018 - Public Meeting - Rezoning
March 25, 2019 - Staff Report - Draft Plan Revision

## Consultation:

Angelo Renon, Stantec Engineering
Lee Perkins, Director of Public Works and Engineering, County of Renfrew
Mark Crockford, CGH Transportation

Gary Scandlan, Watson and Associates Economists Ltd Jim Hutton, Contract Planner

## Documents:

Edey Street \Galvin Street \Daniel Street Intersection Review, Stantec Consulting, September 9, 2020

## Reviewed By Department Head:

Reviewed By General Manager, Client Services/Treasurer:
Jennifer Morawiec

## CAO Concurrence:

Robin Paquette

Workflow Certified By Town Clerk:

To: John Steckly, A.Sc.T.<br>General Manager Operations<br>Town of Arnprior<br>105 Elgin Street W.<br>File: 163601380<br>From: Angelo Renon<br>Stantec Consulting Ltd<br>400 - 1331 Clyde Ave<br>Ottawa, ON<br>Date: September 9, 2020

## Reference: Edey Street \Galvin Street \Daniel Street Intersection Review

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Stantec Consulting Ltd (Stantec) has been retained by the Town of Arnprior (Town) to undertake a review of the intersections of Edey Street and Daniel Street as well as Galvin Street and Daniel Street. As part of this review, Stantec will review $\backslash$ develop options to realign the intersections as well provide comment on other options (right-inlright out, staggered signalized intersection, roundabout) that may be considered at this location. Stantec understands that the Galvin Street $\backslash$ Daniel Street intersection has been designated as one of two primary entrances for the new Fairgrounds subdivision in the Town of Arnprior. The developments will include 161 residential units with a mix of unit types including single-detached (43), semi-detached (84) and townhomes (28). For descriptive purposes for this report, Daniel St is considered to be oriented in a northsouth direction with Edey St located on the west side of Daniel St and Galvin St located on the east side of Daniel St.

As part of the new Fairgrounds development the Town has requested that Stantec's mandate includes the development of a realigned intersection at Edey St $\backslash$ Galvin St $\backslash$ Daniel St and discussion of 3 other Options. A cost estimate will be developed for these options.

### 1.1 SITE DESCRIPTION

The location of the study area, identified in Figure 1, includes Daniel Street and its intersection with Edey St and Galvin St. Area roadways serve the needs of commuter traffic and local commercial traffic on Edey St. The Edey St \Daniel St intersection is signalized, while the existing Galvin St $\backslash$ Daniel St intersection is a stop control (for Galvin St).

## Existing Roadways

Daniel Street South is a north-south arterial roadway that provides access to Highway 417. Within the study area, Daniel Street South has a three-lane cross-section, with the center lane acting as a two-way left-turn lane, and auxiliary right-turn lanes provided at major intersections (Daniel Street /Baskin Drive). South of Baskin Drive, Daniel Street has a five-lane cross-section. The posted speed limit is $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ north of Baskin Drive and $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ south of Baskin Drive.

Edey Street is an east-west urban local roadway that extends from Daniel Street in the east to Edward Street South in the west. Edey Street has a two-lane cross-section and sidewalks at the north and south sides. The posted speed limit is $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.
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Galvin Street is an east-west local roadway that extends from the Site in the east to Daniel Street South in the west. Galvin Street has a two-lane cross-section and continuous access to Michelson Auto Centre parking lot at the north. . Galvin St will be one of the two main access roads for the new Fairground development. A $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ speed limit is proposed.

The study area also includes:

- Arnprior Motor Inn located directly across Edey St. The traffic signal includes one of the two entrances to the Arnprior Motor Inn.
- A garage (Michelson Auto Centre) located in the north-east quadrant of Galvin St $\backslash$ Daniel St intersection
- Arnprior Curling Club located behind the Arnprior Motor Inn on Galvin St.
- There is a ravine with a 1600 csp culvert located on Edey St approximately 47 m from the intersection with Daniel St.


## Existing Intersections

## Daniel Street / Edey Street

The Daniel Street / Edey Street intersection is a signalized ' $T$ '-intersection with pedestrian crossings on all approaches. On the east side of the intersection an entrance to the Arnprior Motor Inn connects to the intersection and is controlled by the traffic control signals. The southbound approach consists of a shared left/through/right lane. The northbound approach consists of a through and dedicated left-turn lane. The eastbound approach consists of a shared left/through/right lane. There is a southern driveway from Daniel Street South to the Arnprior Motor Inn approximately 30 metres south of the intersection. All movements are permitted at this location.

## Daniel Street / Galvin Street

The Daniel Street South/Galvin Street intersection is an unsignalized ' $T$ ' intersection with stop control on the minor approach. The southbound approach consists of a shared through/left-turn lane. The northbound approach consists of a shared through/right-turn lane. The westbound approach is the minor approach and consists of a shared left/through/right lane. All movements are permitted at this location. Upon completion of the development left turns out at this location will be restricted based on the Traffic Impact Study.
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Figure 1 - Project Location

Photos of the site can be found in Appendix A - Photos.

### 1.1.1 Project Objectives

The project objectives are:

- Develop realigned signalized intersection option
- Discuss other intersection options
- Identify and discuss constraints and impacts of option
- Determine Class Environmental Assessment (EA) requirements
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### 1.1.2 Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Implications

Within the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment document, published by the Municipal Engineers Association in 2011 (with 2013 errata corrections), the Municipal Road Projects schedules in Appendix 1 outline the different types of road projects and the EA requirements for each. The project descriptions that are most suitable for the intersection improvements for the Edey St $\backslash$ Galvin St $\backslash$ Daniel St is as follows:
12. a) Construction of localized operational improvements at specific locations (e.g. the realignment of the intersection)
13. Installation, construction or reconstruction of traffic control devices (e.g. signing, signalization)

For the construction of localized operational improvements, these projects fall under a Schedule A+ process and have no prescribed cost limit. These projects are pre-approved and require notification to the public prior to implementation.

For the installation of traffic control devices, these projects fall under a Schedule A process and have a prescribed cost limit of $\$ 9.5$ million before triggering a Schedule B process. It is anticipated that the intersection improvements for this location will be under the $\$ 9.5$ million limit. Schedule A activities are pre-approved. The proponents may proceed without following the procedures set out in any other part of the Municipal Class EA.

### 2.0 PROJECT OPTIONS

The study required the development of the realigned signalized intersection option and discussion of 3 other intersection options.

### 2.1 INTERSECTION OPTIONS

Four Options have been identified at this intersection:

- Option 1 - Realigned signalized intersection. Stantec will review and develop an option for the realignment and signalization of this intersection.
- Option 2A - Right-in, Right-out access to Galvin St. Signals at Edey St to remain as is.
- Option 2B - Right-in, Right-out access to Galvin St. Signals at Edey St to remain as is. As part of this option, new signals will be added at Daniel St $\backslash$ James St.
- Option 3 - Offset signalized intersection at Edey St $\backslash$ Galvin St \ Daniel St.
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- Option 4 - Roundabout at Edey St \Galvin St \Daniel St.


### 2.2 DESIGN CRITERIA

## Standards

The Transportation Association of Canada's (TAC) Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads and the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) Geometric Design Standards for Ontario Highways were the primary design standards used to establish the design criteria to be used for this intersection review.

The proposed Design Criteria below is also based on the following:

- TAC's Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Road, 2017
- Ontario Highway Traffic Act, R.S.O. 1990
- Ontario Traffic Manual - Books 1, 2, 5, 11, 12, 15, 18.

The items below identify the proposed design criteria required for the proposed intersection Options.

## Daniel Street

| Element | Design Standard |
| :---: | :---: |
| Roadway Classification | UAU (Urban Arterial Undivided) |
| Posted Speed | $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ |
| Design Speed | $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ |
| Design Vehicle | Aerial Fire Truck |
| Minimum Stopping Sight Distance | 65 m |
| Equivalent Minimum "K" Factor - |  |
| Crest (SSD) |  |
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| Equivalent Minimum "K" Factor - Sag <br> (Headlight Control) | 10 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Radius Minimum | 80 m |
| Minimum Radius for 50 kmlhr D.S. for <br> Normal Crown | 150 m |
| Pavement Width | 2 @ @ 5.35m (south of Edey St) <br> 2 |
| Sidewalk Width | 1.5 m |
| Approach Grades at Intersection | $0.5 \%-3 \%$ |
| Maximum Grade through Intersection | $0.5 \%-2.0 \%$ |
| Boulevard / Green Zone Width | $0.5 \mathrm{~m}-5.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| Cycling Facility | Shared lane |

## Edey Street

| Element | Design Standard |
| :---: | :---: |
| Roadway Classification | ULU (Urban Local Undivided) |
| Posted Speed | 40 kmlhr |
| Design Speed | 40 kmlhr |
| Design Vehicle | Aerial Fire Truck |
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| Minimum Stopping Sight Distance | 50 m |
| :---: | :---: |
| Equivalent Minimum "K" Factor Crest (SSD) | 11 |
| Equivalent Minimum "K" Factor - Sag (Headlight Control) | 9 |
| Radius Minimum | 50 m |
| Minimum Radius for 50 km hr D.S. for Normal Crown | 120 m |
| Pavement Width | 2 @ 5.35m |
| Sidewalk Width | 1.5m |
| Approach Grades at Intersection | 0.5\%-3\% |
| Maximum Grade through Intersection | 0.5\%-2.0\% |
| Boulevard / Green Zone Width | 0.5m-5.0m |
| Cycling Facility | Shared lane |

## Galvin Street

| Element | Design Standard |
| :---: | :---: |
| Roadway Classification | ULU (Urban Local Undivided) |
| Posted Speed | $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ |
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| Design Speed | $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Design Vehicle | Aerial Fire Truck |
| Minimum Stopping Sight Distance | 50 m |
| Equivalent Minimum "K" Factor Crest (SSD) | 11 |
| Equivalent Minimum "K" Factor - Sag (Headlight Control) | 9 |
| Radius Minimum | 50 m |
| Minimum Radius for 50 km hhr D.S. for Normal Crown | 120 m |
| Pavement Width | 2 @ 4.50m |
| Sidewalk Width | 1.5m |
| Approach Grades at Intersection | 0.5\%-3\% |
| Maximum Grade through Intersection | 0.5\%-2.0\% |
| Boulevard / Green Zone Width | 0.5m-5.0m |
| Cycling Facility | Shared lane |
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### 2.2.1 Description of Options

### 2.2.1.1 Option 1 - Realigned Signalized Intersection

Option 1 includes realigning Edey St and Galvin St, intersecting Daniel St at a skew of $70^{\circ}$. Edey St and Galvin St are currently at an offset of 39.6 m . Ideally, intersections should be at a skew angle of $90^{\circ}$ with a $70^{\circ}$ angle as a minimum. A realigned intersection has been developed based on a $70^{\circ}$ intersection skew angle. Refer to Figure 2 in Appendix B for the layout for this option. Increasing skew angle results in substantial property impacts as well as substantial impacts to the Arnprior Curling Club and the large culvert. The alignment has been developed with horizontal curves with a radius of 95.0 m , resulting in a reverse crown (which connects to intersection at standard grades as noted in the design criteria). The realigned signalized intersection results in stop blocks being located offset from the pedestrian crossing lines in order to accommodate turning movements (Figure 3-5). The design vehicle used is an aerial fire truck. The realigned intersection results in:

- Relocation of above ground utilities (Hydro One and Bell poles) and underground (gas, Bell)
- Adjustment and relocation of catchbasins (storm sewer modifications to match realignment). Drainage will be addressed by connecting to the existing storm sewer system.
- Relocation of fire hydrant and adjustment to water valves
- Impacts to ravine and extension of the 1600 mm CPS culvert by $4-5 \mathrm{~m}$
- Entrance modifications including closure of one of the entrances at the Arnprior Motor Inn and modification to the Michelson Auto Centre Galvin Street entrance.
- Property acquisition. Property will be required in the south-east quadrant (vacant lot 79) and Arnprior Curling Club. There may be property impacts in the north-west quadrant due to culvert extension.
- Installation of traffic signals
- Dedicated cycling infrastructure is not included with the improvements.
- Guide rail to be re-instated adjacent to ravine.


### 2.2.1.2 Option 2A - Right-in, Right-out access at Galvin St.

Option 2 was identified in the 10 Galvin Street - James Street Signal Warrant Technical Memorandum (September 12, 2019) prepared by CGH Transportation. This option includes:
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- The addition of a concrete median between the northbound and southbound lanes of Daniel St and will begin at the Edey St intersection. The existing roadway width through this area varies between 10.70 m and 9.70 m . Minor roadway widening will be required to accommodate the new median.
- Existing traffic signals at Edey St to remain as is.
- This option limits the number of movements in and out of the development.


### 2.2.1.3 Option 2B - Right-in, Right-out access at Galvin St including New Traffic Signals at Daniel St and James St.

Option 2 was identified in the 10 Galvin Street - James Street Signal Warrant Technical Memorandum (September 12, 2019) prepared by CGH Transportation. This option includes:

- The addition of a concrete median between the northbound and southbound lanes of Daniel St and will begin at the Edey St intersection. The existing roadway width through this area varies between 10.70 m and 9.70 m . Minor roadway widening will be required to accommodate the new median.
- Existing traffic signals at Edey St to remain as is.
- This option includes the addition of new traffic signals at Daniel St and James Street.
- This option limits the number of movements in and out of the development.


### 2.2.1.4 Option 3 - Offset signalized intersection at Edey St \Galvin St \Daniel St.

Option 3 was discussed in the 10 Galvin Street - James Street Signal Warrant Technical Memorandum (September 12, 2019) prepared by CGH Transportation. The technical memorandum includes input from Partham Engineering (engineering firm specialized in design and installation of traffic control signals and illumination) that identifies issues with implementing signals at Galvin St. Specifically Partham identifies the following:

> "This is not an ideal location to implement traffic signals. If traffic signals are added at Daniel St and Galvin St, they would need to operate from one controller at Daniel St and Edey St. Ideally the controller setup would provide an extended green signal on Daniel St EB at Galvin St and on Daniel St WB at Edey St. This is required to reduce the number of rear-end collisions caused by closely spaced signals. But this setup would cause an "amber trap" situation on Daniel St eastbound at Edey St and Daniel St westbound at Galvin St. The eastbound direction is shown an amber while the opposing westbound direction is still shown an extended green signal. Motorists facing the eastbound amber signal assume westbound motorists also have an amber signal and that traffic will stop. This leads to a potential for angle type accidents. This same condition would exist for Daniel St eastbound at Galvin St.
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The second option would be to eliminate the extended green operation and display amber to all directions on Daniel St at the same time. Due to the close spacing of signals motorists may react differently. Some may try to stop between signals while other will try to clear the intersection. This can lead to rear-end type collisions.

Closely spaced signals such as these will always cause traffic related issues. If traffic signals are not warranted at Daniel St and Galvin St then consideration should be given to not install signals."

This option can be found in various municipalities throughout Ontario and is still being implemented. It is not a preferred option due to safety issues.

### 2.2.1.5 Option 4 - Roundabout at Edey St $\backslash$ Galvin St $\backslash$ Daniel St.

A functional design study would be required to fully assess the feasibility of a roundabout at this location. Based on our preliminary review of the traffic volumes, roadway geometrics and site constraints, offset intersections are not ideal candidates for roundabouts. Based of the information provided, an inscribed circle diameter of 52.0 m and an island diameter (including truck apron) of 39.0 m would be required resulting in a larger footprint impact than the proposed realigned intersection. The roundabout would impact the following quadrants from a property perspective:

- South-east quadrant including the Arnprior Motor Inn
- North-east quadrant
- North-west quadrant

Impacts will include:

- Relocation of above ground utilities (Hydro One and Bell poles) and underground (gas, Bell)
- Adjustment and relocation of catchbasins (storm sewer modifications to match realignment)
- Relocation of fire hydrant and adjustment to water valves
- Impacts to ravine and extension of the 1600 mm CPS culvert by 5-6 m
- Entrance modifications including closure of one of the entrances at the Arnprior Motor Inn and modification to the Michelson Auto Centre Galvin Street entrance.
- Property acquisition. Property will be required in the south-east quadrant (vacant lot 78 and 79), Arnprior Curling Club and potential impact to Arnprior Motor Inn property. There may also be property impacts in the north-west quadrant due to culvert extension.
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## 3.0 cost estimates

Class C cost estimates have been developed for each alternative and are summarized below in Table 1 below. Table 1 can also be found in Appendix C.

Table 1 - "Class C" Cost Estimates

| Section | Description |  | Option 1 <br> Realizned <br> Intersection |  | ption 2A <br> -in $\backslash$ Risht- <br> Out |  | Option 2B <br> t-in \Right- <br> Out <br> w New ersection at iel \James |  | Option 3 Offset tersection |  | Option 4 Roundabout |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | General | \$ | 10,000.00 | \$ | 5,000.00 | \$ | 5,000.00 | \$ | 8,000.00 | \$ | 20,000.00 |
| B | Removals | \$ | 95,000.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 115,000.00 |
| C | Storm | \$ | 80,000.00 | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | 135,000.00 |
| D | Road ${ }^{1}$ | \$ | 313,000.00 | \$ | 25,000.00 | \$ | 100,000.00 | \$ | 30,000.00 | \$ | 555,000.00 |
| E | Landscaping | \$ | 16,000.00 | \$ | - | \$ | 5,000.00 | \$ | 4,000.00 | \$ | 35,000.00 |
| F | Traffic Signals ${ }^{2}$ | \$ | 185,000.00 | \$ | - | \$ | 195,000.00 | \$ | 120,000.00 |  |  |
| G | Streetlighting ${ }^{3}$ | \$ | 35,000.00 | \$ | - | \$ | 40,000.00 | \$ | 30,000.00 | \$ | 140,000.00 |
| Estimated Construction Tender Total |  | \$ | 734,000.00 | \$ | 30,000.00 | \$ | 345,000.00 | \$ | 192,000.00 | \$ | 1,000,000.00 |
| Engineering Services (20\% of Construction Total) |  | \$ | 146,800.00 | \$ | 6,000.00 | \$ | 69,000.00 | \$ | 38,400.00 | \$ | 200,000.00 |
| Utilities |  | \$ | 22,000.00 | \$ | - | \$ | 20,000.00 | \$ | - | \$ | 38,000.00 |
| Property ${ }^{4}$ |  | TB |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | TB |  |
| Town Internal Costs (5\% of Construction Total) |  | \$ | 36,700.00 | \$ | 1,500.00 | \$ | 17,250.00 | \$ | 9,600.00 | \$ | 50,000.00 |
| Miscellaneous (5\% of Construction Total) |  | \$ | 36,700.00 | \$ | 1,500.00 | \$ | 17,250.00 | \$ | 9,600.00 | \$ | 50,000.00 |
| Sub-Total |  | \$ | 976,200.00 | \$ | 39,000.00 | \$ | 468,500.00 | \$ | 249,600.00 | \$ | 1,338,000.00 |
| Contingency (20\%) |  | \$ | 195,240.00 | \$ | 7,800.00 | \$ | 93,700.00 | \$ | 49,920.00 | \$ | 267,600.00 |
| Total |  | \$ | 1,171,440.00 | \$ | 46,800.00 | \$ | 562,200.00 | \$ | 299,520.00 | \$ | 1,605,600.00 |

${ }^{1}$ Assume 2 lifts 60 mm SuperPave, 150 mm Granular A, 400mm Granular B, Type II
${ }^{2}$ Does not include cost for PXO at roundabout
${ }^{3}$ Assume that streetlighting will entail of 400 W equivalent LED luminaires in all splitter islands within the intersection and with a spacing of 35 m to 50 m on each of the approaches
${ }^{4}$ Property costs unknown for Option 1 and Option 4

### 3.1 COMPARATIVE REVIEW OF INTERSECTION DESIGN OPTIONS

Using the information available, including topographic mapping, utility information, conceptual designs of the options were developed for the Edey St $\backslash$ Galvin St $\backslash$ Daniel St intersection.
The following provides a high-level review of the intersection options identified in this memo. Six key criteria will be used to summarize each alternative. These include:
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## Safety Improvements:

The safety improvement potential of the traffic control options was evaluated.

- Option 1 - Realigned signalized intersection. The traffic signal option is expected to improve safety on the sideroads as the eastbound and westbound movements would operate under dedicated signal phases. The intersection skew angle $\left(70^{\circ}\right)$ does not provide the best geometry resulting in reduced sight triangles.
- Option 2A - Right-in, Right-out access to Galvin St. This option is relatively neutral in terms of safety improvements. It results in a reduced number of movements and thus a reduction in potential conflicts at the Galvin St intersection but increases number of vehicles accessing and leaving the development through the James St \Daniel St intersection.
- Option 2B - Right-in, Right-out access to Galvin St including new traffic signals at Daniel St and James St. This option is relatively neutral in terms of safety improvements. It results in a reduced number of movements and thus a reduction in potential conflicts. It also directs certain movement to the development through James St $\backslash$ Daniel St intersection. The addition of traffic signals at James St $\backslash$ Daniel St improves the safety at the intersection given the existing sight line constraints that are present there.
- Option 3 - Staggered signalized intersection at Edey St $\backslash$ Galvin St $\backslash$ Daniel St. This option is not recommended given that it creates additional safety concerns.
- Option 4 - Roundabout at Edey St $\backslash$ Galvin St $\backslash$ Daniel St. The roundabout option is expected to improve the overall safety at the intersection as it reduces the conflict points from 32 points to 8 points. In addition, the roundabout design option is expected to result in reduced speeds at all entry approaches.


## Traffic Operations:

Based on the traffic operational analysis in 10 Galvin Street - James Street Signal Warrant Technical Memorandum (September 12, 2019) prepared by CGH Transportation, the signalized intersection options are anticipated to operate acceptably under projected future conditions. The right-in \right-out will also function based on the CGH Transportation Technical Memorandum but will direct traffic to James Street. As part of the right-in \right-out option (Option 2B), traffic signals will be installed at the intersection of Daniel St and James Street. It should be noted that there are sightline issues at the intersection of James St and Daniel Street that will need to be addressed $\$ mitigated. It is assumed that the roundabout would also be able to operate acceptably under project future conditions.

## Site Access:

Site access arrangements were evaluated for all options, particularly for the existing garage, motor inn as well as access to the community.
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- Option 1 - Realigned signalized intersection. This option will result in adjustment of the Michelson Auto Centre entrance. Stantec is recommending the closure of one of the entrances to the Arnprior Motor Inn.
- Option 2A - Right-in, Right-out access to Galvin St. This option is relatively neutral in terms of site access. There are no access impacts to nearby sites. It is noted that this option limits the movements into the Fairground development at Galvin St.
- Option 2B - Right-in, Right-out access to Galvin St including new traffic signals at Daniel St and James St. This option is relatively neutral in terms of site access. There are no access impacts to nearby sites. It is noted that this option limits the movements into the Fairground development at Galvin St.
- Option 3 - Staggered signalized intersection at Edey St $\backslash$ Galvin St $\backslash$ Daniel St. Site access is not impacted by this option.
- Option 4 - Roundabout at Edey St $\backslash$ Galvin St $\backslash$ Daniel St. Site access to the Arnprior Motor Inn and Michelson Auto Centre will be impacted.


## Utility Impacts:

Impacts to existing utilities were reviewed for all options.

- Option 1 - Realigned signalized intersection. Three utility poles are directly impacted by this option, resulting in relocation of up to 6 utility poles. Illumination poles are also impacted.
- Option 2A - Right-in, Right-out access to Galvin St. It is anticipated that no utilities are impacted under this option.
- Option 2B - Right-in, Right-out access to Galvin St including new traffic signals at Daniel St and James St. It is anticipated that no utilities are impacted under this option. A preliminary design is required to determine property and utility impacts at this location.
- Option 3 - Staggered signalized intersection at Edey St \Galvin St \Daniel St. It is anticipated that one utility pole will be impacted by this option. Underground utility plant is not anticipated to be impacted.
- Option 4 - Roundabout at Edey St $\backslash$ Galvin St \Daniel St. Four utility poles are directly impacted by this option, resulting in relocation of up to 6 utility poles. Illumination poles are also impacted. Underground utility plant is not anticipated to be impacted.


## Land Requirements:

Property impacts were reviewed for each option.
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- Option 1 - Realigned signalized intersection. This option results in the property impacts on the northwest quadrant, and the south-east quadrant including the Arnprior Curling Club.
- Option 2A Right-in, Right-out access to Galvin St. Signals at Edey St to remain as is. No property impacts resulting from this option
- Option 2B Right-in, Right-out access to Galvin St including new traffic signals at Daniel St and James St. Signals at Edey St to remain as is. No property impacts resulting from this option
- Option 3 - Staggered signalized intersection at Edey St $\backslash$ Galvin St \Daniel St. It is anticipated that no property impacts will result from this option. A preliminary design is required to determine property and utility impacts at this location.
- Option 4 - Roundabout at Edey St $\backslash$ Galvin St \Daniel St. This option results in the property impacts on the north-west quadrant, and the south-east quadrant including the Arnprior Curling Club and the Arnprior Motor Inn.


## Costs / Implementation:

'Class C' cost estimates were prepared for the options using typical unit prices (based on local municipal client 2019 rates); these estimates considered all the improvements identified for each design option.

- Option 1 - Realigned signalized intersection. Improvement costs are moderate.
- Option 2A - Right-in, Right-out access to Galvin St. Improvement costs for this option are low.
- Option 2B - Right-in, Right-out access to Galvin St including new traffic signals at Daniel St and James St. Improvement costs for this option are low.
- Option 3 - Staggered signalized intersection at Edey St \Galvin St \Daniel St. Improvement costs for this option are moderate.
- Option 4 - Roundabout at Edey St $\backslash$ Galvin St $\backslash$ Daniel St. Improvement costs for this option are high.


### 4.0 REVIEW OF OPTIONS

This section provides an overview of the intersection Options.
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### 4.1 COMPARATIVE REVIEW OF INTERSECTION DESIGN OPTIONS

Table 2 in Appendix $\mathbf{D}$ provides a comparative review and summary of the intersection design options. It should be noted that a functional design study has not been completed for each option. This review provides identifies the strengths and weaknesses for each option and provides magnitude of costs for each.

## Stantec Consulting Ltd

Angelo Renon, P.Eng.

Phone: 613-799-8773
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## APPENDIX A

Photos


Galvin St looking west toward Daniel St


Daniel St at Galvin St looking north


Daniel St \Edey St intersection looking toward Edey St


Galvin St looking west toward Daniel St


Daniel St looking south toward Edey St intersection


Daniel St looking south near intersection with Edey St.


Daniel St at Edey St looking south


Edey St looking west near culvert crossing


Daniel St at Edey St looking north


Edey St looking east toward Daniel St


1600 csp culvert


Utilities on north-west corner of Edey St \} \backslash Daniel St.


## APPENDIX B

Figure 2-5

## Realigned Signalized Intersection

## Turning Templates





## APPENDIX C

Figure C
Class C Cost Estimate

TABLE 2 - Comparative Review of Intersection Design Options

| CRITERIA | OPTION 1 REALIGNED SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION | OPTION 2A RIGHT-IN \RIGHT-OUT | OPTION 2B RIGHT-IN \RIGHT-OUT, SIGNALS AT DANIEL \JAMES | OPTION 3 OFFSET SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION | OPTION 4 ROUNDABOUT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS | Improved safety on Edey St and Galvin St | (4) Reduces conflicts at intersection | (1) Reduces conflicts at intersection | Safety concerns due to increased conflicts associated with offset intersection. | Improved safety at intersection. Number of conflict points reduced. Reduced speeds at all entry approaches |
| TRAFFIC OPERATIONS | Intersection to operate acceptably under projected future conditions | Intersection operate acceptably under future conditions with concentration of traffic to Fairground development at Daniel $\backslash$ James intersection | Intersection operate acceptably under future conditions with concentration of traffic to Fairground development at Daniel $\backslash$ James intersection | Intersection to operate acceptably under projected future conditions | Intersection to operate acceptably under projected future conditions |
| SITE ACCESS | Site access maintained. Recommend closing on access to Arnprior Motor Inn. | (1)Limits access to Fairground <br> development at Galvin St | (ل) $\begin{aligned} & \text { Limits access to Fairground } \\ & \text { development at Galvin St }\end{aligned}$ | (1) Limits access to properties | Garage access to be impacted to potentially one (1) point of access. |
| UTILITY IMPACTS | Significant impacts to existing utilities. Will require relocation of a number of utility poles | No impacts to utilities | No impacts to utilities anticipated | Minor impacts to utilities | Significant impacts to existing utilities. Will require relocation of a number of utility poles |
| LAND REQUIREMENTS | $\bigcirc$ Larger Property requirements | Potential for property acquisition \easements | Potential for property acquisition \easements | No Property requirements | Significantly larger property requirements |
| COSTS / IMPLEMENTATION | Additional Traffic Signal infrastructure costs. Higher roadway construction and property costs. Higher maintenance and operating costs | Low cost. | (1) Mid -low cost. | Additional Traffic Signal infrastructure costs. Higher maintenance and operating costs. Low roadway construction costs | No Traffic Signal infrastructure costs. Higher roadway construction and property costs. |Performs Poorly Against CriteriaPerforms Adequately Against Criteria

Performs Well Against Criteria
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Figure D
Comparative Review of Intersection Design Options

Table 1 - "Class C" Cost Estimates

| Section | Description |  | Option 1 <br> Realigned <br> Intersection |  | ption 2A <br> -in \Right- <br> Out |  | ption 2B t-in \ RightOut w New rsection at iel \James |  | Option 3 Offset tersection |  | Option 4 Roundabout |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | General | \$ | 10,000.00 | \$ | 5,000.00 | \$ | 5,000.00 | \$ | 8,000.00 | \$ | 20,000.00 |
| B | Removals | \$ | 95,000.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 115,000.00 |
| C | Storm | \$ | 80,000.00 | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | 135,000.00 |
| D | Road ${ }^{1}$ | \$ | 313,000.00 | \$ | 25,000.00 | \$ | 100,000.00 | \$ | 30,000.00 |  | 555,000.00 |
| E | Landscaping | \$ | 16,000.00 | \$ | - | \$ | 5,000.00 | \$ | 4,000.00 | \$ | 35,000.00 |
| F | Traffic Signals ${ }^{2}$ | \$ | 185,000.00 | \$ | - | \$ | 195,000.00 | \$ | 120,000.00 |  |  |
| G | Streetlighting ${ }^{3}$ | \$ | 35,000.00 | \$ | - | \$ | 40,000.00 | \$ | 30,000.00 |  | 140,000.00 |
| Estimated Construction Tender Total |  | \$ | 734,000.00 | \$ | 30,000.00 | \$ | 345,000.00 | \$ | 192,000.00 | \$ | 1,000,000.00 |
| Engineering Services (20\% of Construction Total) |  | \$ | 146,800.00 | \$ | 6,000.00 | \$ | 69,000.00 | \$ | 38,400.00 | \$ | 200,000.00 |
| Utilities |  | \$ | 22,000.00 | \$ | - | \$ | 20,000.00 | \$ | - | \$ | 38,000.00 |
| Property ${ }^{4}$ |  | TB | D | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |
| Town Internal Costs (5\% of Construction Total) |  | \$ | 36,700.00 | \$ | 1,500.00 | \$ | 17,250.00 | \$ | 9,600.00 | \$ | 50,000.00 |
| Miscellaneous (5\% of Construction Total) |  | \$ | 36,700.00 | \$ | 1,500.00 | \$ | 17,250.00 | \$ | 9,600.00 | \$ | 50,000.00 |
| Sub-Total |  | \$ | 976,200.00 | \$ | 39,000.00 | \$ | 468,500.00 | \$ | 249,600.00 | \$ | 1,338,000.00 |
| Contingency (20\%) |  | \$ | 195,240.00 | \$ | 7,800.00 | \$ | 93,700.00 | \$ | 49,920.00 | \$ | 267,600.00 |
| Total |  | \$ | 1,171,440.00 | \$ | 46,800.00 | \$ | 562,200.00 | \$ | 299,520.00 | \$ | 1,605,600.00 |

${ }^{1}$ Assume 2 lifts 60 mm SuperPave, 150 mm Granular A, 400 mm Granular B, Type II
${ }^{2}$ Does not include cost for PXO at roundabout
${ }^{3}$ Assume that streetlighting will entail of 400W equivalent LED luminaires in all splitter islands within the intersection and with a spacing of 35 m to 50 m on each of the approaches
${ }^{4}$ Property costs unknown for Option 1 and Option 4
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## July 2018:

- Public comments received from residents in advance of subdivision public meeting expressed concern with increased traffic along adjacent Thomas Street.
- This initiated a review of potential staggered/offset signalized intersection at Daniel St. and Galvin St.
- Town requested that developer's engineers review the viability of a staggered/offset, signalized intersection along with realignment with Edey Street and the right-in, right-out option.


## Background

## June 2018:

- Town initiated discussions with County regarding proposed Fairgrounds plan of subdivision, recognizing challenges with primary access road to development being Galvin St from Daniel St.
- County initially required Galvin St be restricted to right-in-right-out turning movements.
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## Background

## Background

## September 10, 2018:

- Public meeting for Fairgrounds Subdivision well attended by residents in community.
- Public concerns raised included:

1. Increasing volumes of traffic on Daniel St and at nearby intersections with Michael, Havey, William, Edey and Galvin Streets.
2. Requests for additional signalization on Daniel Street.
3. Increased flow of cut-through traffic from Fairgrounds through nearby residential neighbourhoods (Thomas St) and resulting safety concerns for pedestrians/ children.
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## Background

## September 2019:

- Developer's updated TIS concluded:

1. Speed hump recommended on Thomas Street.
2. Need for signalization at Daniel St and James St not warranted at full build-out of subdivision.
3. Safety concerns with staggered/offset intersection due to spacing of Edey St and Galvin St:
a) Programming extended green signal on Daniel St could cause angle-type collisions (amber trap).
b) Not programming extended green signal on Daniel St can cause rear-end collisions as some motorists will stop at amber signal while others try to clear intersection.

## Background

## Background

## June 2020:

- Town engaged Stantec to further review intersection options.
- Assignment objectives included:
- Develop realigned signalized intersection option
- Consider and discuss other intersection options
- Identify and discuss constraints and impacts of options
- Determine Class Environmental Assessment (EA) requirements
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## Evaluation Criteria

Review of options included six criteria:

1. Safety Improvements
2. Traffic Operations
3. Site Access
4. Utility Impacts
5. Land Requirements
6. Cost/Implementation
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## Report Findings

- Stantec report suggests that Option \#1 Realigned Signalized Intersection provides best solution for the three main long-term operational criteria being:

1. Safety improvements
2. Traffic operations
3. Site access

- Unfortunately, cost impacted criteria being utility impacts, land requirements and other costs to implement works all come at fairly significant cost totaling an estimated \$1,171,440
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## 1

October 2020:

- Town circulated Stantec's technical memo to County for comment and received the following response:
"Option 1 is the preferred proposal to avoid any future liabilities for the County of Renfrew. It has been the past practice of the County of Renfrew that situations such as these are not a County responsibility and that it is the sole obligation of the Town and the developer. With that said, should the Town of Arnprior wish to submit a proposal to the Operations Committee and County Council, approved by Resolution from the Arnprior Town Council outlining any cost sharing agreement, will be required."
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## Financial Considerations

## "Benefit to Existing"

- Intersection has always had poor alignment.
- Pre-existing access and turning movement challenges at Daniel St and Galvin St due to close proximity to Edey St signals.
- Recent public concerns in media (red light runners, crosswalks, etc.) in part due to geometry of intersection.
- Town proposing equal split with County for "benefit to existing" as County owns intersection, but portion of proposed work is on adjacent Arnprior streets.


## Financial Considerations

## November 2020:

- Arnprior reviewed Option \#1 against its Local Service Policy in the DC Bylaw, noting the following applicable sections:
- Section 3.1 states "Traffic signalization within or external to development - include in D.C. calculation to the extent permitted under s. 5 (1) of the D.C.A."
- Section 4.3 states "Intersection improvements with County roads and provincial highways - Include in D.C. calculation to the exten that they are a Town responsibility"
- Intersection steadily getting busier due to overall growth.
- Arnprior consulted Watson and Associates who advised that Option \#1 project could be funded up to $50 \%$ through Town's DC bylaw (provision for roads), with remaining percentage of project considered "benefit to existing".
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## Financial Considerations

- While the Town's DC Bylaw and Local Service Policy indicate that this project is not a direct developer responsibility, Arnprior advised developer of expectation to contribute towards project on basis that original draft condition required them to construct right-in-right-out and revised condition required them to undertake functional design of offset intersection.
- Previous draft conditions valued in range of $\$ 50,000$.
- $\$ 50 \mathrm{k}$ deemed reasonable amount to require as developer contribution.
- Developer will also be contributing towards project through cost of development charges on nearly 150 future building permits.
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| Financial Considerations |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Projected Funding Source | Percent of Total Cost | Estimated Total Contribution Amount |
| Arnprior Development Charge Reserve Fund (Provision for Roads) | 50\% | \$635,720 |
| Arnprior Capital Expenditure Reserve Fund | 23\% | \$292,860 |
| County of Renfrew contribution | 23\% | \$292,860 |
| Developer contribution (design) | 4\% | \$50,000 |
| Estimated Total | 100\% | \$1,271,440 |

Note: For purposes of estimate, additional \$100,000 has been added as estimated cost to acquire required land on south-east quadrant (vacant lot 79)

## County Taxes from Arnprior

For 2020, Property Taxes:

- \$9,569,138 Municipal Taxes
- \$4,060,269 County Taxes
- \$2,544,106 Education Taxes

Percentage of residential tax revenue $=82 \%$
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## Arnprior Resolution

November 23, 2020:
Arnprior Council considered report from staff and passed following resolution (No. 324-20):

1. That Council support Option \#1 Realigned Signalized Intersection as outlined in the Edey Street $\backslash$ Galvin Street $\backslash$ Daniel Street Intersection Review, prepared by Stantec, dated September 9th, 2020 as the preferred option for the future of the intersection; and
2. That Council direct staff to amend draft conditions 2. v) for the Arnprio Fairgrounds Subdivision File No: 47-T-18004, as follows: The Owner shall contribute a portion of the cost of the Realigned Signalized Intersection (Option \#1) as outlined in the Edey Street \Galvin Street \} Daniel Street Intersection Review, prepared by Stantec, dated September 9th, 2020, in the amount of $\$ 50,000$; and

## Arnprior Resolution

3. That Council direct staff to submit a written request to the County of Renfrew Operations Committee and County Council, requesting that the County of Renfrew contribute a portion of the cost of the Realigned Signalized Intersection (Option \#1), in the amount of 23\% of the total project cost, to a maximum upset limit of $\$ 292,860$; and
4. That Council direct staff to include the estimated cost to undertake the design in the 2021 draft capital budget and include the Town's portion of the estimated costs required to undertake the project in the 2021 of the estimated costs required to
draft Range Capital Forecast.
5. That Council direct staff to provide a copy of this report and approved recommendation to any residents who provided comments at the Public Meeting dated September 10, 2018 in regard to the Draft Plan of Subdivision.

## Revised Conditions

March 12, 2021:

- County Planning Department issued letter of revised draft conditions to developer:

The owner will not be required to design and construct an off-set signalized intersection at Galvin/Edey/Daniel Street. The revised condition will require that the owner contribute financially to future intersection improvements.

- The owner will be required to design and construct a right-in right-out intersection improvements at Galvin and Daniel St (County Road 2).
- A notice will also be mailed out by County to everyone who requested notice as part of public process.


## Public Consultation

## December 2020:

- A copy of staff report from November 23rd 2020 Council meeting, contemplating intersection design options, has been provided to residents who provided comments at September 10th, 2018 Public Meeting.
- No comments have been received from public in response to this circulation.
- Future implementation of Option \#1 Realigned Signalized Intersection would help to address public concerns.
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## Future Considerations Development Charges

- The Development Charges Act, 1997 lays out Ontario's regulatory and legislative framework which municipalities must follow to levy development charges. This legislation resulted from negotiations with municipalities and developers and is based on the core principle that development charges are a primary tool in ensuring that "growth pays for growth".
- That said, opting out of Development Charges does not exempt a municipality (upper tier or lower tier) from their obligations to manage growth accordingly and plan for necessary expansion of infrastructure and services to accommodate growth.


## Future Considerations Development Charges

Development Charges Act. 1997
Planning Act, ss. 51, 53
"59 (1) A municipality shall not, by way of a condition or agreement under section 51 or 53 of the Planning Act, impose directly or indirectly a charge related to a development or a requirement to construct a service related to development except as allowed in subsection (2). 1997, c. 27, s. 59 (1). Exception for local services
(2) A condition or agreement referred to in subsection (1) may provide for
a) local services, related to a plan of subdivision or within the area to which the plan relates, to be installed or paid for by the owner as a condition of approval under section 51 of the Planning Act;
b) local services to be installed or paid for by the owner as a condition of approval under section 53 of the Planning Act. 1997, c. 27, s. 59 (2),

## Future Considerations Master Transportation Study

- County's 2006 Arnprior/ McNab Braeside Area Transportation Planning Study "aimed at identifying growth- related needs and the infrastructure improvements required upgrades required to support such growth."
- Recent review of this document reveals numerous recommended improvements to County roads which have not yet been undertaken or considered in the County's long range financial planning documents.


## Future Considerations Master Transportation Study

- Recommended projects include:
- Upgrade Baskin Dr (Daniel St to Division St) from rural collector to urban arterial (2025).
- Upgrade Division St from rural/urban collector to urban arterial (2025).
- Widen Daniel St (Hwy 417 to Baskin Dr) to include 3 northbound and 3 southbound thru lanes (2025).
- Restrict access to Daniel St (Baskin Dr to Staye Court Dr) to right-in-right-out only.
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## Final Thoughts

- Arnprior tax dollars going to the County annually have continued to rise with the growth that Arnprior experiences. Understanding that tax dollars fund numerous services at the County level, if DC's are not desirable, a portion of the increased taxes should be coming back to the town by way of making these essential growth related improvements. This should not be a discussion of precedent setting, but rather recognizing the need to appropriately manage growth.
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## Future Considerations

 Master Transportation Study- Growth in the Town of Arnprior continues to progress at a significant rate.
- Town of Arnprior's Long Range Capital Forecast currently includes an updated Transportation Master Plan in the year 2022, however the majority of growth related traffic concerns are on County roads, being the major arterial roads in Town
- Town of Arnprior has requested that County Public Works propose funding to County Council in 2022 to undertake a joint Master Transportation Study with the Town of Arnprior.
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## Recommendation

- The Town of Arnprior requests that the County of Renfrew contribute a portion of the cost of the Realigned Signalized Intersection (Option \#1), in the amount of $23 \%$ of the total project cost, to a maximum upset limit of $\$ 292,860$.
- The 2021 Town Capital Budget includes the design of the re-alignment, while the construction was added to 2023 of the Long Range Capital Forecast.


37

## INFRASTRUCTURE DIVISION REPORT

Prepared by: Taylor Hanrath, Acting Manager of Infrastructure Prepared for: Operations Committee

April 13, 2021

## INFORMATION

## 1. County Road 51 (Petawawa Boulevard) Expansion [Strategic Plan Goal No. 2 (b)]

Attached as Appendix IN-I are preliminary drawings of the proposed roundabouts on County Road 51 (Petawawa Boulevard) at the intersection of County Road 26 (Doran Road) and Mohns Avenue and the intersection of County Road 55 (Paquette Road) and the Garrison Entrance that have been developed by AECOM as well as an aerial photo depicting the existing layout of each of the intersections for reference. Staff note that the proposed roundabout at the intersection of County Roads 51 and 26 may have substantial impacts to the County's trail system, which currently crosses County Road 26 at this location and is proposed to cross County Road 26 and Hila Road in order to circumvent the roundabout. Staff has requested that AECOM examine the full affects on the trail. As per Committee Resolution, as approved by Council on March 31, 2021 staff are continuing to develop a schedule and financial plan for the construction of a roundabout at the intersection of County Roads 51 and 26 . However, as further design and evaluation is required by our Design Consultant, AECOM, more detailed information will be presented at a future Committee meeting.

Attached as Appendix IN-II is a map indicating the area of County Road 51 (Petawawa Boulevard) being considered for expansion to four lanes as well as the proposed location Brindle Road accesses currently being designed for Garrison Petawawa, which are anticipated to alleviate the traffic pressures along County Road 51 by 25\%.

Consistent with direction from Committee and Council, tenders have been received by the Operations Division for the mill and pave, with significant curb repairs of County Road 51 (Petawawa Boulevard) from County Road 26 (Doran Road) to County Road 55 (Paquette Road). Given the poor
condition of County Road 51 in this area and the considerable timeline delay should the construction of roundabouts or the expansion of County Road 51 proceed, it is recommended that these 2021 Capital Works be undertaken as planned.

## BY-LAWS

## 2. Oversized and Overweight Vehicle Permits [Strategic Plan No. 2 (a)]

Recommendation: THAT the Operations Committee recommend that County Council pass a By-law to authorize the Director of Public Works and Engineering, or designate, to issue permits governing the movement of oversize and overweight vehicles on County Roads; AND FURTHER THAT By-law 55-94 be rescinded.

## Background

The proposed by-law and corresponding Schedule A, governing the movement of oversized and overweight vehicles on County Roads has been revised since first presented for review at the March meeting of Operations Committee.

Several improvements have been made including a clause consequence with respect to Emergency Moves which the former By-law did not address. The revised version allows the Chief Administrative Officer to determine if an emergency move is warranted during spring load restrictions.

## 3. County Road 62 (John Street) Stop up, Close and Convey Land [Strategic Plan No. 2 (a)]

Recommendation: THAT the Operations Committee recommend that County Council pass a By-law to stop up, close and convey the land located within the County Road 62 (John Street) road allowance in Part Lots 182, 183 and 184, Range "B" South, geographic Township of Sherwood, in the Township of Madawaska Valley, described as Parts 1-4 on Reference Plan 49R-19681, to Zuracon Inc. for the sum of Seventeen Thousand Dollars $(\$ 17,000)$;

AND FURTHER THAT the Operations Committee recommend that County Council pass a By-law to enter into an easement agreement with Hydro One Networks Inc. within the County Road 62 (John Street) road allowance in Part Lots 182, 183 and

184, Range "B" South, geographic Township of Sherwood, in the Township of Madawaska Valley, described as Part 2 on Reference Plan 49R-19681.

## Background

The County of Renfrew Public Works and Engineering Department has been approached by Zuracon Inc. located in Barry's Bay about the potential to purchase a portion of surplus road allowance fronting on their property at 306 John Street (County Road 62).

The County of Renfrew Public Works and Engineering Department reviewed the lands and over the past several months has been working towards the disposal of the surplus lands. A survey of the surplus lands was completed in the summer of 2020 which shows that 1.253 acres could be sold to Zuracon Inc. This would allow the County to retain an offset of 15.0 metres from the centreline of John Street, which would still be in excess of the 13.0 metre County standard.

A certified appraisal report has been completed by Rivington Associates in March of 2021 which provides a value of $\$ 17,000$ for the lands. In accordance with County of Renfrew Corporate Policy GA-02 Disposal of Assets, the land is considered non-viable as the potential benefit would be to Zuracon Inc. Staff is recommending that the land be sold to Zuracon Inc. for the aforementioned value.

Prior to completing the sale of the land, Hydro One Networks Inc. wishes to retain an easement over Part 2, Plan 49R-19681 for an existing anchor. A copy of Plan 49R-19681 has been included as Appendix IN-III.

## 4. Alterations to County Roads and Structures [Strategic Plan No. 3 (b)]

Recommendation: THAT the Operations Committee recommend that County Council pass a By-law approving the alterations to County Roads and Structures.

## Background

Section 35 of the Municipal Act 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25, as amended allows a municipality to pass By-laws removing or restricting the common law right-of-passage by the public over a highway and the common law right-ofaccess to the highway by an owner of land abutting a highway. For several of our 2021 capital projects, the work may include temporary or permanent
changes, alterations or restrictions to the use of the highway, or to private entrances. These works, therefore, should be authorized by By-law.

Approval of the alterations to a highway is intended to be the final step in the design process, wherein the Committee and Council authorize the work to proceed, subject to the budget and tender process. The approval is intended to apply only to those Capital Projects, which would result in alterations to the highway that could affect a person's access to and from their land, or that could significantly restrict or alter the use of the highway for a period of time. Only those projects that involve significant alterations are presented for approval.

The approval of the alterations deals solely with the nature and extent of the work and does not approve funding or contract awards for the work. The approval of funding and contracts for the work would remain a part of the normal budget, tendering, review and approval processes. Temporary road closures or lane restrictions, and entrance closures may be required during construction. All existing entrances will be reinstated. Schedule A to the By-law outlines the projects that will involve changes to the highways and infrastructures which could affect the common law right-of-passage over the highway, or vehicle access to an adjacent private property.

Preliminary Design Drawing
Proposed Roundabout at Garrison Petawawa at County Road 51 (Petawawa Boulevard) and County Road 55 (Paquette Road) Intersection


Preliminary Design Drawing
Proposed Roundabout at County Road 51 (Petawawa Boulevard) and County Road 55 (Paquette Road) Intersection

HILDA STREET

a૪OY NҰYOC




## COUNTY OF RENFREW

## BY-LAW NUMBER

## A BY-LAW TO AUTHORIZE THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ENGINEERING OR DESIGNATE TO ISSUE PERMITS GOVERNING THE MOVEMENT OF OVERSIZE AND OVERWEIGHT VEHICLES ON COUNTY ROADS


#### Abstract

WHEREAS under Section 110 (1) of the Highway Traffic Act R.S.O. 1990, as amended provides that a municipal corporation having jurisdiction over the highway may, upon application in writing, grant a permit for use of the highway by a vehicle or combination of vehicles in excess of the dimensional limits set out in the Highway Traffic Act;


AND WHEREAS Section 110 (3) of the Highway Traffic Act, R.S.O. 1990 provides for the issuance of such permits by an Officer of the Corporation;

AND WHEREAS the Corporation of the County of Renfrew deems it desirable to allow the County Engineer or their designate to issue permits referred to and in accordance with section 110 of the Highway Traffic Act R.S.O. 1990 a;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew hereby enacts as follows:

1. That By-law 55-94 be rescinded.
2. That the Director of Public Works and Engineering or designate be authorized to issue permits in accordance with Section 110 of the Highway Traffic Act R.S.O. 1990.
3. That the issuance of such permits shall be subject to the terms and conditions as set by the County Engineer.
4. That the fees charged for the issuance of such permit shall be as set out in the By-law to "Establish and Require Payment of User Fees and Charges" as amended.
5. That this By-law shall come into force and take effect upon the passing thereof.

READ a first time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a second time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a third time and finally passed this 28th day of April 2021.

[^0]PAUL V. MOREAU, CLERK

## SCHEDULE "A"

## 1) Definitions

a) "Axle" means an assembly of two or more wheels whose centres are in one transverse vertical plane and which are transmitting weight to the highway.
b) "Annual permit" means a permit issued by the County to allow movement of over-dimensional vehicles, subject to specified restrictions, and are valid for one year from date of issue.
c) "Director" means the County's Director of Public Works and Engineering or designate.
d) "Over-dimensional vehicle" means any combination of vehicle and load having a width, length, height or weight more than the limits provided for in the Highway Traffic Act.
e) "Reduced load periods" means the period of time when weight loads may be reduced on County Roads by the Director pursuant to County of Renfrew By-law No. 12-05 being a By-law to Designate a Reduced Load Period on County of Renfrew Roads.
f) "Single Move permit" means a permit issued by the County to allow movement of a specific over-dimensional vehicle, subject to specified restrictions, for a one-way trip of limited duration on specified County highways.
g) "Seasonal Permit" means a permit issued by the County to allow movement of greater than permitted axle weights for essential agricultural-related moves during the reduced load period.
h) "Superload" means a vehicle and load combination having one or more of the following characteristics (i) gross weight in excess of 120,000 kilograms, (ii) length of 45.75 metres or greater, (iii) width of 5.0 metres.

## 2) Over-dimensional vehicle movements

Except as provided in Emergency Moves, no person shall move an overdimensional vehicle on any County highway without having obtained an over-dimensional vehicle permit approved by the Director, CAO or their delegated authority.

## 3) Emergency Moves

Where public safety or health is concerned, movement of an overdimensional vehicle may occur without a permit at the discretion of the Director or Chief Administrative Officer (CAO). The Director or CAO may require any or all information to confirm the validity of an emergency overdimensional vehicle movement. Where an emergency move has taken place, an over-dimensional vehicle permit shall be applied for on the same day the movement is commenced, or if the office of the Director is not open for the issuance of permits, on the morning of the next day on which the office is open.

## 4) Over-dimensional vehicle permits

1) The County retains the right to not issue an over-dimensional vehicle permit, if, in the opinion of the Director, for reasons of public health, safety or protection of infrastructure a permit should not be issued.
2) The Director may direct or alter the proposed route of the overdimensional vehicle or timing of the movement to maximize public safety and infrastructure protection.
3) Over-dimensional vehicles shall be reduced to the minimum practical size and weight.
4) When applying for an over-dimensional vehicle permit, the applicant shall:
a. complete the prescribed application form;
b. provide to the County such information, including, but not limited to, detailed vehicle dimensions, number of axles and axle spacing, tire width, gross vehicle weight and weight distribution;
c. file the completed application together with the non-refundable permit fee per the County's fee bylaw and other documents requested by the Director.
5) Over-dimensional vehicle permits are not transferable and shall apply only to a specific vehicle or vehicles.
6) An over-dimensional vehicle permit is not valid during reduced load periods, unless specified on the permit.

## 5) Permit Types and General Limits

1) For all permits, the Director, or delegated authority, shall impose conditions based on the dimensions and weights requested to be moved which are consistent with industry standards, and, have due regard for public health, safety and/ or the protection of regional infrastructure.
2) Single Moving Permits are to be issued for over-dimensional moves with a specific origin and destination. A Single Moving Permit shall be valid for a period of up to a maximum of three days. The Director can extend or shorten the length of validity of the permit at their discretion.
3) Three Month and Annual Moving Permits shall only be considered when the following weights and dimensions are not exceeded:
a. Width -3.50 metres;
b. Height -4.25 meters;
c. Length -24.50 metres;
d. Weight - As permitted under the Highway Traffic Act.

Carriers issued Annual Moving Permits will need to comply with weight restrictions during the reduced load period and any other special conditions imposed by the Director.
4) Seasonal Moving Permits can be issued for essential agricultural-related moves, valid for the reduced load period within the year they are issued, and, restrictedto the following weights and dimensions:
a. Width, Height, Length - As permitted in the Highway Traffic Act
b. Weight - Maximum of $7,500 \mathrm{~kg} /$ axle

The determination of an essential agricultural-related move shall be made by the Director.

## 6) Vehicle Escorts

Escorts are required for any move where the following limits are exceeded:
Width: 3.50 m
Length: 24.50 m
Escort vehicles shall be in accordance with the requirements set out in the Highway Traffic Act.

Where loads exceed the following dimensions, a Certified Superload Escort will be required and must meet the guidelines set by the Ministry of Transportation:

Width: 4.00 m
Length: 31.00 m

## 7) Night, Weekend and Holiday Moves

1) Permit holders shall move over-dimensional vehicles between one-half hour after dawn and one-half hour before dusk. Night travel is prohibited unless specifically authorized by the Director. Night moves may be permitted in exceptional circumstances if the vehicle is less than or equal to 3.05 m in width, less than or equal to 24.5 m long, meet the conspicuity requirements set out by the Ministry of Transportation Ontario and meet any other conditions required by the Director. In exceptional circumstances, the Director may permit vehicles authorized through a Single Moving Permit to travel on County Roads during weekends. Weekend moves will be restricted to one day only.
2) Unless otherwise approved by the Director, permits will not be valid on statutory holidays as well as Friday p.m. before a long weekend.

## 8) Inclement Weather

1) No travel is permitted under an approved permit when road conditions, weather conditions, or visibility make traveling hazardous to the operator or to the driving public. Conditions shall be deemed to be hazardous upon any accumulation of ice or snow on the roadway or if the continuous use of windshield wipers is required. Vehicles that are underway when inclement weather occurs shall exit the road at the first available location and park in a safe place until the weather and road conditions clear.

## 9) Production and Revocation of Permits

1) The driver of an over-dimensional vehicle on a highway shall produce a true copy of an over-dimensional vehicle permit, when so demanded by a police officer or an officer appointed by the County for carrying out the enforcement of this By-law
2) The driver of an over-dimensional vehicle on a highway shall produce a true copy of the verification of the weight and dimensions of the vehicle when so demanded by a police officer or an officer appointed by the County for carrying out the enforcement of this By-law
3) Where a police officer or officer appointed to carry out the enforcement of this by- law has reasonable or probable grounds that the weight or dimensions of a vehicle may exceed the requirements of this By-law, they may weigh the same by means of either a portable or stationary scales or may require the vehicle to be driven to the nearest weigh scales,
4) The County may revoke an over-dimensional vehicle permit issued under this by- law if it was issued on mistaken, false or incorrect information, if it was issued in error, the weights and/or dimensions as measured above are verified incorrect, the carrier demonstrates that they are unable tomeet the conditions imposed through previous permits, or, if the holder thereof is in contravention of this By-law.

## 10) Indemnification, Damages and Enforcement

1) An over-dimensional vehicle permit will only be issued subject to the condition that the permit holder shall indemnify and save harmless the County of Renfrew, their elected officials, officers, employees and agents from and against any and all claims, actions, losses, expenses, fines, costs (including legal costs), interest or damages of every nature and kind whatsoever, including but not limited to bodily injury or to damage to or destruction of tangible property including loss of revenue arising out of or allegedly attributable to the negligence, acts, errors, omissions, whether willful or otherwise by Permit Holder, their officers, employees, agents, or others who the Permit is legally responsible. This indemnity shall be in addition to and not in lieu of any insurance to be provided by the Permit Holder.
2) Where damage to public property or infrastructure occurs, as a result of the movement of an over-dimensional vehicle on a highway or over or under a bridge, the County shall be compensated by the permit holder for the cost of any repairs including engineering and legal costs. The Director may, at their discretion, require the submission of a refundable security deposit prior to issuing a moving permit.
3) When improvements or modifications to County infrastructure are required in advance of an over-dimensional move, the County shall advise the applicant of such potential costs, and, take measures it deems necessary to ensure that any and all costs are recovered as result of the improvements or modifications needed to County infrastructure.
4) Every person who contravenes any of the provisions of this By-law is guilty of an offence and is liable to a fine as provided for in the Highway Traffic Act.
5) This By-law shall be enforced by the Ontario Provincial Police, Ministry of Transportation Ontario Enforcement Officers and County By-law Enforcement Officer.

## COUNTY OF RENFREW

BY-LAW NUMBER

## A BY-LAW TO STOP UP, CLOSE AND CONVEY SURPLUS LANDS COUNTY ROAD 62 (JOHN STREET)

WHEREAS under Section 2 of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25 as amended, the Municipal Corporation of the County of Renfrew is responsible for managing and preserving the public assets of the municipality;

AND WHEREAS under section 5(3) of the Act, the County of Renfrew's capacity, rights, powers and privileges must be exercised by by-law;

AND WHEREAS the Corporation of the County of Renfrew has declared land surplus to the needs of the County.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew hereby enacts as follows:

1. THAT the land located within the County Road 62 (John Street) road allowance in Part Lots 182, 183 and 184, Range " $B$ " South, geographic Township of Sherwood, in the Township of Madawaska Valley, described as Parts 1-4 on Reference Plan 49R-19681, which is currently under the ownership of the County of Renfrew, be stopped up, closed and conveyed to Zuracon Inc. for the sum of Seventeen Thousand Dollars $(\$ 17,000)$.
2. That the Warden and Clerk be hereby authorized and directed to do all acts and things to give effect to this By-law.
3. That this By-law shall come into force and take effect immediately upon the passing thereof.

READ a first time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a second time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a third time and finally passed this 28th day of April 2021.

## COUNTY OF RENFREW

## BY-LAW NUMBER

## A BY-LAW TO ENTER INTO AN EASEMENT AGREEMENT WITH HYDRO ONE NETWORKS INC.

WHEREAS Renfrew County Road 62 (John Street) is under the jurisdiction of the Council of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew;

AND WHEREAS it is necessary to grant a Hydro easement over certain lands described hereunder in the Geographic Township of Sherwood, Township of Madawaska Valley to Hydro One Networks Inc.;

AND WHEREAS the subject lands are owned by the Corporation of the County of Renfrew.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew enacts as follows:

1. That the Council of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew enter into an agreement to grant an easement to Hydro One Networks Inc. over the lands described as part of Lot 183, Range "B" South, geographic Township of Sherwood, Township of Madawaska Valley, Part 2 on Plan 49R-19681.
2. That the terms of the easement be in accordance with Schedule " A " attached hereto and forming a part hereof.
3. That the Warden and Clerk be hereby empowered to do and execute all things, papers and documents necessary to the completion of said easement agreement and its registration on title.
4. That this By-law shall come into force and take effect upon the passing thereof.

READ a first time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a second time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a third time and finally passed this 28th day of April 2021.

| Properties |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PIN | 57573-0158 LT Interest/Estate Easement | Add Easement |
| Description | SERVIENT LAND: PT LT 183 RANGE B SOUTH SHERWOOD PART 2 PLAN 49R19681; TOWNSHIP OF MADAWASKA VALLEY |  |
| Address | BARRYS BAY |  |
| Consid | ation |  |

Consideration $\$ 2.00$

## Transferor(s)

The transferor(s) hereby transfers the easement to the transferee(s).

| Name | THE CORPORATION OF THE COUNTY OF RENFREW |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Acting as a company |
| Address for Service $\quad 9$ International Drive |  |
|  | Pembroke ON |
|  | K8A 6W5 |

Capacity $\quad$ Share

| Name | HYDRO ONE NETWORKS INC. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Address for Service | Acting as a company <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> Markham, ON <br> L6G 1B7 |

## Statements

Schedule: See Schedules

## Calculated Taxes

## File Number

BY: THE CORPORATION OF THE COUNTY OF RENFREW
TO: HYDRO ONE NETWORKS INC.

```
1. JAMES INNES MCINTOSH IV
    l am
    (a) A person in trust for whom the land conveyed in the above-described conveyance is being conveyed;
    - (b) A trustee named in the above-described conveyance to whom the land is being conveyed;
    (c) A transferee named in the above-described conveyance;
    (d) The authorized agent or solicitor acting in this transaction for HYDRO ONE NETWORKS INC. described in
        paragraph(s) (c) above.
    (e) The President, Vice-President, Manager, Secretary, Director, or Treasurer authorized to act for
        described in paragraph(s) (_) above.
    \square (f) A transferee described in paragraph (_) and am making these statements on my own behalf and on behalf
        of
```

$\qquad$

``` who is my spouse described in paragraph ( \(\_\)) and as such, I have personal knowledge of the facts herein deposed to.
```

3. The total consideration for this transaction is allocated as follows:
(a) Monies paid or to be paid in cash \$2.00
(b) Mortgages (i) assumed (show principal and interest to be credited against purchase price) \$0.00
(ii) Given Back to Vendor \$0.00
(c) Property transferred in exchange (detail below) \$0.00
(d) Fair market value of the land(s) \$0.00
(e) Liens, legacies, annuities and maintenance charges to which transfer is subject \$0.00
(f) Other valuable consideration subject to land transfer tax (detail below) \$0.00
(g) Value of land, building, fixtures and goodwill subject to land transfer tax (total of (a) to (f)) \$2.00
(h) VALUE OF ALL CHATTELS -items of tangible personal property \$0.00
(i) Other considerations for transaction not included in (g) or (h) above \$0.00
(j) Total consideration \$2.00
4. 

Explanation for nominal considerations:
o) Transfer of easement or right of way for no consideration.
5. The land is not subject to an encumbrance
6. Other remarks and explanations, if necessary.

1. The information prescribed for purposes of section 5.0 .1 of the Land Transfer Tax Act is not required to be provided for this conveyance.
2. The transferee(s) has read and considered the definitions of "designated land", "foreign corporation", "foreign entity", "foreign national", "specified region" and "taxable trustee" as set out in subsection 1(1) of the Land Transfer Tax Act. The transferee(s) declare that this conveyance is not subject to additional tax as set out in subsection 2(2.1) of the Act because:
3. (c) The transferee(s) is not a "foreign entity" or a "taxable trustee".
4. The transferee(s) declare that they will keep at their place of residence in Ontario (or at their principal place of business in Ontario) such documents, records and accounts in such form and containing such information as will enable an accurate determination of the taxes payable under the Land Transfer Tax Act for a period of at least seven years.
5. The transferee(s) agree that they or the designated custodian will provide such documents, records and accounts in such form and containing such information as will enable an accurate determination of the taxes payable under the Land Transfer Tax Act, to the Ministry of Finance upon request.

PROPERTY Information Record
A. Nature of Instrument: Transfer Easement

LRO 49 Registration No.
Date:
B. Property(s):

PIN 57573-0158 Address BARRYS BAY
Assessment -
Roll No
C. Address for Service: 185 Clegg Road

Markham, ON
L6G 1B7
D. (i) Last Conveyance(s): PIN 57573-0158 Registration No.
(ii) Legal Description for Property Conveyed: Same as in last conveyance? Yes $\square$ No Not known

## INTEREST / ESTATE TRANSFERRED - EASEMENT IN GROSS

1. THE CORPORATION OF THE COUNTY OF RENFREW (the "Transferor"), being the owner of PT LT 183 RANGE B SOUTH SHERWOOD; TOWNSHIP OF MADAWASKA VALLEY in the COUNTY OF RENFREW being PIN No. 57573-0158 (LT) (the "Lands") hereby grants to Hydro One Networks Inc. (herein called the "Transferee"), its successors and assigns, the exclusive, perpetual rights, easements, rights of way, covenants, agreements and privileges as herein set out in, through, under, over, across, along and upon that portion of the Lands more particularly described as Part 2 on Plan 49R19681 (the "Strip"):
(a) To erect, maintain, operate, repair, replace, relocate, upgrade, reconstruct and remove at any time and from time to time, an electrical transmission line or lines and communication line or lines consisting of all necessary poles and all necessary anchors with all necessary guys, braces, wires, cables, padmount equipment, if applicable, underground cable and associated material and equipment (all or any of which works are herein called the "Line");
(b) To enter on and erect, maintain and use such gates as the Transferee may from time to time consider necessary in any fences which are now or may hereafter be installed on the Strip by the Transferor;
(c) To enter on and mark the location of the Line under the Strip by suitable markers, but said markers when set in the ground shall be placed in fences or other locations which will not interfere with any reasonable use the Transferor shall make of the Strip;
(d) (i) To enter on and selectively cut trees and shrubs on the Strip and to keep it clear of all trees, shrubs and brush which may interfere with the safe operation and maintenance of the Line;
(ii) To cut, prune and remove, if necessary, trees located outside the Strip whose condition renders them liable to interfere with the safe operation and maintenance of the Line;
(e) To conduct engineering and legal surveys in, on and over the Strip;
(f) To clear the Strip and keep it clear of all buildings, structures or other obstructions of any nature whatsoever (including swimming pools and wading pools) including removal of any materials which in the opinion of the Transferee are hazardous to the Line. Notwithstanding the foregoing, in all cases where in the sole discretion of the Transferee the safe operation and maintenance of the Line is not endangered or interfered with, the Transferor from time to time or the person or persons entitled thereto, may with prior written approval of the Transferee, at the Transferor's own expense construct and maintain roads, lanes, walks, drains, sewers, water pipes, oil and gas pipelines and fences (not to exceed 2 metres in height) on or under the Strip or any portion thereof, provided that prior to commencing any such installation, the Transferor shall give to the Transferee 30 days' notice in writing so as to enable the Transferee to have a representative inspect the site and be present during the performance of the work and that the Transferor complies with any instructions that may be given by such representative in order that such work may be carried out in such a manner
as not to endanger, damage or interfere with the Line. For clarity, the Transferor agrees it shall not, without the Transferee's consent in writing, change or permit the change of the existing configuration, grade or elevation of the Strip and the Transferor further agrees that no excavation or opening or work which may disturb or interfere with the existing surface of the Strip shall be done or made unless consent therefore in writing has been obtained from Transferee;
(g) To enter on, to exit from and to pass and repass at any and all times in, over, along, upon, across, through and under the Strip and so much of the Lands as may be reasonably necessary, at all reasonable times, for the Transferee and its respective officers, employees, workers, permitees, servants, agents, contractors, subcontractors, with or without vehicles, supplies, machinery, plant, material and equipment of all purposes necessary or convenient to the exercise and enjoyment of the said Rights and easement subject to payment by the Transferee of compensation for any crop or other physical damage only to the Land caused by the exercise of this right of entry and passageway; and
(h) To remove, relocate and reconstruct the Line on or under the Strip, subject to payment by the Transferee of additional compensation for any damage caused thereby.
2. This Transfer of Easement shall be subject to the Planning Act,R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended.
3. This Transfer of Easement is given for the purpose of an electricity distribution or electricity transmission line within the meaning of Part VI of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998, S.O. 1998, c. 15. Sched B, as amended.
4. The Transferor agrees that notwithstanding any rule of law or equity, the works installed by the Transferee shall at all times remain the property of the Transferee, notwithstanding that such works are or may become annexed or affixed to the Strip and shall at any time and from time to time be removable in whole or in part by Transferee
5. No waiver of a breach or any of the covenants of this grant of Rights shall be construed to be a waiver of any succeeding breach of the same or any other covenant.
6. All covenants herein contained shall be construed to be several as well as joint where the context or the identity of the Transferor/Transferee so requires.
7. The burden and benefit of this Transfer of Easement shall run with the Strip and the works and undertaking of the Transferee and shall be binding upon and enure to the benefit of the parties hereto, and their respective heirs, executors, administrators, successors and assigns.

# Appendix IN-III 



# A BY-LAW TO ALTER HIGHWAYS AND STRUCTURES IN THE COUNTY OF RENFREW 

WHEREAS the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25 as amended, provides for the construction and maintenance of County Roads and Bridges;

AND WHEREAS Section 35 of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25, requires the Council to pass a by-law authorizing the removal or restriction of the common law right-of-passage by the public over a highway and the common law right-of-access to the highway by an owner of land abutting a highway;

AND WHEREAS the alterations to various County Roads and Structures were reviewed and accepted by the Operations Committee as part of the 2021 Capital Works Program.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew hereby enacts:

1. That the Council of the County of Renfrew approves of the alterations to County Roads and Structures as detailed on Schedule " $A$ " attached to this By-law.
2. That this By-law shall come into force and take effect upon the passing thereof.

READ a first time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a second time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a third time and finally passed this 28th day of April 2021.

## Schedule A

| Road/ <br> Structure No. | Name | From | To |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Elgin Street West |  <br> Elgin | County Road 3 <br> (Usborne Street) <br> Henry Crescent |
| 1 | River Road | Mast Road | Berlanquet Road |
| 5 | Stone Road | 1574 Stone Road |  |
| 7 | Foresters Falls Road | County Road 4 <br> (Queens Line) | Harriet Street |


| Municipality(ies) | Type |
| ---: | :--- |
| Arnprior and | Rehabilitation |
| McNab/Braeside |  |
| McNab/Braeside | Rehabilitation |
| Admaston/Bromley | Rehabilitation |
| Whitewater Region | Rehabilitation |
| Renfrew | Rehabilitation |
| Whitewater Region | Rehabilitation |
| Petawawa | Rehabilitation |
| Horton | Rehabilitation |
| Renferw | Rehabilitation |
| Greater Madawaska | Rehabilitation |
| Killaloe, Hagarty and | Rehabilitation |
| Richards | Rehabilitation |
| Greater Madawaska | Rehabilitation |
| McNab/Braeside | Rehabilitation |
| Bonnechere Valley | Rehabilitation |
| Laurentian Hills | Rehabilitation |
| Admaston/Bromley | Rehabilitation |
| Greater Madawaska | Rehabilitation |
| Bonnechere Valley |  |


| Road/ <br> Structure No. | Name | From |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B202 | Cameron Street Bridge | Cameron Street |
| B240 | Fourth Chute Bridge | Fourth Chute Road <br> B319 |
| Bucholtz Bridge | County Road 58 (Round <br> Lake Road) |  |
| C003 | Moores Creek Culvert | County Road 5 (Stone <br> Road) |
| C058 | Constant Creek | Ferguson Lake Road |
| C099 | Colton Creek Bridge | Matawatchan Road <br> Dunlop Crescent |
| C116 Dunlop Crescent |  |  |

Municipality(ies)
Type

| Killaloe, Hagarty and <br> Richards <br> Bonnechere Valley <br> Laurentian Valley | Rehabilitation |
| :---: | :--- |
| Admaston/Bromley | Rehabilitatation |
| Greater Madawaska | Rehabilitation |
| Greater Madawaska | Rehabilitation |
| Head, Clara and Maria | Rehabilitation |
| North Algona Wilberforce | Rehabilitation |
| Madawaska Valley | Rehabilitation |
| Whitewater Region | Rehabilitation |
| Whitewater Region | Rehabilitation |
| McNab/Braeside | Rehabilitation |
| Bonnechere Valley | Rehabilitation |

## OPERATIONS DIVISION REPORT

Prepared by: Richard Bolduc, A.Sc.T., Manager of Operations Prepared for: Operations Committee

April 13, 2021

## INFORMATION

## 1. Quotations and Tenders [Strategic Plan No. 3 (b)]

A summary of tenders and quotations received in the months of March and April 2021 is attached as Appendix OP-I. Tenders listed in Appendix OP-I have been awarded under the authority of the Director of Public Works and Engineering or the Chief Administrative Officer. In all cases the procurements have followed the processes set out in Corporate Policy GA01 Procurement of Goods and Services.
2. Winter Operations [Strategic Plan Goal No. 4(c)]

The month of February provided a variety of winter weather conditions that required responses by staff. Table 1 provides a summary of winter events, material usage and precipitation amount to date. Staff continues to be ready to respond to winter events as they occur.

Table 1

| Month | No. of Event Days |  |  | Type of Event |  |  | Material Used <br> (tonnes) |  | Precipitation |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Weekday | Weekend | Snow | Blowing <br> Snow | Freezing <br> Rain | Salt | Sand | Weather <br> Station | Amount <br> (mm) |  |
| Nov | 8 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 3 | $1,749.0$ | 312.0 | Petawawa | 39.0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Bancroft | 86.8 |  |
| Dec | 18 | 11 | 19 | 0 | 6 | $5,227.0$ | $1,359.0$ | Petawawa | 56.0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Bancroft | 94.9 |  |
| Jan | 15 | 6 | 17 | 2 | 5 | $3,322.3$ | $2,121.6$ | Petawawa | 5.0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Bancroft | 34.8 |  |
| Feb | 14 | 6 | 19 | 8 | 3 | $4,279.3$ | $1,464.2$ | Petawawa | 38.0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Bancroft | 58.0 |  |
| Mar | 8 | 1 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 554.8 | 703.0 | Petawawa | 35.0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Bancroft | 54.9 |  |


| Month | No. of Event Days |  | Type of Event |  |  | Material Used <br> (tonnes) |  | Precipitation |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Weekday | Weekend | Snow | Blowing <br> Snow | Freezing <br> Rain | Salt | Sand | Weather <br> Station | Amount <br> (mm) |
| Totals | 63 | 27 | 73 | 13 | 20 | $15,132.4$ | $5,959.8$ | Petawawa <br> Bancroft | 173.0 <br> 329.4 |

Table 2 outlines the Significant Weather Events declared to date for the 2020/2021 season.

## Table 2

| Declaration Start |  |  | Declaration End |  |  | Reason |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Month | Day | Time | Month | Day | Time |  |
| Nov | 22 | 3:15 PM | Nov | 23 | 10:50 AM | Snow |
| Nov | 25 | $5: 00$ PM | Nov | 26 | $1: 00$ PM | Ice |
| Dec | 12 | $6: 24$ AM | Dec | 13 | $7: 03$ AM | Ice |
| Dec | 24 | $8: 00$ AM | Dec | 26 | $7: 30$ AM | Ice |
| Jan | 15 | $8: 30$ PM | Jan | 16 | $1: 45$ PM | Snow |
| Feb | 15 | 8:00 AM | Feb | 17 | 9:30 AM | Snow |
| Mar | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

## BY-LAWS

## 3. PWC-2021-04 - Rehabilitation of County Road 51 (Petawawa Boulevard) [Strategic Plan No. 2 (a)]

Recommendation: THAT the Operations Committee recommend that Contract PWC-2021-04 as submitted by H \& H Construction Inc., Petawawa, Ontario for the rehabilitation of County Road 51 (Petawawa Boulevard) in the amount of $\$ 579,267.64$ plus HST be approved; AND FURTHER THAT County Council pass a By-law to Authorize Execution of the Contract.

## Background

Tenders were requested for the rehabilitation of County Road 51
(Petawawa Boulevard) from County Road 26 (Doran Road) to County Road
55 (Paquette Road), a distance of 1.16 km in the Town of Petawawa.
Tenders were received as follows:

1. H \& H Construction Inc., Petawawa ON
2. R.G.T. Clouthier Construction, Pembroke ON
3. Greenwood Paving Ltd., Pembroke, ON

All amounts exclude applicable taxes
\$579,267.64
\$641,832.50
\$732,632.00

## Financial Implications

The current 2021 Capital Works budget includes funds in the amount of $\$ 800,000$ for the rehabilitation of County Road 51 . Staff have reviewed the tender results for the project and confirmed that there are sufficient funds to complete the project as tendered. Tenders were processed in accordance with County of Renfrew Corporate Policy GA-01 Procurement of Goods and Services. A comparison of the 2021 budget and projected costs is provided in the following table.

| County Road 51 (Petawawa Boulevard) Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Low Tender |  | High Tender |  |
|  | 2021 Budget | Projected | Variance | Projected | Variance |
| Construction- Rehabilitation | 699,090.91 | 589,462.75 | -109,628.16 | 745,526.32 | 46,435.41 |
| Engineering - Design/Tendering | 10,000.00 | 10,000.00 | 0.00 | 10,000.00 | 0.00 |
| Material Testing | 3,000.00 | 3,000.00 | 0.00 | 3,000.00 | 0.00 |
| Project Administration |  |  |  |  |  |
| \& Supervision | 18,000.00 | 18,000.00 | 0.00 | 180,000.00 | 162,000.00 |
| Contingency | 69,909.09 | 29,473.14 | -40,435.95 | 37,276.32 | -32,632.77 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 800,000.00 | 649,935.89 | -150,064.11 | 975,802.64 | 175,802.64 |
| * All costs are net HST |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Projected costs are based on low T | der results |  |  |  |  |

## 4. PWC-2021-06 - Rehabilitation of County Road 52 (Burnstown Road) [Strategic Plan No. 2 (a)]

Recommendation: THAT the Operations Committee recommend that Contract PWC-2021-06 as submitted by Thomas Cavanagh Construction Ltd., Ashton, Ontario for the rehabilitation of County Road 52 (Burnstown Road) in the amount of $\$ 498,900$ plus HST be approved; AND FURTHER THAT County Council pass a Bylaw to Authorize Execution of the Contract.

## Background

Tenders were requested for the rehabilitation of County Road 52 (Burnstown Road) from Fraser Road to Pucker Street, a distance of 4.28 km in the Township of Horton. Tenders were received as follows:

1. Thomas Cavanagh Construction Ltd., Ashton, ON
2. H \& H Construction Inc., Petawawa, ON \$510,132.09
3. Greenwood Paving Ltd., Pembroke, ON \$523,000.00
4. Miller Construction Company, Arnprior, ON \$581,515.00
5. Bonnechere Excavating Inc, Renfrew, ON \$624,127.83
All amounts exclude applicable taxes

## Financial Implications

The current 2021 Capital Works budget includes funds in the amount of $\$ 932,840$ for the rehabilitation of County Road 52. Staff have reviewed the tender results for the project and confirmed that there are sufficient funds to complete the project as tendered. Tenders were processed in accordance with County of Renfrew Corporate Policy GA-01 Procurement of Goods and Services. A comparison of the 2021 budget and projected costs is provided in the following table.

| County Road 52 (Burnstown Road) Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Low Tender |  | High Tender |  |
|  | 2021 Budget | Projected | Variance | Projected | Variance |
| Construction- Rehabilitation | 832,581.82 | 527,680.64 | -304,901.18 | 644,127.83 | -188,453.99 |
| Engineering - Design/Tendering | 8,000.00 | 8,000.00 | 0.00 | 8,000.00 | 0.00 |
| Material Testing | 3,000.00 | 3,000.00 | 0.00 | 3,000.00 | 0.00 |
| Project Administration |  |  |  |  |  |
| \& Supervision | 6,000.00 | 6,000.00 | 0.00 | 6,000.00 | 0.00 |
| Contingency | 83,258.18 | 26,384.03 | -56,874.15 | 32,206.39 | -51,051.79 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 932,840.00 | 571,064.67 | -361,775.33 | 693,334.22 | -239,505.78 |
| * All costs are net HST |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Projected costs are based on low | der results |  |  |  |  |

## 5. PWC-2021-07 - Rehabilitation of County Road 7 (Foresters Falls Road) [Strategic Plan No. 2 (a)]

Recommendation: THAT the Operations Committee recommend that Contract PWC-2021-07 as submitted by Greenwood Paving Ltd., Pembroke, Ontario for the rehabilitation of County Road 7 (Foresters Falls Road) in the amount of $\$ 472,764.50$ plus HST be approved; AND FURTHER THAT County Council pass a By-law to Authorize Execution of the Contract.

## Background

Tenders were requested for the rehabilitation of County Road 7 (Foresters Falls Road) from Queens Line to 225 m East of Government Road, a distance of 2.6 km in the Township of Whitewater Region. Tenders were received as follows:

1. Greenwood Paving Ltd., Pembroke, ON
2. B.R. Fulton Construction Ltd., Renfrew, ON
\$513,025.50
3. H\&H Construction Inc., Petawawa, ON
4. R.G.T. Clouthier Construction, Pembroke, ON
5. Thomas Cavanagh Construction, Ashton, ON
6. Miller Paving Ltd., Arnrprior, ON
7. Bonnechere Excavating Inc., Renfrew, ON All amounts exclude applicable taxes
\$540,600.19
\$567,376.50
\$588,627.50
\$592,522.20
\$689,331.14

## Financial Implications

The current 2021 Capital Works budget includes funds in the amount of $\$ 672,836$ for the rehabilitation of County Road 7. Staff have reviewed the tender results for the project and confirmed that there are sufficient funds to complete the project as tendered. Tenders were processed in accordance with County of Renfrew Corporate Policy GA-01 Procurement of Goods and Services. A comparison of the 2021 budget and projected costs is provided in the following table.

| County Road 7 (Foresters Falls Road) Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Low Tender |  | High Tender |  |
|  | 2021 Budget | Projected | Variance | Projected | Variance |
| Construction- Rehabilitation | 588,032.73 | 481,085.16 | -106,947.57 | 701,463.37 | 113,430.64 |
| Engineering - Design/Tendering | 9,000.00 | 9,000.00 | 0.00 | 9,000.00 | 0.00 |
| Material Testing | 3,000.00 | 3,000.00 | 0.00 | 3,000.00 | 0.00 |
| Project Administration |  |  |  |  |  |
| \& Supervision | 14,000.00 | 14,000.00 | 0.00 | 14,000.00 | 0.00 |
| Contingency | 58,803.27 | 24,054.26 | -34,749.01 | 35,073.17 | -23,730.10 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 672,836.00 | 531,139.41 | -141,696.59 | 762,536.54 | 89,700.54 |
| * All costs are net HST |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Projected costs are based on low Tender results |  |  |  |  |  |

## 6. PWC-2021-08 - Rehabilitation of County Road 67 (Simpson Pit Road) [Strategic Plan No. 2 (a)]

Recommendation: THAT the Operations Committee recommend that Contract PWC-2021-08 as submitted by Greenwood Paving Ltd., Pembroke , Ontario for the rehabilitation of County Road 67 (Simpson Pit Road) in the amount of $\$ 480,477.50$ plus HST be approved; AND FURTHER THAT County Council pass a By-law to Authorize Execution of the Contract.

## Background

Tenders were requested for the rehabilitation of County Road 67 (Simpson Pit Road) from Byers Creek Road to 250 m north of Buckhill Road, a distance of 2.6 km in the Township of Killaloe, Hagarty \& Richards. Tenders were received as follows:

1. Greenwood Paving Ltd., Pembroke, ON
2. H\&H Construction Inc., Petawawa, ON
3. R.G.T. Clouthier Construction Ltd., Pembroke, ON
4. Miller Paving Ltd., Arnprior, ON
\$480,477.50
\$585,460.91
\$665,512.50
5. Bonnechere Excavating Inc., Renfrew, ON

All amounts exclude applicable taxes

## Financial Implications

The current 2021 Capital Works budget includes funds in the amount of $\$ 921,200$ for the rehabilitation of County Road 67 . Staff have reviewed the tender results for the project and confirmed that there are sufficient funds to complete the project as tendered. Tenders were processed in accordance with County of Renfrew Corporate Policy GA-01 Procurement of Goods and Services. A comparison of the 2021 budget and projected costs is provided in the following table.

| County Road 67 (Simpson Pit Road) Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Low Tender |  | High Tender |  |
|  | 2021 Budget | Projected | Variance | Projected | Variance |
| Construction- Rehabilitation | 819,272.73 | 488,933.90 | -330,338.82 | 702,174.77 | -117,097.96 |
| Engineering - Design/Tendering | 8,000.00 | 8,000.00 | 0.00 | 8,000.00 | 0.00 |
| Material Testing | 3,000.00 | 3,000.00 | 0.00 | 3,000.00 | 0.00 |
| Project Administration |  |  |  |  |  |
| \& Supervision | 9,000.00 | 9,000.00 | 0.00 | 9,000.00 | 0.00 |
| Contingency | 81,927.27 | 24,446.70 | -57,480.58 | 35,108.74 | -46,818.53 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 921,200.00 | 533,380.60 | -387,819.40 | 757,283.51 | -163,916.49 |
| * All costs are net HST |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Projected costs are based on low | er results |  |  |  |  |

## 7. PWC-2021-11 - Rehabilitation of County Road 1 (River Road) [Strategic Plan No. 2 (a)]

Recommendation: THAT the Operations Committee recommend that Contract PWC-2021-11 as submitted by Thomas Cavanagh Construction Ltd., Ashton, Ontario for the rehabilitation of County Road 1 (River Road) in the amount of $\$ 513,794.95$ plus HST be approved; AND FURTHER THAT County Council pass a By-law to Authorize Execution of the Contract.

## Background

Tenders were requested for the rehabilitation of County Road 1 (River Road) from Mast Road to 120 m west of Henry Crescent, a distance of 1.9 km in the Township of Horton. Tenders were received as follows:

1. Thomas Cavanagh Construction Ltd., Ashton, ON
2. H \& H Construction Inc., Petawawa, ON
3. Greenwood Paving Ltd., Pembroke, ON
4. Miller Construction Company, Arnprior, ON
5. Aecon Construction Ontario East, Carp, ON
6. B.R. Fulton Construction Ltd, Renfrew, ON
7. R.G.T. Clouthier Construction Ltd., Pembroke, ON
8. Bonnechere Excavating Inc., Renfrew, ON
\$513,794.95
\$526,448.15
\$571,896.00
\$580,463.00
\$597,000.00
\$608,360.00
\$644,614.50
\$738,459.60

All amounts exclude applicable taxes

## Financial Implications

The current 2021 Capital Works budget includes funds in the amount of $\$ 600,240$ for the rehabilitation of County Road 2. Staff have reviewed the tender results for the project and confirmed that there are sufficient funds to complete the project as tendered. Tenders were processed in accordance with County of Renfrew Corporate Policy GA-01 Procurement of Goods and Services. A comparison of the 2021 budget and projected costs is provided in the following table.

| County Road 1 (Mast Road to Henry Crescent) Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Low Tender |  | High Tender |  |
|  | 2021 Budget | Projected | Variance | Projected | Variance |
| Construction- Rehabilitation | 526,581.82 | 522,837.74 | -3,744.08 | 751,548.07 | 224,966.25 |
| Engineering - Design/Tendering | 7,000.00 | 7,000.00 | 0.00 | 7,000.00 | 0.00 |
| Material Testing | 3,000.00 | 3,000.00 | 0.00 | 3,000.00 | 0.00 |
| Project Administration |  |  |  |  |  |
| \& Supervision | 11,000.00 | 11,000.00 | 0.00 | 11,000.00 | 0.00 |
| Contingency | 52,658.18 | 26,141.89 | -26,516.29 | 37,577.40 | -15,080.78 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 600,240.00 | 569,979.63 | -30,260.37 | 810,125.47 | 209,885.47 |
| * All costs are net HST |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Projected costs are based on low Tender results |  |  |  |  |  |

## 8. PWC-2021-20 - Rehabilitation of County Road 65 (Centennial Lake Road) [Strategic Plan No. 2 (a)]

Recommendation: THAT the Operations Committee recommend that Contract PWC-2021-20 as submitted by Greenwood Paving Ltd., Pembroke, Ontario for the rehabilitation of County Road 65 (Centennial Lake Road) in the amount of $\$ 623,352.65$ plus HST be approved; AND FURTHER THAT County Council pass a By-law to Authorize Execution of the Contract.

## Background

Tenders were requested for the rehabilitation of County Road 65
(Centennial Lake Road) from 220m east of Chimo Road South to 554 m west
of Opal Road, a distance of 4.0 km in the Township of Greater Madawaska. Tenders were received as follows:

| Submitted | Corrected |
| :---: | ---: |
| Amount | Amount |

1. Greenwood Paving Ltd., Pembroke, ON
\$623,352.65
2. H\&H Construction Inc., Petawawa, ON
3. Miller Construction Company, Arnprior, ON
\$646,772.55
4. B.R. Fulton Construction, Renfrew, ON
\$695,165.00
5. R.G.T. Clouthier Construction, Pembroke, ON
\$698,670.00
6. Thomas Cavanagh Construction Ltd., Ashton, ON
\$716,201.70
7. Bonnechere Excavating Inc., Renfrew, ON
\$744,255.37
All amounts exclude applicable taxes
\$841,997.06
$\$ 841,992.06$

## Financial Implications

The current 2021 Capital Works budget includes funds in the amount of $\$ 1,078,300$ for the rehabilitation of County Road 65 . Staff have reviewed the tender results for the project and confirmed that there are sufficient funds to complete the project as tendered. Tenders were processed in accordance with County of Renfrew Corporate Policy GA-01 Procurement of Goods and Services. A comparison of the 2021 budget and projected costs is provided in the following table.

| County Road 65 (Centennial Lake Road) Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Low Tender |  | High Tender |  |
|  | 2021 Budget | Projected | Variance | Projected | Variance |
| Construction- Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |
| CR65 - Centennial Lake Road | 678,090.91 | 634,323.66 | -43,767.25 | 856,816.21 | 178,725.30 |
| CCC Tender (Awarded Mar, 29/2020 | 130,000.00 | 65,247.49 | -64,752.51 | 126,488.33 | -3,511.67 |
| Day Labour Works | 144,000.00 | 144,000.00 | 0.00 | 144,000.00 | 0.00 |
| Engineering - Design/Tendering | 10,000.00 | 10,000.00 | 0.00 | 10,000.00 | 0.00 |
| Material Testing | 4,000.00 | 4,000.00 | 0.00 | 4,000.00 | 0.00 |
| Project Administration |  |  |  |  |  |
| \& Supervision | 17,000.00 | 17,000.00 | 0.00 | 17,000.00 | 0.00 |
| Contingency | 95,209.09 | 42,178.56 | -53,030.53 | 56,365.23 | -38,843.86 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 1,078,300.00 | 916,749.70 | -161,550.30 | 1,214,669.77 | 136,369.77 |
| * All costs are net HST |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Projected costs are based on low Ten | er results |  |  |  |  |

## 9. PWC-2021-39 Corrugated Steel Pipe Round Culverts [Strategic Plan No. 2

 (a)]Recommendation: THAT the Operations Committee recommend that the tender submitted by Armtec Limited, Peterborough, Ontario for the supply and delivery of Corrugated Steel Pipe Round Culverts in the amount of $\$ 154,782.05$ plus HST
be approved; AND FURTHER THAT County Council pass a By-law to Authorize Execution of the Contract.

## Background

Tenders were requested and received for the supply and delivery of Corrugated Steel Pipe Round Culverts.

1. Armtec Limited, Peterborough, ON
\$154,782.05
2. Atlantic Industries (Canada) Limited \$195,554.47
All amounts exclude applicable taxes
Staff has reviewed the tender results for the purchase and has confirmed that there are sufficient funds to complete the purchase as tendered.

Procurement of the equipment included in this tender, followed the requirements set out in Corporate Policy GA-01 Procurement of Goods and Services.

The Township of Greater Madawaska was a participant on this tender. The bid price stipulated in this report does not include the Township's portion of the tender. In alignment with previous years, staff will provide the municipality with the results for their portion of the tender to award as per their procurement policy.

## 10. PWO-2021-02 - Pavement Marking [Strategic Plan No. 3 (b)]

Recommendation: THAT the Operations Committee recommend that Contract PWO-2021-02 as submitted by Almon Equipment Ltd., Etobicoke, Ontario for Pavement Marking in the amount of $\$ 412,605$ plus HST be approved; AND FURTHER THAT County Council pass a By-law to Authorize Execution of the Contract.

## Background

Tenders were requested for Pavement Marking of various County Roads. Tenders were received as follows:

1. Almon Equipment Ltd., Etobicoke, ON
2. McGuinness Lines, Port Perry, ON
3. Provincial Road Markings Inc., Guelph, ON
\$412,605.00
\$481,681.00
\$447,960.00

The cost for this contract is $\$ 412,605$ plus applicable taxes. Staff has reviewed the tender results for the purchase and has confirmed that there are sufficient funds to complete the purchase as tendered.

Procurement of the equipment included in this tender, followed the requirements set out in Corporate Policy GA-01 Procurement of Goods and Services.

The Townships of Admaston/Bromley, Bonnechere Valley, Greater Madawaska, Laurentian Valley, Madawaska Valley and McNab/Braeside were participants on this tender. The bid price stipulated in this report does not include their portion of the tender. In alignment with previous years, staff will provide the municipalities with the results for their portion of the tender to award as per their procurement policy.

## 11. PWO-2021-04 - Tandem Truck and Plow [Strategic Plan No. 2 (a)]

Recommendation: THAT the Operations Committee recommend that the tender submitted by Valley Truck and Spring, Pembroke, Ontario for the supply and delivery of one Tandem Truck and Plow Unit in the amount of $\$ 315,940$ plus applicable taxes be approved; AND FURTHER THAT County Council pass a By-law to Authorize Execution of the Contract.

## Background

Tenders were requested for the supply and delivery of one Tandem Truck and Plow Unit and Attachments. Tenders were received as follows:

1. Valley Truck and Spring, Pembroke ON \$315,940.00
2. Francis Canada Truck Centre Inc., Ottawa ON
\$316,625.00
All amounts exclude applicable taxes
The cost for this contract is $\$ 315,940$ plus applicable taxes. Staff has reviewed the tender results for the purchase and has confirmed that there are sufficient funds to complete the purchase as tendered.

Procurement of the equipment included in this tender, followed the requirements set out in Corporate Policy GA-01 Procurement of Goods and Services.

## 12. PWO-2021-05-4 Pick-Up Trucks [Strategic Plan No. 2 (a)]

Recommendation: THAT the Operations Committee recommend that the tender submitted by Fraser Durham Chrysler, Oshawa, Ontario for the supply and delivery of four pick-up trucks in the amount of $\$ 157,906.20$ plus applicable taxes be approved; AND FURTHER THAT County Council pass a By-law to Authorize Execution of the Contract.

## Background

Tenders were requested for the supply and delivery of four pick-up trucks and received as follows:

1. Fraser Durham Chrysler, Oshawa, ON
\$157,906.20
2. Urban Ford Sales Ltd, Arnprior, ON \$163,419.00
All amounts exclude applicable taxes
The current 2021 Department budget includes funds in the amount of \$102,000 for three pick-up trucks. Committee was advised in March that staff were adding an additional light duty truck to the 2021 tender due to an incident in January. The remaining funds will come from savings within the 2021 Operations Budget or Tangible Capital Asset reserves.

Staff has reviewed the tender results for the purchase and has confirmed that there are sufficient funds to complete the purchase as tendered. Procurement of the equipment included in this tender, followed the requirements set out in Corporate Policy GA-01 Procurement of Goods and Services.

## 13. PWO-2021-17 - Reroofing and Rehabilitation of Southwest Patrol Yard Dome [Strategic Plan No. 2 (a)]

Recommendation: THAT the Operations Committee recommend that the tender submitted by T. Hamilton and Sons Roofing, Scarborough, Ontario for the reroofing and rehabilitation of the Southwest Patrol Yard Dome in the amount of \$204,900 plus HST be approved; AND FURTHER THAT County Council pass a Bylaw to Authorize Execution of the Contract.

## Background

Tenders were requested for the reroofing and rehabilitation of the Southwest Patrol Garage Dome located in Palmer Rapids and received as follows:

1. T. Hamilton and Sons Roofing, Scarborough ON
Part A: $\$ 102,400$

Part B: $\$ 102,500$
2. Perth Roofing, 2701738 Ontario Inc., Perth ON

Part A \$125,000
Part B \$125,000
3. Bay Roofing and Exteriors Ltd., North Bay ON

Part A: \$114,238.00
Part B: $\$ 105,862.00$
4. Van Pelt Construction Inc., Mitchell ON

Part B: \$129,800
All amounts exclude applicable taxes
The current 2021 Operations Housing budget includes funds in the amount of $\$ 230,000$ reroofing and rehabilitation of the Southwest Patrol Garage Dome. A comparison of the 2021 budget and projected costs is provided in the following table.

| Reroofing and Rehabilitation of Southwest Patrol Yard Domes |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Low Tender |  | High Tender |  |
|  | 2021 Budget | Projected | Variance | Projected | Variance |
| Construction | 210,000.00 | 208,506.24 | -1,493.76 | 265,898.88 | 55,898.88 |
| Engineering - Design/Tendering | 1,500.00 | 1,500.00 | 0.00 | 1,500.00 | 0.00 |
| Project Administration |  |  |  |  |  |
| \& Supervision | 18,500.00 | 19,993.76 | 1,493.76 | 19,993.76 | 1,493.76 |
| Contingency | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 230,000.00 | 230,000.00 | -0.00 | 287,392.64 | 57,392.64 |
| * All costs are net HST |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Projected costs are based on low T | der results |  |  |  |  |

Procurement of the equipment included in this tender, followed the requirements set out in Corporate Policy GA-01 Procurement of Goods and Services.

## Summary of Quotations/Tenders

## PWC-2021-18 Close Cut Clearing - County Road 65 (Centennial Lake Road)

1. McCrea Excavating, Pembroke, ON \$64,119.00
2. Crain's Construction Ltd., Mayberly, ON \$85,180.20
3. Goldie Mohr Ltd., Richmond, ON \$80,169.60
4. Josh LaSalle, Merrickville, ON
\$88,499.97
5. North Renfrew Tree Service, Griffith, ON
\$110,000.57 Excludes all applicable taxes

The total cost for this contract is $\$ 64,119$ plus HST. Sufficient funds are provided for in the 2021 Departmental Budget.

## COUNTY OF RENFREW

## BY-LAW NUMBER

## A BY-LAW FOR THE EXECUTION OF CONTRACT NO. PWC-2021-04 REHABILITATION OF COUNTY ROAD 51 (PETAWAWA BOULEVARD)

WHEREAS under Section 11 of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25, as amended, the Municipal Corporation of the County of Renfrew has the authority to pass by-laws to enter into contracts to construct and maintain County Roads and Bridges;

AND WHEREAS public tenders were requested for the rehabilitation of County Road 51 (Petawawa Boulevard) under Contract No. PWC-2021-04;

AND WHEREAS the tender submitted by H \& H Construction Inc., Petawawa, Ontario was reviewed and accepted by the Operations Committee.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew hereby enacts:

1. That the Council of the County of Renfrew approve of the awarding of Contract No. PWC-2021-04 for the rehabilitation of County Road 51 (Petawawa Boulevard) as submitted by H \& H Construction Inc., Petawawa, Ontario in the amount of $\$ 579,267.64$ plus HST.
2. That the Warden and Clerk be empowered to do and execute all things, papers and documents necessary to the execution of the said contract.
3. That this By-law shall come into force and take effect upon the passing thereof.

READ a first time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a second time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a third time and finally passed this 28th day of April 2021.

## COUNTY OF RENFREW

## BY-LAW NUMBER

## A BY-LAW FOR THE EXECUTION OF CONTRACT NO. PWC-2021-06 REHABILITATION OF COUNTY ROAD 52 (BURNSTOWN ROAD)

WHEREAS under Section 11 of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25, as amended, the Municipal Corporation of the County of Renfrew has the authority to pass by-laws to enter into contracts to construct and maintain County Roads and Bridges;

AND WHEREAS public tenders were requested for the rehabilitation of County Road 52 (Burnstown Road) under Contract No. PWC-2021-06;

AND WHEREAS the tender submitted by Thomas Cavanagh Construction Ltd., Ashton, Ontario was reviewed and accepted by the Operations Committee.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew hereby enacts:

1. That the Council of the County of Renfrew approve of the awarding of Contract No. PWC-2021-06 for the rehabilitation of County Road 52 (Burnstown Road) as submitted by Thomas Cavanagh Construction Ltd., Ashton, Ontario in the amount of $\$ 498,900$ plus HST.
2. That the Warden and Clerk be empowered to do and execute all things, papers and documents necessary to the execution of the said contract.
3. That this By-law shall come into force and take effect upon the passing thereof.

READ a first time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a second time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a third time and finally passed this 28th day of April 2021.

## COUNTY OF RENFREW

## BY-LAW NUMBER

## A BY-LAW FOR THE EXECUTION OF CONTRACT NO. PWC-2021-07 REHABILITATION OF COUNTY ROAD 7 (FORESTERS FALLS ROAD)

WHEREAS under Section 11 of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25, as amended, the Municipal Corporation of the County of Renfrew has the authority to pass by-laws to enter into contracts to construct and maintain County Roads and Bridges;

AND WHEREAS public tenders were requested for the rehabilitation of County Road 7 (Foresters Falls Road) under Contract No. PWC-2021-07;

AND WHEREAS the tender submitted by Greenwood Paving Ltd., Pembroke, Ontario was reviewed and accepted by the Operations Committee.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew hereby enacts:

1. That the Council of the County of Renfrew approve of the awarding of Contract No. PWC-2021-07 for the rehabilitation of County Road 7 (Foresters Falls Road) as submitted by Greenwood Paving Ltd., Pembroke, Ontario in the amount of $\$ 472,764.50$ plus HST.
2. That the Warden and Clerk be empowered to do and execute all things, papers and documents necessary to the execution of the said contract.
3. That this By-law shall come into force and take effect upon the passing thereof.

READ a first time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a second time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a third time and finally passed this 28th day of April 2021.

## COUNTY OF RENFREW

## BY-LAW NUMBER

## A BY-LAW FOR THE EXECUTION OF CONTRACT NO. PWC-2021-08 REHABILITATION OF COUNTY ROAD 67 (SIMPSON PIT ROAD)

WHEREAS under Section 11 of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25, as amended, the Municipal Corporation of the County of Renfrew has the authority to pass by-laws to enter into contracts to construct and maintain County Roads and Bridges;

AND WHEREAS public tenders were requested for the rehabilitation of County Road 67 (Simpson Pit Road) under Contract No. PWC-2021-08;

AND WHEREAS the tender submitted by Greenwood Paving Ltd., Pembroke, Ontario was reviewed and accepted by the Operations Committee.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew hereby enacts:

1. That the Council of the County of Renfrew approve of the awarding of Contract No. PWC-2021-08 for the rehabilitation of County Road 67 (Simpson Pit Road) as submitted by Greenwood Paving Ltd., Pembroke, Ontario in the amount of $\$ 480,477.50$ plus HST.
2. That the Warden and Clerk be empowered to do and execute all things, papers and documents necessary to the execution of the said contract.
3. That this By-law shall come into force and take effect upon the passing thereof.

READ a first time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a second time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a third time and finally passed this 28th day of April 2021.

## COUNTY OF RENFREW

## BY-LAW NUMBER

## A BY-LAW FOR THE EXECUTION OF CONTRACT NO. PWC-2021-11 REHABILITATION OF COUNTY ROAD 1 (RIVER ROAD)

WHEREAS under Section 11 of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25, as amended, the Municipal Corporation of the County of Renfrew has the authority to pass by-laws to enter into contracts to construct and maintain County Roads and Bridges;

AND WHEREAS public tenders were requested for the rehabilitation of County Road 1 (River Road) under Contract No. PWC-2021-11;

AND WHEREAS the tender submitted by Thomas Cavanagh Construction Ltd., Ashton, Ontario was reviewed and accepted by the Operations Committee.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew hereby enacts:

1. That the Council of the County of Renfrew approve of the awarding of Contract No. PWC-2021-11 for the rehabilitation of County Road 1 (River Road) as submitted by Thomas Cavanagh Construction Ltd., Ashton, Ontario in the amount of $\$ 513,794.95$ plus HST.
2. That the Warden and Clerk be empowered to do and execute all things, papers and documents necessary to the execution of the said contract.
3. That this By-law shall come into force and take effect upon the passing thereof.

READ a first time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a second time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a third time and finally passed this 28th day of April 2021.

## COUNTY OF RENFREW

## BY-LAW NUMBER

## A BY-LAW FOR THE EXECUTION OF CONTRACT NO. PWC-2021-20 REHABILITATION OF COUNTY ROAD 65 (CENTENNIAL LAKE ROAD)

WHEREAS under Section 11 of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25, as amended, the Municipal Corporation of the County of Renfrew has the authority to pass by-laws to enter into contracts to construct and maintain County Roads and Bridges;

AND WHEREAS public tenders were requested for the rehabilitation of County Road 65 (Centennial Lake Road) under Contract No. PWC-2021-20;

AND WHEREAS the tender submitted by Greenwood Paving Ltd., Pembroke, Ontario was reviewed and accepted by the Operations Committee.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew hereby enacts:

1. That the Council of the County of Renfrew approve of the awarding of Contract No. PWC-2021-20 for the rehabilitation of County Road 65 (Centennial Lake Road) as submitted by Greenwood Paving Ltd., Pembroke, Ontario in the amount of $\$ 623,352.65$ plus HST.
2. That the Warden and Clerk be empowered to do and execute all things, papers and documents necessary to the execution of the said contract.
3. That this By-law shall come into force and take effect upon the passing thereof.

READ a first time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a second time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a third time and finally passed this 28th day of April 2021.

## COUNTY OF RENFREW

## BY-LAW NUMBER


#### Abstract

A BY-LAW FOR THE EXECUTION OF CONTRACT NO. PWC-2021-39 FOR THE SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF CORRUGATED STEEL PIPE ROUND CULVERTS


WHEREAS under Section 11 of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25, as amended, the Municipal Corporation of the County of Renfrew has the authority to pass by-laws to enter into contracts to construct and maintain County Roads and Bridges;

AND WHEREAS public requests for proposals were requested for the manufacture, supply and delivery Corrugated Steel Pipe Round Culverts under Contract No. PWC-2021-39;

AND WHEREAS the proposal submitted by Armtec Limited, Peterborough, Ontario was reviewed and accepted by the Operations Committee.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew hereby enacts:

1. That the Council of the County of Renfrew approve of the awarding of Contract No. PWC-2021-39 for the manufacture, supply and delivery Corrugated Steel Pipe Round Culverts as submitted by Armtec Limited, Peterborough, Ontario in the amount of $\$ 154,782.05$ plus HST.
2. That the Warden and Clerk be empowered to do and execute all things, papers and documents necessary to the execution of the said contract.
3. That this By-law shall come into force and take effect upon the passing thereof.

READ a first time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a second time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a third time and finally passed this 28th day of April 2021.

## BY-LAW NUMBER

# A BY-LAW FOR THE EXECUTION OF CONTRACT NO. PWO-2021-02 FOR PAVEMENT MARKING 

WHEREAS the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25, as amended, requires a municipality to adopt policies with respect to the procurement of goods and services;

AND WHEREAS public tenders were requested for Pavement Marking under Contract PWO-2021-02 in accordance with County of Renfrew Corporate Policy GA-01 Procurement of Goods and Services;

AND WHEREAS the tender submitted by Almon Equipment Ltd., Etobicoke, Ontario was reviewed and accepted by the Operations Committee.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew hereby enacts:

1. That the Council of the County of Renfrew approve of the awarding of Contract PWO-2021-02 for Pavement Marking, as submitted by Almon Equipment Ltd., Etobicoke, Ontario in the amount of $\$ 412,605$ plus HST.
2. That the Warden and Clerk be empowered to do and execute all things, papers and documents necessary for the execution of the said Contract.
3. That this By-law shall come into force and take effect upon the passing thereof.

READ a first time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a second time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a third time this 28th day of April 2021.

DEBBIE ROBINSON, WARDEN
PAUL V. MOREAU, CLERK

## BY-LAW NUMBER

## A BY-LAW FOR THE EXECUTION OF CONTRACT NO. PWO-2021-04 FOR THE SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF ONE TANDEM TRUCK AND PLOW UNIT

WHEREAS The Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25, as amended, requires a municipality to adopt policies with respect to the procurement of goods and services;

AND WHEREAS public tenders were requested for the supply and delivery of one Tandem Truck and Plow Unit, under Contract PWO-2021-04, in accordance with County of Renfrew Corporate Policy GA-01, Procurement of Goods and Services;

AND WHEREAS the tender submitted by Valley Truck and Spring, Pembroke, Ontario was reviewed and accepted by the Operations Committee.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew hereby enacts:

1. That the Council of the County of Renfrew approve the awarding of Contract PWO-2021-04 for the supply and delivery of one Tandem Truck and Plow Unit as submitted by Valley Truck and Spring, Pembroke, Ontario in the amount of $\$ 315,940$ plus applicable taxes.
2. That the Warden and Clerk be empowered to do and execute all things, papers and documents necessary for the execution of the said contract.
3. That this By-law shall come into force and take effect upon the passing thereof.

READ a first time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a second time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a third time and finally passed this 28th day of April 2021.

## COUNTY OF RENFREW

## BY-LAW NUMBER

## A BY-LAW FOR THE EXECUTION OF CONTRACT NO. PWO-2021-05 FOR THE SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF FOUR LIGHT DUTY PICK-UP TRUCKS

WHEREAS The Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25, as amended, requires a municipality to adopt policies with respect to the procurement of goods and services;

AND WHEREAS public tenders were requested for the supply and delivery of four light-duty pick-up trucks, under Contract PWO-2021-05, in accordance with County of Renfrew Corporate Policy GA-01 Procurement of Goods and Services;

AND WHEREAS the tender submitted by Fraser Durham Chrysler, Oshawa, Ontario was reviewed and accepted by the Operations Committee.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew hereby enacts:

1. That the Council of the County of Renfrew approve the awarding of Contract PWO-2021-05 for the supply and delivery of our light-duty pick-up trucks as submitted by Fraser Durham Chrysler, Oshawa, Ontario in the amount of $\$ 157,906.20$ plus applicable taxes.
2. That the Warden and Clerk be empowered to do and execute all things, papers and documents necessary for the execution of the said contract.
3. That this By-law shall come into force and take effect upon the passing thereof.

READ a first time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a second time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a third time and finally passed this 28th day of April 2021.

BY-LAW NUMBER

## A BY-LAW TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT FOR THE REROOFING AND REHABILITATION OF THE SOUTHWEST PATROL YARD DOME

WHEREAS Sections 8,9 and 11 of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25, as amended, authorizes Council to pass by-laws to enter into agreements for the purpose of renovations of County of Renfrew property;

AND WHEREAS the Southwest Patrol Yard Dome is necessary for the maintenance of County Roads and Bridges within the Southwest Patrol in Palmer Rapids, Ontario;

AND WHEREAS public tenders were requested for the reroofing and rehabilitation of the Southwest Patrol Dome under Contract PWO-2021-17;

AND WHEREAS the tender submitted by T. Hamilton and Sons Roofing, Scarborough, Ontario was reviewed and accepted by the Operations Committee.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew hereby enacts:

1. That the Council of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew approve of the awarding of Contract PWO-2021-17 for the reroofing rand rehabilitation to the Southwest Patrol Yard Dome to T. Hamilton and Sons Roofing, Scarborough, Ontario in the amount of $\$ 204,900$ plus HST.
2. That the Warden and Clerk be empowered to do and execute all things, papers and documents necessary to the execution of the said Contract.
3. That this By-law shall come into force and take effect upon the passing thereof.

READ a first time this 28th day of April 2021.
READ a second time this 28th day of April 2021
READ a third time and finally passed this 28th day of April 2021.


[^0]:    DEBBIE ROBINSON, WARDEN

