APPENDIX B



Bridges Status Report

MD Bridges & Bridge Sized Culverts

Supplemental:

Utilization and Levels of Service Review

PREPARED BY:

The Municipal District of Bonnyville No. 87 Infrastructure Services Bag 1010, 4905 – 50 Ave Bonnyville, AB T9N 2J7

Document Control Sheet

Document Revision	Date	Revision Details
0	September 11, 2023	Bridges Status Report – Utilization and Levels of Service Review

Table of Contents

Back	grou	nd7
1.	End	d of Life Options
	1.1	Bridge Replacement with an Equivalent Structure10
	1.2	Bridge Replacement with an Updated Structure10
	1.3	Bridge Rehabilitation
	1.4	Bridge Replacement with a Downgraded Crossing11
	1.5	Bridge Decommissioning
2.	Bri	dge Decommissioning Process
3.	Cos	st-Benefit Review and Prioritization of Bridge Replacement Projects
	3.1	Information Collected
	3.2	Assumptions Made
	3.3	Items not Considered
	3.4	Cost-Benefit Calculations
	3.5	Replacement Priority / Closure Candidate Categories
	3.6	Replacement Priority / Closure Candidate Summaries15
4	Cos	st Saving Summaries – Bridge and Bridge Culvert Decommissioning16
5	Со	nclusion17
APP	END	X A – MD Bridge Structures Approaching the End of Serviceable Life
– Re	plac	ement Priority Maps
APP	END	X B – MD Bridge Structures Approaching the End of Serviceable Life
– Re	plac	ement Priority List and Bridge Information Sheets

Background

On March 14, 2023, administration presented a status report on the MD's inventory of bridges and bridge sized culverts to Council. In this presentation, information was provided regarding the condition and age distribution of its bridge inventory and how many bridges in the MD were approaching the end of their service life.



Figure 1 – Age of MD Bridges and Bridge-sized Culverts (from Bridges Status Report)

Using recent bridge construction costs and the estimated replacement dates shown in recent bridge inspection reports, 10-, 25-, 50- and 75-year cost forecasts were also provided in the Bridges Status Report to assist in financial planning.



10 YEAR SCENARIO

LIFECYCLE BRIDGE REPLACEMENTS EXPECTED TO BE NEEDED AS PER BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORTS TO DEC 31, 2022





25 YEAR SCENARIO

LIFECYCLE BRIDGE REPLACEMENTS EXPECTED TO BE NEEDED AS PER BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORTS TO DEC 31, 2022

Figure 3 – 25-Year Cost Forecast (from Bridges Status Report)



LIFECYCLE BRIDGE REPLACEMENTS EXPECTED TO BE NEEDED AS PER BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORTS TO DEC 31, 2022

Figure 4 – 50-Year Cost Forecast (from Bridges Status Report)



LIFECYCLE BRIDGE REPLACEMENTS EXPECTED TO BE NEEDED AS PER BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORTS TO DEC 31, 2022

Figure 5 – 75-Year Cost Forecast (from Bridges Status Report)

Due to the number of bridge structures expected to need replacement in the short term and the overall forecasted costs attached to those replacements, administration was asked to provide information so Council could review the current levels of service the MD is providing and consider bridge decommissioning as a cost saving measure.

1. End of Life Options

When a bridge reaches the end of its service life there will often be a period where service can be maintained through more frequent and costly inspections and the acceptance of a higher level of risk that an emergent issue will develop that may remove the bridge from service. But a point will usually be reached where the repairs needed to maintain service on a deteriorating bridge structure will be inefficient from a lifecycle costing perspective and these types of stopgap repairs should not be relied upon as a substitute for responsible management of the inventory. Once this point has been reached, one of the following options should be considered.

1.1 Bridge Replacement with an Equivalent Structure

When a bridge structure is replaced, it will be brought to the current code requirements for load carrying capacity, geometry, design life, durability, hydraulic opening, fish passage, etc., but otherwise it will be the functional equivalent of the original structure.

1.2 Bridge Replacement with an Updated Structure

Since bridges have long life spans, they are often upgraded and changed when they get replaced with a vision of the future in mind. Extra lanes or shoulders can be added for traffic, or sidewalks can be added for pedestrian or cycle use. The bridge could also be re-aligned or moved to a better location to serve future needs. It is much cheaper to plan for these upgrades when a bridge is replaced as opposed to trying to make these changes after the fact. When replacing a 75-year bridge structure in 2023, it is recommended to consider the expected needs of 2043.

1.3 Bridge Rehabilitation

Bridge rehabilitation involves replacing those bridge elements that have reached the end of their service lives while salvaging those that have significant life left. Bridge rehabilitation can have the following advantages over replacement:

- Lower initial capital cost
- Reduced time of construction and service disruption
- Reduced scope of work
- Provides life extension when replacement will be costly and/or difficult.

Bridge rehabilitation has the following disadvantages when compared to replacement:

- Shorter expected service life.
- Higher maintenance requirements.
- While initial capital costs are usually lower, long-term costs in maintaining the crossing may be higher, which can lead to inefficient decision making and deferral of costs to future generations.

- Bridge rehabilitation often doesn't address functional issues such as load restrictions, insufficient hydraulic openings, scour susceptibility, narrow (or single) lane widths, poor alignment, wrong location, etc.
- Can be a missed opportunity to update infrastructure to modern needs, diverting resources towards the needs of 50-100 years ago.

When performing a bridge assessment, a bridge engineer will usually provide a comparison of rehabilitation and replacement options, as well as a recommendation as to which they think is best to fit the customers needs.

With many of the bridges that are coming up for replacement in the MD being small modular concrete girder bridges with no deck and creosote timber substructures, it is expected that replacement will likely be the more efficient option most of the time as both the concrete girders and the creosote substructures will be reaching the end of their service lives at roughly the same time. While possible, major rehabilitation work on these bridges will likely not have enough value to justify the cost.

Rehabilitation may be a cost competitive option for some of the Beaver River truss bridges because the structural steel lasts much longer than the timber elements and may have significant life remaining. However, when comparing the costs of rehab versus replacement on century old truss bridges, the MD should be mindful that it is not comparing equivalent end products. These old bridges were originally built to provide land access for development but were not designed or intended to serve present day needs. While there likely is some sentimental attachment to them, they may currently be barriers to economic activity due to their load carrying capacity, geometry, and location. Current and future needs should be considered before any significant investment in a 100-year-old bridge structure.

1.4 Bridge Replacement with a Downgraded Crossing

There are some jurisdictions that have installed low level crossings as a cheaper alternative to bridges where 100% access is not required. In the MD of Bonnyville, some of the expected challenges in considering low level crossings would be high water tables and silty soil conditions in the area affecting the stability of creek bases, sediment contamination and environmental requirements making it difficult to get approvals, as well as the amount of time these crossings would be out of service during water events. Low level crossings are also only usually suitable for very low traffic volumes so may only be worth looking at in a few cases; they tend to be more common in arid climates and mountainous regions. Another possible downgrade in some situations to save on initial cost would be to reduce the high-water event that is being designed for and accepting the erosion damage and service disruptions that happen during flood events – this is currently being considered in some low traffic situations.

1.5 Bridge Decommissioning

It is reasonable to expect that the reasons for replacing bridge crossings in 2023 will be different than they were when the structures were first built. Some existing bridge structures may not be worth replacing based on their current utilization so could possibly be decommissioned instead.

2. Bridge Decommissioning Process

Permanent bridge closures are covered by section 22 of the Municipal Government Act. While it is reasonable for the MD to close a road or bridge temporarily if a public safety issue has developed, without going through a more formal closure process the expectation is that the infrastructure will be re-opened within a reasonable time frame once the issue has been addressed.

To execute a permanent road or bridge closure, it is expected that the decommissioning process will involve as a minimum; public notifications, the passing of a bylaw, public hearings, approval by the Minister of Transportation, and as well as possible compensation to landowners if there have been any significant land devaluations related to the closure.

3. Cost-Benefit Review and Prioritization of Bridge Replacement Projects

In considering whether to replace or decommission old bridges, it is important to be able to understand the benefits that these assets are currently providing to our ratepayers so those benefits can be compared to our expected costs in replacing those structures. For the purposes of this report, bridges that are showing as likely needing replacement within the next 10 years have been reviewed. Two of the primary benefits of rural local road bridges have been considered in this report:

- Land access for use and development
- Shortened travel distances between people and places.

3.1 Information Collected

While there is no established method of quantifying the benefits of bridge replacement projects to compare the relative value of those projects, the following information was collected by MD staff for the purpose of making these comparisons:

- A traffic count was taken at each of the 56 bridges that inspection reports have suggested are approaching the end of their service life (within 10 years) using one of the MD's radar traffic counters. The information obtained was the average daily traffic (ADT) and average daily truck traffic (ADTT) crossing each of these bridges, typically over a 3-to-7-day period.
- The length of the shortest reasonable alternative travel route around each bridge was measured on a map. (Shortest reasonable road length between bridge ends without crossing the bridge)
- A rough forecasted replacement cost was estimated, based on a comparison with previous projects. (Class 5 estimate typically within -50%/+100% accuracy most times)
- A high-level review of typical land values with the MD's tax assessor took place to establish a likely portion of land and property value that was associated with having bridge access. These numbers were used to establish user value where a bridge was an only access.
 - Developed property values with bridge access were estimated to be roughly equivalent to their tax assessed values. There were no developments without bridge access it was

assumed that without bridge access, most developments would have minimal residual value.

- Cleared agricultural land with bridge access was estimated to have a rough average value of approximately \$400K per quarter based on comparisons with similar properties. There were no cleared agricultural lands without bridge access it was assumed that without bridge access any cleared agricultural would revert to a brushed state due to a lack of use and maintenance. Note that tax assessments for these types of lands are not based on land value, but utilization of the land, so they cannot be used for evaluation.
- Brushed (grazing) land with bridge access was estimated to have a rough average value of approximately \$250K per quarter based on comparisons with similar properties.
- Brushed land without bridge access was estimated to have a rough average value of approximately \$125K per quarter based on comparisons with similar properties. It was assumed that this would be the residual land value any time bridge access was removed from a land or property.

3.2 Assumptions Made

To perform the cost-benefit evaluations, the following_assumptions were made:

- On average, each current user of a bridge will need to drive an additional distance equal to 1/3 of the closest reasonable driving distance between bridge ends should the bridge be closed.
- Detouring vehicles on local roads drive an average speed of 60 km/hr.
- The average operating cost of a detouring vehicle is \$0.60/km.
- The average operating cost of a detouring truck (6m+ long) is \$1/km.
- The average value of time for a detouring vehicle is \$20/hr.
- The average value of time for a detouring truck (6m+ long) is \$40/hr.
- Derelict bridges can be left in place with closure costs being negligible, resulting in a net cost/savings of 100% when considering bridge replacements/closures.
- Bridge culverts will need to be dug out and the waterways re-established, resulting in a net cost/savings of only 50% when considering bridge culvert replacements/closures.
- Average daily truck traffic counts (6m+ vehicles) will jump to 10% of ADT if/when load restrictions over the Beaver River are removed.
- There will be no requirements for compensation if a bridge is closed where there is reasonable alternate access for land and property owners. MD expects that the legal risk of this kind of compensation is low a hypothetical loss in land value related to a bridge closure would need to be demonstrated through legal means, which would be difficult to do when there was reasonable alternate access provided. As long as a fair and reasoned bridge decommissioning process is followed, It is expected that most compensations of this nature would be optional.
- There will be compensation required for any land devaluations related to bridge closures where no alternate access is available.

3.3 Items not Considered

The following factors were not considered in the cost-benefit calculations:

- The carbon footprint / environmental costs of the increased distances being driven when a bridge is closed.
- Agricultural users not being able to reasonably drive an alternative route when a bridge is closed due to the slow speeds of some equipment or the unsuitability of those alternate routes.
- While the removal of load restrictions during major bridge replacements was considered, the increased utilization of bridges resulting from other replacement upgrades were not. (Larger equipment being able to cross wider structures, increased use of bridges due to better locations, etc)

3.4 Cost-Benefit Calculations

Abbreviations:

- ADT = Average Daily Traffic (Average number of vehicles crossing bridge per day)
- ADTT = Average Daily Truck Traffic (Average number of 6m+ vehicles crossing bridge per day)
- Dist. = Closest reasonable alternate route around the bridge, as measured between bridge ends
- RD = Annual reduced travel distance attributable to a bridge crossing (all vehicles)
- RTD = Annual reduced trucking distance attributable to a bridge crossing (6m+ vehicles an additional \$0.40/km in operating costs and an additional \$20/hr in time value were applied for the distances being travelled by these kinds of vehicles as they were already counted in the RD distances)

Calculations Performed: (Alternate Route Available)

- RD = ADT x Dist/3 x 365
- RTD = ADTT x Dist/3 x 365
- Annual User Value = (RD x \$.060/km) + (RD/60km/hr x \$20/hr) + (RTD x \$0.40/km) + (RTD/60km/hr x \$20/hr)
- Benefit/Cost Ratio (Bridge) = Annual User Value / Annuitized Replacement Cost
- Benefit/Cost Ratio (Bridge Culvert) = Annual User Value / (Annuitized Replace Cost x 50%)

Calculations Performed: (No Alternate Route Available)

- Annual User Value = (Estimated value of accessed properties with bridge access Estimated value of accessed properties assuming no bridge access) / expected life of bridge
- Benefit/Cost Ratio (Bridge) = Annual User Value / Annuitized Replace Cost
- Benefit/Cost Ratio (Bridge Culvert) = Annual User Value / (Annuitized Replace Cost x 50%)

It should be noted that the Benefit Cost Ratios (BCR) that are being produced can be used for an initial comparison between bridges and the development of a draft priority list. However, there are likely factors not fully captured by the analysis. The numbers would be subject to revision as better and more accurate information becomes available.

Note that a landowner map has been included with each bridge information sheet in Appendix B for the purposes of identifying the benefits that individual landowners may be receiving beyond what has been captured through this analysis.

3.5 Replacement Priority / Closure Candidate Categories

Once a Benefit-Cost ratio was calculated, MD bridges were separated into 1 of 4 categories that will help identify priorities for replacement as well as candidates for closure within its bridge replacement program. This should help optimize available resources for replacing bridges as well as ensuring responsible end-of-life management processes when resources fall short.

Replacement	Description	Primary User Benefit	Calculated
Priority			Benefit/Cost
Category			Ratio
А	Low Value Replacement /	Shortened Travel Distances -	0.0 - 2.0
	Low Impact Closure	Alternate Route(s) Available to Users	
В	Medium Value Replacement	Shortened Travel Distances -	2.1 - 4.0
	/ Medium Impact Closure	Alternate Route(s) Available to Users	
С	High Value Replacement /	Shortened Travel Distances -	>4.0
	High Impact Closure	Alternate Route(s) Available to Users	
D	Only Access Bridge	Property/Land Access - No alternate	Any
		route(s) available	

Table 1 – Replacement Priority Categories

3.6 Replacement Priority / Closure Candidate Summaries

See Appendix A for maps showing 56 MD bridge structures that were identified in bridge inspection reports as likely needing replacement within the next 10 years, colour coded by the replacement priority category.

See Appendix B for a list of bridge structures that were identified in bridge inspection reports as likely needing replacement within the next 10 years, ranked by calculated benefit-cost ratio, as well as bridge information sheets showing more details about how each bridge was assessed.

4 Cost Saving Summaries – Bridge and Bridge Culvert Decommissioning

Figures 6 and 7 show an overall summary of the forecasted savings that would be realized by closing bridges within the various closure categories and cost-benefit thresholds that were established in this review.



Figure 6 – 10-Year Bridge Decommissioning Savings by Closure Category



Alternate Access Bridges (A-C)

Figure 7 – 10-Year Bridge Decommissioning Savings by Benefit/Cost Ratio

-\$1.804.982

5 Conclusion

In theory, many local road bridges within the MD could be closed without impacting land access as there are alternate accesses available in most cases. However, the reliance that MD residents and industry have on these bridges and the connectivity they provide may make this solution untenable. Having a transportation network able to facilitate the efficient movement of goods, services, equipment, and people is one of the foundations of a healthy economy and investing in the MD's transportation network is an investment in the future.

However, the decision to build many of these bridges was originally made in a post wartime economy when there were new tax revenue streams and a focus on infrastructure. The situation today is not the same as there are many competing priorities.

The decision to invest in bridges when there are so many competing budgetary needs is a difficult one, and one that can only be made at the political level. The contents of this report are intended to inform and facilitate the discussion on what the MD's service levels should be for infrastructure spending going forward and what resource streams will be needed to pay for it.





Replacement Priority Category

- <2 Low Value Replacement Low Impact Closure (A)</p>
- 2-4 Medium Value Replacement Medium Impact Closure (B)
- >4 High Value Replacement High Impact Closure (C)
- Only Access Replacement (D)

Document Path: O:\GISData\MD_Assets\MD_MXDs\Bridge_Culvert_20230830_11x17Index.mxd



- <2 Low Value Replacement Low Impact Closure (A)</p>
- 2-4 Medium Value Replacement Medium Impact Closure (B)
- >4 High Value Replacement High Impact Closure (C)
- Only Access Replacement (D)



- <2 Low Value Replacement Low Impact Closure (A)</p>
- 2-4 Medium Value Replacement Medium Impact Closure (B)
- >4 High Value Replacement High Impact Closure (C)
- Only Access Replacement (D)



- <2 Low Value Replacement Low Impact Closure (A)</p>
- 2-4 Medium Value Replacement Medium Impact Closure (B)
- >4 High Value Replacement High Impact Closure (C)
- Only Access Replacement (D)



Map D

MD of Bonnyville No. 87 2023 Bridge Structures Approaching the End of Serviceable Life (10 Years)

- <2 Low Value Replacement Low Impact Closure (A)</p>
- 2-4 Medium Value Replacement Medium Impact Closure (B)
- >4 High Value Replacement High Impact Closure (C)
- Only Access Replacement (D)

APPENDIX B - MD BRIDGES APPROACHING END OF SERVICEABLE LIFE

(Bridge inspection reports estimate replacement likely needed within 10 years)

MD of Bonnyville Bridge Structures Approaching End of Serviceable Life (10 Years)						
				Bridge Replacement Estir		Estimated
Duides File	T	Dead	Deferreres	Benefit/Cost	Priority	Closure Net
Bridge File	Туре	Road	Reference	Ratio (BCR)	Category	Savings
72141	Culvert	TWP 600	W RR 430	0.3	А	\$643,809
72293	Bridge	RR 451	S of Twp 610	0.5	А	\$1,091,693
73150	Bridge	RR 474	N TWP 635	0.7	А	\$1,192,679
72140	Bridge	RR 432	N TWP 622	1.1	А	\$947,699
8663	Culvert	RR 434A	N TWP 615	1.3	А	\$272,378
9270	Culvert	RR 453	TWP 630	1.6	А	\$1,564,216
78683	Bridge	RR 432	N TWP 624	1.8	А	\$1,118,744
72749	Bridge	TWP 623	E RR 431	1.8	А	\$1,569,639
75456	Bridge	TWP 620	W RR 445	2.1	В	\$749,862
72355	Bridge	RR 4100	S of Twp 632	2.1	В	\$4,283,963
13116	Bridge	RR 444	S TWP 615	2.2	В	\$1,164,143
2241	Culvert	RR 482	N TWP 600	2.3	В	\$1,716,345
74989	Bridge	RR 440	S TWP 630	2.3	В	\$882,166
75594	Culvert	RR 434	S TWP 604	2.4	В	\$421,310
71909	Culvert	RR 490	S TWP 591	2.6	В	\$1,862,351
75639	Bridge	Twp 622	E of RR 484	2.8	В	\$1,430,476
71791	Culvert	RR 480	S TWP 610	2.9	В	\$553,942
72189	Bridge	RR 490	N TWP 614	3.0	В	\$766,607
72752	Bridge	TWP 593A	W HWY 657	3.2	В	\$1,053,620
74828	Bridge	RR 435	S TWP 622	3.5	В	\$678,702
71155	Bridge	RR 491	N HWY 660	3.6	В	\$907,120
78069	Bridge	TWP 613	E FORT KENT	3.6	В	\$782,039
72515	Bridge	RR 485A	N of Twp 630	4.0	В	\$8,184,210
72518	Bridge	TWP 604A	E RR 451	4.2	С	\$782,039
71790	Culvert	TWP 604	W RR 465	4.5	С	\$257,523
70665	Culvert	RR 490	S HWY 28	4.7	С	\$1,423,806
72107	Bridge	RR 471	N TWP 640	5.0	С	\$1,113,627
9595	Bridge	RR 452	N of Twp 624	5.1	С	\$9,111,181
76766	Culvert	TWP 624	E RR 443	5.2	С	\$197,012
75792	Culvert	RR 435	N TWP 622	5.4	С	\$233,247
72208	Culvert	TWP 630	W RR 471	5.6	С	\$541,097
75640	Bridge	Twp 624	W of RR 4100	5.8	С	\$736,644
75453	Bridge	RR 440	S TWP 622	6.5	С	\$678,702
76031	Bridge	RR 433	N of Twp 624	8.2	С	\$1,046,857
7865	Culvert	RR 430	N TWP 602	12.2	С	\$405,031

				Bridge Replacement		Estimated
Duideo Filo	Turne	Deed	Deference	Benefit/Cost	Priority	Closure Net
Bridge File	туре	коаа	Reference	Ratio (BCR)	Category	Savings
72754	Bridge	RR 455	N TWP 634A	12.2	С	\$782,039
72903	Bridge	RR 485	N TWP 614	12.8	С	\$846,916
8229	Bridge	RR 452A	N TWP 630	13.2	С	\$1,418,858
82021	Culvert	RR 432A	N of Twp 641	15.8	С	\$438,054
72115	Bridge	TWP 640	E RR 472	24.6	С	\$1,091,693
78682	Culvert	TWP 634	W RR 425	26.2	С	\$1,485,411
77807	Culvert	Twp 633A	E of Hwy 881	30.5	С	\$377,840
77393	Culvert	RR 443	N TWP 620	31.4	С	\$225,599
79410	Culvert	TWP 641	W RR 433	49.0	С	\$445,467
71913	Culvert	TWP 604A	W RR 465	57.9	С	\$171,682
13039	Culvert	TWP 610	W RR 451	98.3	С	\$286,137
7431	Bridge	TWP 624	E RR 485	0.3	D	\$2,376,807
76626	Culvert	RR 490	S of Twp 643A	0.9	D	\$174,413
73061	Bridge	RR 450A	N TWP 641	1.1	D	-\$88,391
13135	Bridge	RR 471	N HWY 55	1.6	D	-\$372,221
77453	Culvert	TWP 594	E RR 475	1.6	D	-\$238,728
76421	Bridge	RR 480	N TWP 635A	2.6	D	-\$1,579,811
72753	Culvert	TWP 603A	W RR 451	3.8	D	-\$476,560
74502	Culvert	RR 420	N TWP 651	4.0	D	-\$7,378,840
73402	Culvert	RR 423A	S TWP 650	11.1	D	-\$1,804,982
74565	Culvert	RR 420	N TWP 651	Not	D	Not
				calculated		calculated

А	Low Value Replacement – Low Impact Closure
В	Medium Value Replacement – Medium Impact Closure
С	High Value Replacement – High Impact Closure
D	Only Access

BF72141 closure would impact:

-average 2 vehicles/day -average 1 truck/day

Resulting in:

-maximum 11km added travel distance -assumed average 3.7km added travel distance (max/3)

Estimated Annual User Value

Total annual:

-2677km reduced travel distance

- -45 hours reduced travel time
- -1338km reduced trucking distance
- -22 hours reduced trucking time

Assume:

\$20/hour vehicle time value
\$40/hour trucker time value
\$0.6/km vehicle cost
\$1/km truck cost

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$3480 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Culvert Replacement Cost = \$22,419

Shallow (<6m) 2.7m Bridge Culvert: Projected 2030 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$1,287,617 Projected 2030 Closure/Removal Cost (2% infl) = \$643,809

Category A Closure Candidate Closure Net Savings: \$643,809



BF72141 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT BENEFIT/COST RATIO = 0.3 (0.2)

A: LOW VALUE REPLACEMENT - LOW IMPACT CLOSURE

Kilomotrae











BF78683 closure would impact:

-average 19 vehicles/day -average 1 truck/day

Resulting in:

-maximum 10km added travel distance -assumed average 3.3km added travel distance (max/3)

Estimated Annual User Value

Total annual:

-23,117km reduced travel distance
-385 hours reduced travel time
-1216km reduced trucking distance
-20 hours reduced trucking time

Assume:

\$20/hour vehicle time value \$40/hour trucker time value \$0.6/km vehicle cost \$1/km truck cost

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$22,468 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$12,788

Single Span Bridge:

Projected 2031 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$1,123,744 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (\$185,000 – optional 2031 bridge removal)

Category A Closure Candidate Closure net savings: \$1,118,744 (\$938,744 including bridge removal)

BF78683 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT BENEFIT/COST RATIO = 1.8

71913

A: LOW VALUE REPLACEMENT - LOW IMPACT CLOSURE

78817



TWP RD 631

7.5456

78069

13157

TWP RD 631

WP RD 623

WP RD 621

7164

70928

S

9270

8229

TWP RD 621

TWP RD 615

arlotte Lake

Fort Kent

75638

WP RD 614

13.1

79412

WP RD 624

WP RD 625



BF75456 closure would impact:

average 25 vehicles/day -average 2 trucks/day

Resulting in:

maximum 6km added travel distance -assumed average 2km added travel distance (max/3)

Estimated Annual User Value

Total annual:

18,250km reduced travel distance -304 hours reduced travel time -1460km reduced trucking distance -24 hours reduced trucking time

Assume:

\$20/hour vehicle time value \$40/hour trucker time value \$0.6/km vehicle cost \$1/km truck cost

Moose Lake

71913

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$18,104 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$8762

Single Span Bridge:

Projected 2030 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$754,862 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (\$165,000 – optional 2030 bridge removal)

THE

85342.1

78817

Closure net savings: \$749,862 (\$589,862 including bridge removal)



BF 75456 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT BENEFIT/COST RATIO = 2.1

B: MEDIUM VALUE REPLACEMENT - MEDIUM IMPACT CLOSURE





B: MEDIUM VALUE REPLACEMENT - MEDIUM IMPACT CLOSURE

BF72355 closure would impact:

average 36 vehicles/day average 1 truck/day

Resulting in:

 maximum 22km added travel distance assumed average 7.3km added travel distance (max/3)

It is also expected that individual landowners would be significantly impacted as the bridge is between lands they own and work.

73061

TWP RD 640 72755.2

TWP RD 63

WP RD 623

9270

79412

WP RD 624

TWP RD 625

75606

WP RD 642

72754

Estimated Annual User Value

Total annual: 72899

96,360km reduced travel distance 1606 hours reduced travel time -2555km reduced trucking distance (9198km at 10% ADT) -43 hours reduced trucking time (153 hours at 10% ADT)

Assume:

\$20/hour vehicle time value \$40/hour trucker time value \$0.6/km vehicle cost \$1/km truck cost Truck traffic increase to 10% ADT when load restriction removed.

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$91,899 (\$102,942: trucks at 10% ADT) Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$49,784

Beaver River Truss: Projected 2030 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$4,288,963 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (\$460,000 – optional 2030 bridge removal)

Category B Closure Candidate Closure net savings: \$4,283,963 (\$3,883,963 including bridge removal)








Kilomotras



75640 TWP RD 624

BF75639 closure would impact:

-average 21 vehicles/day -average 1 truck/day

Resulting in:

-maximum 19km added travel distance -assumed average 6.3km added travel distance (max/3)

Estimated Annual User Value

Total annual:

- -48,290km reduced travel distance
- -805 hours reduced travel time
- -6935km reduced trucking distance
- -116 hours reduced trucking time

Assume:

\$20/hour vehicle time value \$40/hour trucker time value \$0.6/km vehicle cost \$1/km truck cost

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$47,004 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$16,662

Single Span Bridge: Projected 2030 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$1,435,476 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (\$190,000 – optional 2030 bridge removal)

Category B Closure Candidate Closure Net Savings: \$1,430,476 (\$1,245,476 if bridge removed)











Kilomotras





BF78069 closure would impact:

-average 103 vehicles/day -average 3 trucks/day

Resulting in:

-maximum 3km added travel distance -assumed average 1km added travel distance (max/3)

Estimated Annual User Value

Total annual:

-37,595km reduced travel distance

- -627 hours reduced travel time
- -1095km reduced trucking distance
- -18 hours reduced trucking time

Assume:

\$20/hour vehicle time value \$40/hour trucker time value \$0.6/km vehicle cost \$1/km truck cost

Moose Lake

71913

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$35,892 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$9,889

Single Span Bridge:

Projected 2026 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$787,039 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (\$165,000 – optional 2026 bridge removal)

Category B Closure Candidate Closure net savings: \$782,039 (\$622,039 including bridge removal)

85342.1

78817

BENEFIT/COST RATIO = 3.6





TWP RD 63







BF72107 closure would impact:

-average 41 vehicles/day -average 7 trucks/day

Resulting in:

-maximum 13km added travel distance -assumed average 4.3km added travel distance (max/3)

Estimated Annual User Value

Total annual: -64,970km reduced travel distance 1083 hours reduced travel time -10,950km reduced trucking distance 183 hours reduced trucking time

Assume: \$20/hour vehicle time value \$40/hour trucker time value \$0.6/km vehicle cost \$1/km truck cost

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$68,644 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$13,779

Single Span Bridge:

Projected 2027 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$1,118,628 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (\$178,000 – optional 2027 bridge removal)

Category C Closure Candidate Closure net savings: \$1,113,628 (\$940,628 including bridge removal)

TWP RD 624

7431



5640 TWP RD 624

72355.1



120				
5	BF9595 closure would impact:	DE		
443	-average 225 vehicles/day			
RGE RD RGE RD	-average 15 trucks/day			
my	Resulting in:			
	-maximum 24km added travel distance	\subseteq		
	-assumed average 8km added travel distance (max/3)			
TWP RD 62	Estimated Annual User Value			
	(Current bridge)			
76766.1	Total annual:	TWP RD 624		
75788.1	-657,000km reduced travel distance			
	-10,950 hours reduced travel time	17		
	-43,800km reduced trucking distance (65,700km at 10% ADT)			
	-730 hours reduced trucking time (1095 hours at 10% ADT)	W I		
	Assume	Beave		
	\$20/hour vehicle time value			
	\$40/hour trucker time value	677		
77393	\$0.6/km vehicle cost	24		
TT	\$1/km truck cost	T > A		
	Truck traffic increase to 10% ADT if/when load restriction removed	51.1		
TWP RD 620		18 /		
100h	Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$645,320 (\$681,820: Trucks at 10% ADT)	1/ (
_	Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$134,200	5		
13116 13115.2	Desiver Diver Truce Dridge	3		
13110	Beaver River muss Bhuge. Projected 2025 Replacement Cost (2% infl) - \$12,764,854	RD 4		
0	Estimated Closure Cost = $$5000$	RGE		
	Estimated Derelict Structure Removal Cost (Optional) = \$500,000	1 1 1		
		A.		
-	-Closure not recommended unless a relocated crossing has been built.	BD .		
5	-Closure net savings: \$12,264,854	5		
	-Consider relocating future river crossing to better service users and reduce construction	0		
	costs – the current location does not appear to be optimal due to the existing road geometry			
DURE	and misalignment with existing development/transportation comdors.	2 22 5		
0 ~ Ca				
	GER	8 2 8		
- C - L - L		· 12		
n of this river crossing when the bridge is replaced:				
not co stoop)				
iot so steep)				
sired development and transportation corridors				
incu ue	relopment and transportation contaols	4		
G	74139	5		



BF75792 closure would impact:

average 35 vehicles/day -average 1 truck/day

Resulting in:

-maximum 6km added travel distance -assumed average 2km added travel distance (max/3)

Estimated Annual User Value

Total annual:

-25,550km reduced travel distance -425 hours reduced travel time -730km reduced trucking distance -12 hours reduced trucking time

Assume:

\$20/hour vehicle time value \$40/hour trucker time value \$0.6/km vehicle cost \$1/km truck cost

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$24,382 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Culvert Replacement Cost = \$8968

Shallow (<6m) Bridge Culvert: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$466,494 Projected 2025 Closure/Removal Cost (2% infl) = \$233,247

Tert

85342.1

78817

Category C Closure Candidate Closure Net Savings: \$233,247



BF75792 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT BENEFIT/COST RATIO = 5.4(2.7)

Moose Lake

BF72208 closure would impact:

-average 18 vehicles/day -average 3 trucks/day

Resulting in:

-maximum 13km added travel distance -assumed average 4.3km added travel distance (max/3)

Estimated Annual User Value

Total annual:

-28,470km reduced travel distance -78 hours reduced travel time -4745km reduced trucking distance -79 hours reduced trucking time

Assume:

\$20/hour vehicle time value
\$40/hour trucker time value
\$0.6/km vehicle cost
\$1/km truck cost

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$30,052 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Culvert Replacement Cost = \$20,803*

*Note that 75% provincial grant funding for culvert replacement is in place for BF72208 to facilitate fish passage.

Deep (6m+) Bridge Culvert: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$1,040,172 **Net 2025 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$260,043** Projected 2025 Closure/Removal Cost (2% infl) = \$520,086

-Closure Net Savings: \$0

BF72208 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT BENEFIT/COST RATIO = *5.6 (2.8)(1.4)

C: HIGH VALUE REPLACEMENT - HIGH IMPACT CLOSURE





BF75640 closure would impact:

-average 47 vehicles/day

Resulting in:

-average 4 trucks/day

-maximum 10km added travel distance -assumed average 3.3km added travel distance (max/3)

-57,183km reduced travel distance -4867km reduced trucking distance

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$56,940 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$9,889

Projected 2023 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$741,644 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (\$160,000 – optional 2023 bridge removal)

Closure net savings: \$736,644 (\$576,644 including bridge removal)

AR **BF75640 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT BENEFIT/COST RATIO = 5.8**

C: HIGH VALUE REPLACEMENT - HIGH IMPACT CLOSURE





13135	.1 Charles and the second			
Se .	BF76031 closure would impact:	0 03		
	-average 83 vehicles/day -average 6 trucks/day	155 DW RD 631 TWP RD 631 TWP RD 631		
RGE RD	Resulting in:	79412 9270 9270		
72208	-maximum 10km added travel distance			
K	Estimated Annual User Value	TWP RD 625		
	Total annual:	TWP PD 624		
81	-100.983km reduced travel distance			
• ~)	-1683 hours reduced travel time	man and the		
	-7300km reduced trucking distance	TWP RD 623		
	-122 hours reduced trucking time	KGE A 452		
	Assume:	TWP RD 622		
TWP RD 622	\$20/hour vehicle time value	D 454		
	\$40/hour trucker time value	GE RI		
	\$0.6/km vehicle cost	2 TWP RD 621 TWP RD 621		
	\$1/km truck cost			
	Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$99,604 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$12,209	198 U		
N	Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$952,699 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (\$165,000 – optional 2025 bridge removal)	WP RD 615 Fort Kent 78069 W TWP RD 615 75638 13157 WP RD 614 TWP RD 614		
	Closure Not Recommended Closure net savings: \$947,699 (\$787,699 including bridge removal)	7164 70928 50 70928 50 TWP RD 613		
}		E B 453		
BE76031 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT				
- //		a for the second s		
	BENEFIT/COST RATIO = 8.2	il a		
∧		73114		

C: HIGH VALUE REPLACEMENT - HIGH IMPACT CLOSURE

71913

72518.1



BF7865 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT BENEFIT/COST RATIO = 12.2 (6.1)

WP RD 60

C: HIGH VALUE REPLACEMENT - HIGH IMPACT CLOSURE

Muriel Lake

BF7865 closure would impact:

-average 55 vehicles/day -average 6 trucks/day

12/

Resulting in:

72518.1

-maximum 14km added travel distance -assumed average 4.7km added travel distance (max/3)

Estimated Annual User Value

Total annual: -93,805km reduced travel distance -1563 hours reduced travel time -10,220km reduced trucking distance -170 hours reduced trucking time

Assume:

\$20/hour vehicle time value
\$40/hour trucker time value
\$0.6/km vehicle cost
\$1/km truck cost

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$94,932 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Culvert Replacement Cost = \$15,572

Shallow (<6m) 4.3m Bridge Culvert: Projected 2027 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$842,788 Projected 2027 Closure/Removal Cost (2% infl) = \$421,394

-Closure not recommended. -Closure Net Savings: \$421,394



71913

71790

TWP RD 604

Kilomotrae









-average 102 vehicles/day -average 12 trucks/day

Resulting in:

TWP RD 622

TWP RD 61

-maximum 10km added travel distance -assumed average 3.3km added travel distance (max/3)

Estimated Annual User Value

Total annual: -124,100km reduced travel distance -2068 hours reduced travel time -14,600km reduced trucking distance -243 hours reduced trucking time

Assume: \$20/hour vehicle time value \$40/hour trucker time value \$0.6/km vehicle cost \$1/km truck cost

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$126,533 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$9,889

Single Span Bridge: Projected 2030 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$851,916 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (\$185,000 – optional 2030 bridge removal)

Closure not Recommended. Closure net savings: \$846,916 (\$661,916 including bridge removal)

18 2

BF72903 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT BENEFIT/COST RATIO = 12.8

C: HIGH VALUE REPLACEMENT - HIGH IMPACT CLOSURE



BF82021 closure would impact:

-average 69 vehicles/day -average 3 trucks/day

Mare

Resulting in:

-maximum 14km added travel distance -assumed average 4.7km added travel distance (max/3)

Estimated Annual User Value

Total annual:

- -117,530km reduced travel distance
- -1959 hours reduced travel time
- -5110km reduced trucking distance
- -85 hours reduced trucking time

Assume:

WP RD 62

\$20/hour vehicle time value
\$40/hour trucker time value
\$0.6/km vehicle cost
\$1/km truck cost

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$113,442 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Culvert Replacement Cost = \$14,374

Shallow (<6m) Bridge Culvert: Projected 2033 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$876,108 Projected 2033 Closure/Removal Cost (2% infl) = \$438,054

-Closure not recommended. -Closure Net Savings: \$438,054

RESOURCES RESOURCES DENNIS & GLEN & LTD LTD DIANE \Box_{Π} GILMOUR 1 OIL IDS RP. MICHAEL & HELEN -16 STONE, DAVID & INEZ Ethel Lake < GAUTHIER KETT, GER EE MURPHY, RAY & RYAN KENNETH A. & DONNA L JOHNSON, IDEN D PHY, Y & AN MURPHY MCKEE, THOMAS RAY & SCOUTS BAUERFIND, RYAN ASSOCIATION VALERIE KOLEWASI JAYSON A GERVAIS, SHANE SON, BRADLEY & SHELLEY WILLIAM-SUTTON, GARRY & JICK. PARDELL IES &

TWP RD 640 TWP RD 640 TWP RD 635 TWP RD 634

TWP RD 63

WP RD 632

74989

BF82021 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT BENEFIT/COST RATIO = 15.8 (7.9)

9270

79412

C: HIGH VALUE REPLACEMENT - HIGH IMPACT CLOSURE





BF78682 closure would impact:

Mais

-average 567 vehicles/day -average 37 trucks/day

Resulting in:

-maximum 10km added travel distance -assumed average 3.3km added travel distance (max/3)

Estimated Annual User Value

Total annual:

-689,850km reduced travel distance -11,498 hours reduced travel time -45,017km reduced trucking distance -750 hours reduced trucking time

Assume:

\$20/hour vehicle time value \$40/hour trucker time value \$0.6/km vehicle cost \$1/km truck cost

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$676,872 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Culvert Replacement Cost = \$51,726

Shallow (<6m) Bridge Culvert: Projected 2030 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$2,970,823 Projected 2030 Closure/Removal Cost (2% infl) = \$1,485,412

 Closure not recommended. Closure Net Savings: \$1,485,412

1 (1



BF78682 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT BENEFIT/COST RATIO = 26.2 (13.1)

79412

C: HIGH VALUE REPLACEMENT - HIGH IMPACT CLOSURE

TWP RD 631



BF77393 closure would impact:

-average 113 vehicles/day -average 9 trucks/day

Resulting in:

-maximum 10km added travel distance 72208 -assumed average 3.3km added travel distance (max/3)

Estimated Annual User Value

Total annual:

-137,483km reduced travel distance -2291 hours reduced travel time -10,950km reduced trucking distance

- 102 hours reduced trucking distance
- -183 hours reduced trucking time

Assume:

\$20/hour vehicle time value
\$40/hour trucker time value
\$0.6/km vehicle cost
\$1/km truck cost

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$136,348 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Culvert Replacement Cost = \$8,674

Shallow (<6m) 4.3m Bridge Culvert: Projected 2027 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$451,199 Projected 2027 Closure/Removal Cost (2% infl) = \$225,600

-Closure not recommended. -Closure Net Savings: \$225,600

71913

La Corey **TWP RD 631 TWP RD 631** 79412 8229 9270 TWP RD 625 TWP RD 624 WP RD 623 WPRDF TWP RD 622 TWP RD 621 WP RD 62 7.5456 TWP RD 62 Fort Kent 78069 TWP RD 615 76127 13116 E 13157 75638 WP RD 614 VP RD 61 7164 70928 WP RD 61 0 Lake

73114

BF 77393 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT BENEFIT/COST RATIO = 31.4 (15.7)

Cont

C: HIGH VALUE REPLACEMENT - HIGH IMPACT CLOSURE



BF79410 closure would impact:

Mais

-average 110 vehicles/day -average 7 trucks/day

Resulting in:

-maximum 29km added travel distance -assumed average 9.7km added travel distance (max/3)

Estimated Annual User Value

Total annual:

-388,117km reduced travel distance -6469 hours reduced travel time -24,698km reduced trucking distance -412 hours reduced trucking time

Assume:

\$20/hour vehicle time value
\$40/hour trucker time value
\$0.6/km vehicle cost
\$1/km truck cost

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$380,354 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Culvert Replacement Cost = \$15,512

Shallow (<6m) Bridge Culvert: Projected 2030 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$890,934 Projected 2030 Closure/Removal Cost (2% infl) = \$445,467

155

-Closure not recommended. -Closure Net Savings: \$445,467

1 (1

BF79410 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT BENEFIT/COST RATIO = 49.0 (24.5)

79412

0

C: HIGH VALUE REPLACEMENT - HIGH IMPACT CLOSURE

8229

TWP RD 631

9270

SUNRISE IOLDINGS (2002) INC.

'a Lake

PAN RENA

MURPHY, RAY & RYAN

FIELDING

GARY D. & & RUBY 32

APPeloney_

Lake

HILDA MAKE

DAVIS, LEATA N.A.

GARY D. & RUBY

48197 DUW25 0020 WC1



BF71913 closure would impact:

-average 246 vehicles/day -average 10 trucks/day

Resulting in:

-maximum 6km added travel distance -assumed average 2km added travel distance (max/3)

Estimated Annual User Value

- Total annual:

179.580km reduced travel distance -2993 hours reduced travel time -7300km reduced trucking distance -122 hours reduced trucking time

Assume: \$20/hour vehicle time value \$40/hour trucker time value \$0.6/km vehicle cost \$1/km truck cost

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$172,961 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Culvert Replacement Cost = \$5978

Shallow (<6m) Bridge Culvert: Projected 2030 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$343,365 Projected 2030 Closure/Removal Cost (2% infl) = \$171,683



-Closure Net Savings: \$171,683

BF71913 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT BENEFIT/COST RATIO = 57.9 (28.9)

C: HIGH VALUE REPLACEMENT - HIGH IMPACT CLOSURE

DOR

TWP RD

TWP RD 590



BF7431 closure would impact:

-1 residence

-only ROW access to 1 developed residential property east of the Beaver River (48322 Twp Rd 624 – 2022 tax assessed value = \$283,890)

-only ROW access to 5 largely undeveloped quarters east of the Beaver River with a likely land value of around \$1.25M

-secondary light vehicle access to wellsites on east side of Beaver River

Estimated Annual User Value

2022 tax assessed value of residence inflated to 2023 = \$300,000 50% of undeveloped land value associated with bridge access = \$625,000 Annuitized for life of bridge = \$12,333

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$12,333 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$42,379

Beaver River Truss:

Projected 2025 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$3,306,807 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (\$300,000 – optional 2025 bridge removal) Compensation assuming full cost of residence plus 50% of undeveloped land value = \$925,000

Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: \$2,376,807





BF7431 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT BENEFIT/COST RATIO = 0.3

D: ONLY ACCESS

"The Jungle" - composed of a network of CNRL leases and gated wellsite access roads. While emergency access would exist through this area during dry conditions (subject to CNRL permission), the cost of providing and maintaining a permanent MD access road to the residence is estimated to be higher than the cost of the bridge.
BF76626 closure would impact:

-only ROW access to 2 developed residential properties north of creek:

64311 Rge Rd 490	(1 Cabin)
64413 Rge Rd 490	(2 Houses, 4 cabins, misc. structures)

-only ROW access to 0.9 agricultural quarters north of creek

-only ROW access to 2 undeveloped quarters north of creek

-only access to crown land, including 2 possible pad sites visible in aerial photographs

35

72

80745 -1

sm

77449 -1

36

25

24

7455 -2

nk

31

30

SMITH, ROGER ALAN

SMITH, ROGER ALAN

SMITH,

ROGER

7807

SMITH,19 ROGER

18

ALLAN

Estimated Annual User Value

Tax assessed value of accessed residences inflated to 2023 = \$753,125 Likely agricultural land value associated with having bridge access = \$247,500 50% of likely undeveloped land value associated with having bridge access = \$250,000

Annuitized for life of bridge culvert = \$25,013

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$25,013 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$53,714

Deep (6m+) Bridge Culvert: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$2,850,076 Estimated Closure Cost = \$1,425,038 Compensation assuming full cost of residences and partial reduction in agricultural and undeveloped land value = \$1,250,625





D: ONLY ACCESS





BF73061 closure would impact:

-only ROW access to 2 developed residential properties north of creek:

64304 Rge Rd 451A (2 Cabins, utility building, misc. structures) SE-26-64-5-4 (2 Cabins, 2 Storage Buildings, misc. structures)

-only ROW access to 2 undeveloped residential properties north of creek

64303 Rge Rd 451A SW-25-64-5-4

-only ROW access to 3 undeveloped agricultural quarters north of creek

Estimated Annual User Value

Tax assessed value of accessed residences inflated to 2023 = \$572,000 50% of likely undeveloped land value associated with having bridge access = \$528,903

Annuitized for life of bridge = \$14,679

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$14,679 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$13,040

Three Span Bridge:

Projected 2025 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$1,017,512 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (\$200,000 – optional 2025 bridge removal) Compensation assuming full cost of residences and 50% reduction in undeveloped land value = \$1,100,903

Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: -\$88,391



BF73061 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT BENEFIT/COST RATIO = 1.1

TWP RD 640

6

76755 -1

D: ONLY ACCESS



-only ROW access to 3 residential properties north of Manotokan Creek: 63218 Rge Rd 471

-only ROW access to 1 agricultural guarter north of Manotokan Creek

Tax assessed value of accessed residences inflated to 2023 = \$895,000 Likely agricultural land value associated with having bridge access = \$275,000

Annuitized for life of bridge = \$15,600

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$15,600 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$9,889

Projected 2027 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$802,779 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (\$165,000 – optional 2027 bridge removal) Compensation assuming full cost of residences and reduction in agricultural land value from \$400,000 to \$125,000 (agricultural quarter with bridge access to undeveloped quarter with no bridge access) = \$1,170,000

Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: -\$372,221



1Km

BF77453 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT

BF76421 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT BENEFIT/COST RATIO = 2.6 D: ONLY ACCESS D: ONL				AN IL
BENEFIT/COST RATIO = 2.6 -ROW access to approximately 6 agricultural quarters north of the creek with a likely combined value of around \$2.4M D: ONLY ACCESS -ROW access to approximately 12 pad sites visible in aerial photographs Estimated Annual User Value -ROW access 15,155,000 S0% of undeveloped land value associated with having bridge access - \$1,000,000 -Romutized tor life of bridge = \$35,333 Annuitzed tor life of bridge = \$35,333 -Romutized 2025 Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost = \$10,000,000 Commutation on the strenge:	4	BF76421 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT	BF76421 closure would impact:	DARICHUK,
D: ONLY ACCESS - creck with a likely combined value of around \$2.4M -ROW access to approximately 12 pad sites visible in aerial photographs - Estimated Annual User Value \$275K x 6 quarters - agricultural land value associated with having bridge access - 51,550,000 S0% of undeveloped land value associated with having bridge access - 51,000,000 Annuitized for life of bridge = \$35,333 Annuitized for life of bridge = \$35,333 Annuitized 2023 Annual User Value = \$35,333 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost = \$10,000 and solve reduction in undeveloped land value due to losing bridge access = \$2,000 (Compensation assuming a reduction in agricultural land values form \$400,000 to \$125,000 (ogricultural quarter with bridge access to undeveloped and value due to losing bridge access = \$2,550,000 Categorp D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: -\$1,579,811 - 200 / 200 - 1 - 200 / 200 / 200 - 200 / 200 - 200 / 200 - 200 / 200 - 200 / 200 - 200 / 200 - 200 / 200 - 200 / 200 - 200 / 200 - 200 / 200 - 200 / 200 - 200 / 200 - 200 / 200 - 200 / 200 - 200 / 200 - 200 / 200 - 200 / 200 - 200 / 200 / 200 - 200 / 200 / 200 - 200 / 20		BENEFIT/COST RATIO = 2.6	-ROW access to approximately 6 agricultural guarters north of the	ELSIE
D: ONLY ACCESS -ROW access to approximately 8 undeveloped quarters north of the creek with a lifely combined value of acoud 32M -ROW access to approximately 12 pad sites visible in aerial photographs -ROW access to approximately 12 pad sites visible in aerial photographs Estimated Annual User Value			creek with a likely combined value of around \$2.4M	4 F
the creek with a likely combined value of around \$2M -ROW access to approximately 12 pad sites visible in aerial photographs Estimated Annual User Value \$275K x 6 quarters - agricultural land value associated with having bridge access =\$1,650,000 S0% of undeveloped land value associated with having bridge access = \$1,000,000 Annuitized for life of bridge = \$35,333 Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$35,333 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge Projected 2025 Replacement Cost (2% inft) = \$1,075,189 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (optional bridge removal = ~ \$160,000 Compensation assuming a reduction in agricultural and values trom \$400,000 to \$125,000 (agricultural quarter with bridge access = \$2,650,000 Category D - Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: \$1,579,811 Reduction in undeveloped land value due to losing bridge access = \$2,650,000 Category D - Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: \$1,579,811 Reduction in agricultural quarter with on for a gricultural for a side of the savings: \$1,579,811 Reduction in undeveloped land value for a side of the savings: \$1,579,811 Reduction in agricultural quarter with participation and the savings = \$2,500,000 Category D - Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: \$1,579,811 Reduction in agricultural quarter with participation and the savings = \$2,500,000 Category D - Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: \$1,579,811 Reduction in agricultural quarter with participation and the savings = \$2,500,000 Category D - Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: \$1,579,811 Reduction in agricultural quarter with participation and the savings = \$2,600,000 Category D - Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: \$1,579,811 Reduction in agricultural quarter with participation and the savings = \$2,600,000 Category D - Only Access Bridge Closure net savings = \$1,579,811 Reduction in agricultural quarter with participation and the savings = \$1,579,610 Reduction in agricultural quarter with participation and the savinge =	2		-ROW access to approximately 8 undeveloped quarters north of	SHAUN
-ROW access to approximately 12 pad sites visible in aerial photographs Estimated Annual User Value S275K x6 quarters - agricultural land value associated with having bridge access = \$1,000,00 Annuitized for life of bridge = \$35,333 Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$35,333 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost = \$10,75,189 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (optional bridge removal = ~ \$160,000 Compensation assuming a reduction in agricultural land values from \$400,000 to \$152,500 (ogticultural quarter with bridge access to undeveloped quarter with no bridge access = \$2,650,000 Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: \$1,579,811			the creek with a likely combined value of around \$2M	H
Set and the set of the			-ROW access to approximately 12 pad sites visible in aerial	ROBINSON,
B Estimated Annual User Value \$275K x 6 quarters - agricultural land value associated with having bridge access = \$1,650,000 50% of undeveloped land value associated with having bridge access = \$1,650,000 Soft of undeveloped land value associated with having bridge access = \$1,000,000 Annuitized for life of bridge = \$35,333 Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$35,333 Annuitized 2023 Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost = \$10,075,189 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (optional bridge removal = ~ \$160,000) Compensation assuming a reduction in agricultural land values from \$40,000 to \$125,0000 (agricultural quarter with bridge access = \$2,650,000 Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure Cost = \$1,579,811 Reduction in undeveloped land value due to losing bridge access = \$2,650,000 Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: =\$1,579,811 Reduction in agricultural quarter with no bridge access = \$2,650,000 Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: =\$1,579,811 Reduction in agricultural quarter with no bridge access = \$2,650,000 Reduction in agricultural provide access = \$2,650,000 Reduction in agricultural provide access = \$2,650,000 Reduction in agricultural provide access = \$2,650,000 R			photographs	SHAUN
Similar Annual Oser Value Similar Annual Oser Value Siz XX x 6 quarters - agricultural land value associated with having bridge access = \$1,000,000 Six 6 undeveloped land value associated with having bridge access = \$1,000,000 Annuitzed for life of bridge = \$35,333 Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$35,333 Annuitzed 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost = \$10,075,189 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (optional bridge removal = ~\$16,0000) Compensation assuming a reduction in agricultural quarter with bridge access to undeveloped land value due to losing bridge access = \$2,650,000 Category D - Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: -\$1,579,811 Test 1 Test 1 <th>?</th> <th></th> <th>Estimated Appual Licer Value</th> <th>2</th>	?		Estimated Appual Licer Value	2
SZ75K x 6 quarters - agricultural land value associated with having bridge access = \$1,650,000 59% 60 rundeveloped land value associated with having bridge access = \$1,000,000 Annuitized for life of bridge = \$35,333 Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$25,333 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Compensation assuming a reduction in agricultural land values from \$400,000 to \$125,000 (agricultural quarter with bridge access) and a 50% reduction in undeveloped land value due to losing bridge access = \$2,650,000 Category D - Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: -\$1,579,811 Tow Pass Tow Pass			Estimated Annual Oser value	STELLA
having bridge access = \$1,650,000 50% of undeveloped land value associated with having bridge access = \$1,000,000 Annuitized for life of bridge = \$35,333 Estimated 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$1,075,189 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (optional bridge removal = ~ \$160,000 Compensation assuming a reduction in agricultural land values from \$400,000 to \$125,000 (agricultural quarter with bridge access to undeveloped quarter with no bridge access = \$2,650,000 Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: \$1,579,811 72825-1 72			\$275K x 6 quarters - agricultural land value associated with	_
50% of undeveloped land value associated with having bridge access = \$1,000,000 Annuitized for life of bridge = \$35,333 Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$35,333 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$1,075,189 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (optional bridge removal = ~ \$160,000) Compensation assuming a reduction in agricultural land values from \$400,000 to \$125,000 (agricultural quarter with bridge access to undeveloped quarter with no bridge access) and a 50% r = \$2,650,000 Category D - Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: -\$1,579,811			having bridge access = \$1,650,000	BILOSHYSKI, T
access = \$1,000,000 Annuitized for life of bridge = \$35,333 Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$35,333 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$10,775,189 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (optional bridge removal = ~ \$160,000) Compensation assuming a reduction in agricultural land values from \$100,000 to \$125,000 (agricultural quarter with bridge access to undeveloped quarter with no bridge access) and a 50% reduction in undeveloped quarter with no bridge access = \$2,650,000 Category D - Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: -\$1,579,811 72825-1 728	۳		50% of undeveloped land value associated with having bridge	STELLA
Annuitized for life of bridge = \$35,333 Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$35,333 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$1,075,189 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (optional bridge removal = ~ \$160,000) Compensation assuming a reduction in agricultural land values from \$400,000 to \$125,000 (agricultural quarter with bridge access to undeveloped quarter with no bridge access) and a 50% reduction in undeveloped land value due to losing bridge access = \$2,650,000 Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: -\$1,579,811			access = \$1,000,000	
Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$35,333 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$1,075,189 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (optional bridge removal = ~ \$160,000) Compensation assuming a reduction in agricultural land values from \$400,000 to \$125,000 (agricultural quarter with bridge access to undeveloped quarter with no bridge access) and a 50% reduction in undeveloped land value due to losing bridge access = \$2,650,000 Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: -\$1,579,811		[1] · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Annuitized for life of bridge = \$35,333	BILOSHYSKI, K STELLA
Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$35,333 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$1,075,189 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (optional bridge removal = ~ \$160,000) Compensation assuming a reduction in agricultural land values from \$400,000 to \$125,000 (agricultural quarter with bridge access to undeveloped land value due to losing bridge access = \$2,650,000 Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: -\$1,579,811				
Annutized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$13,779 Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost (2% inft) = \$1,075,189 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (optional bridge removal = ~ \$160,000) Compensation assuming a reduction in agricultural land values from \$400,000 to \$125,000 (agricultural quarter with bridge access to undeveloped land value due to losing bridge access) and a 50% reduction in undeveloped land value due to losing bridge access = \$2,650,000 Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: -\$1,579,811			Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$35,333	TKACHUK,
Single Span Bridge: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$1,075,189 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (optional bridge removal = ~ \$160,000) Compensation assuming a reduction in agricultural land values from \$400,000 to \$125,000 (agricultural quarter with bridge access to undeveloped quarter with no bridge access) and a 50% reduction in undeveloped land value due to losing bridge access = \$2,650,000 Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: -\$1,579,811			Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$13,779	MARLENE
Image Span Druge. Projected 2025 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$1,075,189 Estimated Closure Cost = \$5000 (optional bridge removal = ~ \$160,000) Compensation assuming a reduction in agricultural land values from \$400,000 to \$125,000 (agricultural quarter with bridge access to undeveloped quarter with no bridge access) and a 50% reduction in undeveloped land value due to losing bridge access = \$2,650,000 Category D - Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: -\$1,579,811 Total - 1			Single Span Bridge:	5
Image: State of the state			Projected 2025 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = $$1,075,189$	
Y160,000) Compensation assuming a reduction in agricultural land values from \$400,000 to \$125,000 (agricultural quarter with hidge access) and a 50% reduction in undeveloped quarter with no bridge access) and a 50% reduction in undeveloped land value due to losing bridge access = \$2,650,000 Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: -\$1,579,811 7667 -1 7667 -1 7667 -1 7667 -1 7667 -1 7780 -1 7780 -1			Estimated Closure Cost = $$5000$ (optional bridge removal = ~	
Image: Second			\$160,000)	55 G
from \$400,000 to \$125,000 (agricultural quarter with bridge access to undeveloped quarter with no bridge access) and a 50% reduction in undeveloped land value due to losing bridge access = \$2,650,000 Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: -\$1,579,811 72825-1 72825-1 72825-1 72825-1 72825-1 72825-1 72825-1 72825-1 72825-1 72825-1 72825-1 72825-1 72825-1			Compensation assuming a reduction in agricultural land values	
TWP RD 641 access to undeveloped quarter with no bridge access) and a 50% reduction in undeveloped land value due to losing bridge access \$2,650,000 Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: -\$1,579,811 7600-1 72625-1 72625-1 72625-1 72625-1 72625-1 72625-1 72625-1 72625-1 72625-1 72625-1 72625-1			from \$400,000 to \$125,000 (agricultural quarter with bridge	
reduction in undeveloped land value due to losing bridge access = \$2,650,000 Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: -\$1,579,811		TWP RD 641	access to undeveloped quarter with no bridge access) and a 50%	
Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: -\$1,579,811			reduction in undeveloped land value due to losing bridge access	
Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: -\$1,579,811			= \$2,650,000	
Closure net savings: -\$1,579,811			Catagony D Only Access Bridge	
			Closure net savings: -\$1.579.811	
			72625-1	G TW
A A A Image: A marked bit in the second bit			2 2 2 2 C	
Image: Contract of the second secon				
TWP D 635				5
			TWP ID 635	-275
		(*)	14	

1 Mi 1 Km



BF72753 closure would impact:

-only ROW access to 1 residential property east of creek:

60316 RR 451 (4 cabins, 1 manufactured home, 3 garages)

-Only ROW access to 1.4 agricultural quarters:

NW-24-60-5-4 NE-23-60-5-4

Estimated Annual User Value

Tax assessed value of accessed residences inflated to 2023 = \$270,000 Likely agricultural land value associated with having bridge access = \$385,000

Annuitized for life of bridge culvert = \$13,100

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$13,100 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Culvert Replacement Cost = \$6860

Shallow (<6m) Bridge Culvert: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$356,880 Estimated Closure Cost = \$178,440 Compensation assuming full cost of residences and reduction in agricultural land value from \$560,000 to \$175,000 (1.4 agricultural quarters with bridge access converted to undeveloped quarters with no bridge access) = \$655,000

Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: -**\$476,560**



BF72753 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT BENEFIT/COST RATIO = 3.8 (1.9)

D: ONLY ACCESS

TWP RD 603A

Autiel Creek

54.198336. -110.627521

500 yd 500 m

BF74502 closure would impact:

-only ROW access to 20+ residential properties:

Total combined 2021 tax assessed value over \$6,000,000

-only access to Cold Lake Air Weapons Range -only access to Cold Lake Provincial Park (North)

Estimated Annual User Value

2021 tax assessed value of accessed properties over \$6,000,000
2022 inflation = 6.43%
2023 inflation (assumed) = 6.5%
Annuitized for life of bridge culvert = over \$136,000

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = over \$136,000 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$100,775

Shallow (<6m) Bridge Culvert: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$5,242,320 (Note that our class 5 cost forecast for this structure seems high – a class 4 estimate will probably come in lower when establishing a project budget) Estimated Closure/Removal Cost = \$2,621,160 Likely Purchase Price of Affected Properties = Unknown (tax assessments can be low)

Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: \$2,621,160 – any required legal costs and/or compensations for access removal



BF74502 LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT BENEFIT/COST RATIO = *2.4 (1.2)

D: ONLY ACCESS



BF73402 closure would impact:

-only ROW access to 5 residential properties south of creek:

- 1 64301 Rge Rd 423A (2021 tax assessed value = \$249,560) (1 House, 2 Garages)
- 2 64301 Rge Rd 423A (2021 tax assessed value = \$215,200) (Vacant Land - Lakefront)
- 3 64301 Rge Rd 423A (2021 tax assessed value = \$262,600) (1 Warehouse, 1 Garage)
- 4 64301 Rge Rd 423A (2021 tax assessed value = \$429,430) (1 House, 2 Garages)
- 5 64301 Rge Rd 423A (2021 tax assessed value = \$599,810) (1 House, 1 Garage)

Total combined 2021 tax assessed value = \$1,756,600

Estimated Annual User Value

2021 tax assessed value of accessed properties= \$1,756,600 2022 inflation = 6.43% 2023 inflation (assumed) = 6.5% Annuitized for life of bridge culvert = \$39,821

Estimated 2023 Annual User Value = \$39,821 Annuitized 2023 Bridge Replacement Cost = \$7154

Shallow (<6m) Bridge Culvert: Projected 2025 Replacement Cost (2% infl) = \$372,175 Estimated Closure/Removal Cost = \$186,088 Likely Purchase Price of Affected Properties = Unknown (tax assessments can be low)

Category D – Only Access Bridge Closure net savings: \$186,088 - any required legal costs and/or compensations for access removal

습







