

# ERRATA

February 2019

County of Wellington  
Salem Bridge (No. B018050), Woolwich Street West (Wellington Road 18)  
Township of Centre Wellington  
Class Environmental Assessment Study

Project File – December 2018

The table below identifies revisions to the Project File (December 2018) for the above-noted study based on comments received from The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) via email on January 16, 2019 following filing of the Project File.

PROJECT FILE SECTION	REVISION
Section 6.6	<p>The following replaces the third paragraph of Section 6.6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The MTCS returned a response on November 2, 2018 following their review with no concerns with the content of the Draft HIA (see <b>Appendix F</b>); however, they inquired how the HIA commitments would be incorporated into the Project File. An overview of how the recommendations of the HIA will be implemented, along with explanations regarding which of the recommendations are considered viable to be carried out during detailed design of the bridge, are provided in <b>Errata Table 1: Assessment of Conservation Recommendations for the Salem River Bridge Crossing</b>, which is appended to the end of this section. The Centre Wellington Heritage Committee has passed a recommendation to the County of Wellington to endorse the findings of the HIA and that the committee prefers the rehabilitation alternative; however, if replacement is the option selected by the County, then the Committee requests that recommendations 2 through 6 of the Draft HIA regarding sympathetic replacement be implemented, given the significance within the context of the surrounding cultural heritage landscape.</li></ul>

PROJECT FILE SECTION	REVISION
Section 6.10	<p>The following sentence replaces the sixth item in the bulleted list of future commitments found in Section 6.10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="565 394 1408 718">• An overview of how recommendations from the HIA will be implemented, along with explanations regarding which of the recommendations are considered viable to be carried out during detailed design of the bridge, are provided in <b>Errata Table 1: Assessment of Conservation Recommendations for the Salem River Bridge Crossing</b>, which is appended to the end of this section.</li></ul>

**Errata Table 1. Assessment of Conservation Recommendations for the Salem River Bridge Crossing (Revised February 26, 2019)**

The following conservation options expands on discussion and recommendations from the Heritage Impact Assessment and are regarded as potential management interventions on bridges that have been identified to have heritage value. They are arranged according to level or degree of intervention from maximum to minimum.

Conservation Option		Analysis	Viable Option
1	Retention of existing bridge with no major modifications undertaken	<p>The bridge currently has major elements in an advanced state of deterioration and is currently posted with load restrictions.</p> <p>Several components are in need of maintenance, rehabilitation and/or replacement and the bridge is approaching the end of its useful service life.</p> <p>Functional/operational deficiencies including substandard roadway width, restricted sidewalk width, posted load limit and sub-standard barrier protection and guide rail protection are noted on this site. Main load bearing components (steel trusses) are exposed to potential traffic impact damage that could result in severe structural damage or even collapse.</p> <p>Retention of the existing bridge with no major modifications would not address any of the functional or operational deficiencies and would pose an unacceptable risk to public safety.</p>	No
2	Restoration of Missing or Deteriorated Elements	<p>The bridge currently has major elements in an advanced state of deterioration and is currently posted with load restrictions.</p> <p>Several components are in need of maintenance, rehabilitation and/or replacement and the bridge is approaching the end of its useful service life.</p> <p>Functional/operational deficiencies including substandard roadway width, restricted sidewalk width, posted load limit and sub-standard barrier protection and guide rail protection are noted on this site. Main load bearing components (steel trusses) are exposed to potential traffic impact damage that could result in severe structural damage or even collapse.</p> <p>The cost of maintaining the current bridge under a rehabilitation approach is comparable to the cost of replacement and rehabilitation does not address many of the functional/operational deficiencies.</p>	No

3	Retention of existing with sympathetic modification	<p>The bridge currently has major elements in an advanced state of deterioration and is currently posted with load restrictions.</p> <p>Several components are in need of maintenance, rehabilitation and/or replacement and the bridge is approaching the end of its useful service life.</p> <p>Functional/operational deficiencies including substandard roadway width, restricted sidewalk width, posted load limit and sub-standard barrier protection and guide rail protection are noted on this site. Main load bearing components (steel trusses) are exposed to potential traffic impact damage that could result in severe structural damage or even collapse.</p> <p>The cost of maintaining the current bridge under a rehabilitation approach with sympathetic modifications is comparable to the cost of replacement and rehabilitation does not address many of the functional/operational deficiencies.</p>	No
4	Retention of existing bridge with sympathetically designed new structure in proximity.	Retention of the existing structure in a near by application is not considered technically feasible due to the lack of appropriate locations with similar spans, inadequate load capacity, deteriorating condition of the main load carrying members, as well as due to increased maintenance, high cost and safety concerns.	No
5	Retention of existing bridge no longer in use for vehicular purposes but adapted for a new use	The of reuse the truss structure as a pedestrian bridge at another location, incorporating salvaged elements into the design of a new pedestrian bridge at another location or as a monument near the Irvine Creek crossing is not considered technically feasible due to the deteriorating condition of the main load carrying members, as well as due to increased maintenance and safety concerns.	No
6	Retention of existing bridge as a heritage monument for viewing purposes only	<p>The of reuse the existing bridge as a heritage monument for viewing purposes is not considered technically feasible due to limited available space within the right-of-way at the site, the deteriorating condition, as well as due to increased maintenance and safety concerns.</p> <p>The existing (3) bridge plaques shall be incorporated into the new bridge structure or included in a commemorative display.</p>	No
7	Relocation of smaller, lighter single span bridge to an appropriate new site for continued use or adaptive re-use	The of reuse the existing bridge as a smaller, lighter single span bridge to an appropriate new site for continued use or adaptive re-use is not considered technically feasible due to the incompatibility of the existing truss design to modifications for shorter spans, the deteriorating condition, as well as due to increased maintenance and high costs.	No

8	Bridge replacement with a sympathetically designed structure	<p>Replacing the existing bridge with a new sympathetically designed structure is a viable option. The option can be sympathetically designed in order to best conserve the cultural heritage values and attributes of the bridge and incorporate the character of the existing bridge into the landscape. Although this option would result in the removal of the existing deck truss, abutments and end spans, the conservation of heritage attributes through sympathetic design is achievable.</p> <p>An open steel railing system may be considered to serve as a sympathetic design element that maintains some of the existing materials, massing and aesthetic qualities of the existing bridge.</p> <p>The current proposed replacement structure includes Texas style concrete baluster rail barriers in accordance with the Wellington County policy for bridges in urban areas.</p>	Yes. The railing type will be determined in detailed design as part of the bridge replacement with a sympathetically designed structure.
9	Views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features	Views from above the bridge will be considered and retained in the design of the replacement bridge by limiting the height of the bridge barrier to the minimum required standard and removing the truss from obstructing views and incorporating an open railing system.	Yes. The height of the bridge barrier will be determined during detailed design to minimize obstruction of views with an open railing concept.
10	Commemoration	The County of Wellington shall install a commemorative plaque at or near the crossing of the Irvine Creek that describes the history of the bridge crossing, the Salem (Wissler) Mill and Dam and Salem. The existing (3) bridge plaques shall be incorporated into the new bridge structure or included in a commemorative display. This will be done in cooperation with the Township of Centre Wellington Heritage Committee and the GRCA.	Yes, incorporation of the existing bridge plaques into the new structure or inclusion in a commemorative display will be completed during detailed design. The location of the plaques on the future bridge will be determined in detailed design.
11	Documentation	The Salem Bridge CHER and HIA shall act as the principal documentation records for the structure and the County will deposit either hard or electronic copies of both reports with the Wellington County Museum and Archives.	Yes, the County will provide copies of the CHER and HIA to the Wellington County Museum and Archives.

*Conservation recommendation options in Errata Table 1 are from Section 9.2, page 33, of the Heritage Impact Assessment Report for the Salem Bridge, County Site No. B018050 over Irvine Creek (Dated September 2018, revised November 2018) by Unterman McPhail Associates and from MTCS Correspondence (February 19, 2019).*