

Preliminary Design of Structure Rehabilitation for the Bridge on PR 204 over the Red River

Phase 3: What We Heard

Project Overview

The bridge over the Red River on PR 204 (Bridge Site No. 2431-00) is part of Manitoba's Regional Highway System and is the main access from the east side of the Red River to the City of Selkirk. Approximately 7,290 vehicles cross the bridge every day. The bridge has a six-meter-wide road deck that serves two lanes of vehicular traffic, and a narrow sidewalk on the north side of the bridge. The bridge was constructed in 1935; at 88 years old, it is 38 years beyond its design life. The bridge is experiencing deterioration and is currently under a 33-ton load restriction.

A vital link over the Red River, any bridge closures or extended restrictions would significantly impact surrounding communities and economic activities. Manitoba Transportation and Infrastructure (MTI) initiated the Preliminary Design of Structure Rehabilitation for Bridge PR 204 by considering two options: bridge rehabilitation or replacement. Following a review of bridge safety and integrity, the Project Team has decided to proceed with bridge rehabilitation. The team is currently considering options for rehabilitation which may include repairing existing damage, widening sidewalks and widening the roadway.

Engagement Overview

Engagement Objectives

The Phase 3 engagement objectives were: to share Phase 2 feedback, present bridge rehabilitation options and capture feedback questions. Engagement initiatives included a Public Open House and virtual meetings with the City of Selkirk and the RM of St. Clements.

Engagement Outreach

To ensure that public and stakeholders were informed about the Public Open House, engagement outreach included:

- emails to a broad distribution list, including: the Rural Municipalities (RMs) of St. Clements and St. Andrews, the City of Selkirk, local businesses and the public, and
- Canada Post direct mail-outs to 3,487 properties in the notification radius, covering homes, apartments, businesses, and rural properties.

Engagement Activities

At each engagement session, stakeholders and/or the general public were invited to ask questions and share feedback.

Engagement Audience	Meeting + Time	Location
RM of St. Clements	January 20, 2026 1:00pm – 2:30pm	Virtual (Teams Meeting)
City of Selkirk	January 19, 2026 9:00am – 10:00am	Virtual (Teams Meeting)

Engagement Audience	Meeting + Time	Location
Public Open House	January 28, 2026 6:00pm – 8:00pm	Selkirk Memorial Hall, 376 Jemima St, Selkirk, MB R1A 1X3, Canada

What We Heard

Public Open House

On January 28, 2026 approximately 80 people attended the Public Open House. Attendees included members of the general public, municipal staff and elected officials from the City of Selkirk, and RM of St. Clements. The Project Team hosted a drop-in style meeting, and poster boards with key project information were placed throughout the room for attendees to view at their own pace. Project Team members from MTI, WSP and AECOM were available throughout the open house to answer questions. Paper copies of a feedback form were provided for attendees to complete.

The following feedback was gathered:

- Many attendees expressed support for Option #3 (wider sidewalk and wider roadways). Several indicated they would prefer Option #3 without sidewalk widening, recommending that any additional width be allocated to the roadway instead.
- Attendees were generally supportive of removing the bridge towers and felt their heritage value could still be preserved if relocated. Suggestions included creating a digital record of rehabilitation (such as drone footage), relocating selected bridge components to the local Marine Museum, and involving local historical groups in the design process.
- Opinions on spring flooding varied. Some attendees felt occasional flooding was not a major concern due to available alternate routes, while others emphasized the need to address flooding impact particularly to ensure reliable access for emergency services.
- Three respondents emphasized the need to address flooding.
- Several noted that traffic lights should be added at the Eveline Street/Eaton Avenue/River Road intersection to reduce congestion.
- Two respondents recommended pursuing a new bridge as a long-term solution.
- One respondent suggested banning heavy trucks from using the bridge.
- One respondent raised concerns about emergency vehicle access under current conditions.

General Correspondence

Comments and recommendations related to the project were also submitted to AECOM by email and phone. Submissions were sent between January 12 - January 29, 2026. Comments included:

- Concern that rehabilitation may be a short-term solution, noting the bridge’s age, narrow width, and ongoing structural challenges. Several called for planning for a new bridge to begin immediately, arguing that costs will only increase over time. Others supported rehabilitating the current structure while simultaneously advancing long-term replacement planning.
- Recurring spring flooding on PR 204, including road closures and ice-jam impacts on the bridge. Suggestions included elevating the roadway, designing a higher-arc bridge, and incorporating flood-mitigation measures.



- One suggestion for building a new, wider bridge with improved turning radii near the downtown area, potentially off the end of McLean Avenue. Concern that the current bridge is too narrow, especially for trucks and trailers, and highlighted safety concerns including lane encroachment and congestion during peak periods.
- The need for clear communication, transparent decision-making, and identification of potential conflicts of interest early in the process.
- Clarification on project timelines, delays, and past commitments regarding replacement.

Stakeholder Meetings

City of Selkirk

On January 19, 2026 the Project Team held a virtual meeting with the City of Selkirk Director of Operations, Chief Administration Office, Director of Protective Services and Manager of Public Works. The following feedback was gathered:

- The Project Team confirmed that all three rehabilitation options would extend the existing bridge's service life by a minimum of 20 years.
- The City emphasized the need for early clarity on the eventual replacement bridge location to support long-term land and infrastructure planning. MTI noted that determining a preferred future alignment requires significant study and is outside the scope of the current rehabilitation work.
- The City and Project Team discussed the merits of removing the bridge tower (Option 3) and potential road widening gained from tower removal.
- The City noted annual flooding issues caused by ice jams and overland flow, particularly on the east side. Asked if this be considered in the current bridge design. MTI confirmed that major flood-mitigation works fall outside this project scope and would require separate investment.
- The City inquired about incorporating utilities such as a water line being installed concurrently with the bridge. MTI and WSP stated that structural and foundation capacity must be evaluated, and further study is needed.
- The Project Team shared that the rehabilitation option is selected using a weighted decision matrix which considers the technical criteria, cost, and input from consultation, among other factors.
- The City stressed the need for advance notification to emergency services prior to construction for route planning. MTI and AECOM confirmed these considerations are being integrated.
- The City also identified safety concerns related to fires and encampments under the bridge; MTI acknowledged these challenges and is incorporating risk-mitigation measures into the project planning and design considerations.

RM of St Clements

On January 20, 2026 the Project Team held a virtual meeting with RM of St. Clements staff and municipal representatives. The Project Team shared the presentation and addressed questions. The following feedback was gathered:

- The Project Team confirmed that all three rehabilitation options would extend the existing bridge's service life by a minimum of 20 years.
- The RMs noted that load limits need to be enforced through measures beyond signage, as signage alone has proved ineffective. MTI confirmed that they are considering other targeted enforcement if issues with overweight vehicles persist.
- The RM inquired about the construction impacts associated with Option 3. WSP explained that this option would require removal of the tower and lift mechanism (approximately one month), followed by installation of the replacement girder. During girder installation, a full bridge closure would be required, as the remaining structure would not be capable of safely supporting traffic during construction.
- The RM asked about maintaining the lift functionality as a heritage feature. MTI noted that the bridge lift has not been functional for at least a decade, and restoring functionality would be extremely costly. MTI and WSP acknowledged the heritage nature of the bridge and discussed preserving select elements for the museum. The team discussed how tower removal must balance safety, cost, and heritage considerations.
- The RM anticipates public concern about congestion and the failure to immediately begin planning for a new bridge. MTI and WSP emphasized that new bridge development is a long-term process, and rehabilitation is required to maintain the current crossing in the interim.

How It Was Considered

The purpose of Phase 3 engagement was to share the rehabilitation options being considered and to gather feedback on the preferred option. The table below highlights what was heard and how it was considered.

What was Heard	How it was Considered
REHABILITATION	
Strong support for Option #3 (wider sidewalk and roadway), with many preferring Option #3 without sidewalk widening to allocate all width to vehicles.	Explore deck widening for Option #3, with no changes to sidewalk width.
The bridge is too narrow, especially for trucks/trailers; desire for better turning.	Explore deck widening for Option #3, with no changes to sidewalk width. Ramp design options were outside the scope of this project.
Rehabilitation is short-term solution and desire to see progress on bridge planning for the area.	MTI assessed the bridge and found it is safe for use. Rehabilitation will extend the current bridge's service life, avoid long term service disruption, and support immediate community needs. The goal is to extend the current bridge's life to allow time for future planning and coordination.
The City and RM require early and ongoing information on bridge replacement locations for planning purposes.	For bridge rehabilitation and future bridge replacement, the Province will continue to coordinate with the City of Selkirk, Rural Municipalities and Indigenous groups, provide timely project updates, and work collaboratively to support local development goals.
HERITAGE	
General support for removing towers if heritage is preserved and towers are relocated.	Work with local authorities and stakeholders to identify relocation opportunities.
Ideas for preserving heritage include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a digital recording of the bridge rehabilitation and tower removal • museum placement of artifacts, and • engaging local heritage groups. 	Work with local authorities and local history stakeholders to identify options to honour the bridge heritage.
TRAFFIC	
Call to enforce load limits and limit the heavy vehicle usage of the bridge.	Improper use of the bridge by large vehicles such as cement trucks, heavy trucks, etc. is an enforcement issue. The Project Team is exploring options such as signage and cameras to identify oversized or overweight vehicles. These enforcement measures can protect the bridge from misuse and extend its lifespan.

What was Heard	How it was Considered
Emergency response routing concerns.	For all bridge closures during construction, emergency services will be rerouted to maintain service to the full area.
FLOODING	
Flooding is as an inconvenience and a risk to be mitigated. Respondents suggested to elevate the roadway and design a higher arc bridge that would allow for emergency access in spring, when flooding typically occurs from ice dams melting.	MTI acknowledged ongoing flooding challenge. Noted that the rehabilitation efforts are intended to restore the bridge's functionality and the restoration efforts needed to fix the flooding would be a much larger challenge. MTI is committed to investigating the feasibility of raising the road to prevent/minimize annual closures.

Next Steps

The Project Team will review and consider feedback received during Phase 3 engagement. Presentation materials will be made available online and shared electronically to attendees, as well as to local municipalities and the City. To support broader community access and participation, these materials will be translated into French.

Looking ahead to the next phase of engagement, accessibility and inclusive communication will remain a priority to ensure community members can participate meaningfully in the process.

The timeline for the project engagement process as the time of writing of this report is as follows:

- Phase 4 Engagement – Share the Final Preferred Design Alternative: Spring 2026
- Phase 5 Engagement - Share Detailed Design Progress: 2027
- Anticipated Construction Period: 2027 - 2029

Questions

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Tracey McKenna at tracey.mckenna@aecom.com.

