



# REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

---

## MOSHERVILLE ROAD BRIDGE OVER KALAMAZOO RIVER BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT



Structure #3355



### **Hillsdale County Road Commission**

1919 Hudson Road  
Hillsdale, Michigan 49242  
517-437-4458

---

# PROJECT LOCATION

FOR THE  
MOSHERVILLE ROAD OVER KALAMAZOO RIVER REPLACEMENT PROJECT  
T5S, R3W, Sections 5 & 8, Scipio Township, Hillsdale County



**Request for Proposal (RFP) for  
Design & Construction Assistance Engineering Services**

**Bridge Replacement for:**

**Mosherville Road over the south branch of the Kalamazoo River  
Structure #3355  
Federal ID No. 30324H00012B010  
T5S, R3W, Sections 5 & 8, Scipio Township, Hillsdale County**

**SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND:**

The Hillsdale County Road Commission (HCRC) is currently accepting proposals for design engineering and construction assistance services for the proposed replacement of the Mosherville Road bridge over the south branch of the Kalamazoo River. This structure has been approved for funding through the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) Local Agency Programs with the use of the Neighborhood Road Funds. The design must be in accordance with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and MDOT standards and specifications. The proposal must include all necessary work for plan and proposal acceptance by the HCRC and MDOT.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

**Mosherville Road over the south branch of the Kalamazoo River (SN 3355)** is a single-span steel multi-stringer bridge with a non-composite cast-in-place reinforced concrete deck and bituminous wearing surface. The structure was built in 1947 and is located 0.1 miles east of Borden Road. The current span is 29.9 feet. Funding was assuming a structure 50 feet long x 36 feet wide. The structure is open to traffic, but load posted. The proposed work for this structure includes full replacement. The selected consultant will be responsible for completing all design tasks and construction assistance tasks as outlined in this RFP. This structure has been approved for \$2,245,000 in funding through the MDOT Local Bridge Program with the use of Neighborhood Road Funds for fiscal year 2028 construction.

**Scope of Services**

Provide a proposal for design engineering, construction assistance, and related services. The final proposal and plans must be completed and approved by the HCRC and MDOT for a **November 2027 bid letting**. The scope of work included within the preliminary engineering proposal shall include, at the minimum, the following:

**Topographic & Hydraulic Survey**

Topographic and hydraulic survey as needed to support the bridge design services. This work may include, but is not limited to, structure survey, road alignment, property lines of adjacent riparian owners, river and flood plain cross sections necessary to develop hydraulics for ELGE permit, topography, permits, etc. Any survey work completed shall utilize Northing and Easting coordinates in NAD83 Michigan State Plane South – International Feet. NAVD88 elevations shall be used.

**Geotechnical Subsurface Investigation**

Soil borings for substructure investigation and capacity analysis will be the full responsibility of the consultant, including necessary traffic control, and shall be included in the proposal. Soil borings shall be included on the plans and include any gradation test results, shear tests, etc. Soil borings shall be made for

each substructure location. The consultant will provide the log of boring details and a geotechnical report, with foundation recommendations to the HCRC.

For the purposes of this proposal, the consultant should assume a total of 2 borings at a depth of no more than 60 feet each. If necessary, the cost associated with additional depth of borings beyond 60 feet will be paid for at a \$/foot unit price after approval by the HCRC. The consultant should include this additional \$/foot cost in the proposal for information only.

### **Utility Investigation**

The consultant shall identify utility conflicts and coordinate with and inform all utilities of the proposed work that may impact existing facilities. Copies of the preliminary design shall be sent to the various utilities found within the project limits for their review of utility location and for their comments on the need for any utility relocation. The consultant shall conduct a meeting with all affected utilities, if requested, to coordinate any required relocations.

### **USACE/EGLE Joint Permit**

The consultant shall be responsible for completing the USACE/EGLE Joint Permit application, along with supporting sketches and other documentation as required by USACE/EGLE for this project. If a permit is required, the consultant will submit the permit application via the EGLE MiWaters database on behalf of the HCRC.

### **SHPO Clearance**

The consultant is responsible for completing the SHPO review and determination of impact to historic properties based on the proposed scope of work. The consultant is required to follow the MDOT LAP new Section 106 review process.

### **NEPA Clearance**

All work associated with NEPA requirements and guidelines including potential public involvement and threatened and endangered species review, must also be considered in the proposal. Lickley Road has been identified as an area of concern for threatened and endangered mussels per [Threatened Endangered Mussels Locations Delta thru Hillsdale.pdf](#). The costs associated with completion of a mussel survey and relocation/monitoring of mussels must be included in the consultant's costs associated with this proposal.

Submittal to MDOT, including the Local Agency Environmental Clearance form 5323, must be completed in a timely manner to avoid delays in the project schedule.

### **Asbestos Investigation**

The consultant is responsible for investigating and identifying asbestos material in the existing bridge deck. If asbestos is present, information must be included in the bid documents for the contractor's information and mitigation measures will be required during construction.

### **Right-of-Way Submission**

No right-of-way plans or easements are anticipated for this proposal. The proposed structure should be designed to avoid the need for permanent right-of-way acquisition if at all possible. If additional right-of-way plans or easements are required, they will be generated through a mutually agreeable extra, based on time and materials.

### **MDOT Programming Application**

The consultant shall assist with completion of all technical sections of the MDOT Programming Application. The HCRC will complete all other portions of the application and submit to MDOT when complete.

### **Hydraulic & Scour Analysis**

The consultant is responsible for completing the hydraulic analysis as required by EGLE for permitting. In addition to the hydraulic analysis, complete a Level 1 and Level 2 scour analysis. Any scour analysis results are to be submitted to the HCRC for inclusion in their bridge files.

### **Bridge and Roadway Design**

Complete all plans, specifications, and cost estimates as required for each submittal to MDOT. All work shall be completed in accordance with MDOT Local Agency Programs requirements and the 2020 edition of the Michigan Standard Specifications for Construction.

The design must be in accordance with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) guidelines, MDOT standards and specifications for structure replacement projects, and HCRC guidelines. The structure design must meet HL-93 Modified live loading requirements, MEGLE permitting requirements, and clear roadway width configuration (lane and shoulder widths) as required by AASHTO, MDOT, and the HCRC.

### **Type, Size, and Location**

Prepare and submit type, size and location (TS&L) plans using the most current MDOT TS&L requirements, specifications, and an estimate of probable construction costs to the HCRC and MDOT for review, comment, and approval.

### **Preliminary Design**

Prepare Preliminary Plans including engineer's opinion of cost, special provisions, and additional information as required to meet MDOT and HCRC standards. All comments received at the TS&L stage are to be incorporated into the preliminary plans. Submit to the HCRC and MDOT for approval.

A preliminary project cost estimate shall be prepared using current unit price estimates from MDOT. This estimate shall be submitted with the preliminary plans.

### **Grade Inspection Meeting (G.I.)**

The consultant shall attend a meeting with the HCRC, Utility Companies, & MDOT to review the preliminary plans.

### **Final Design**

After all the preliminary design comments have been received from the HCRC, the various utilities, and all other pertinent agencies, final plans shall be developed incorporating all of the comments into the plans. In the event that any of the comments conflict the final decision on the comments shall be determined by HCRC. The final plans shall meet all MDOT requirements. The final submittal shall include the completed plans, details, special provisions, supplemental specifications, and a final cost estimate.

### **Final Review Submittal**

After the final plan submittal has been reviewed by the HCRC, any comments shall be added to the plans and specifications. The final plans, specifications, special provisions, and estimate of costs shall be submitted to MDOT.

### **Structure Load Rating**

Provide preliminary AND final load rating calculations and documentation in accordance with current MDOT, FHWA, and AASHTO practices, guidelines, policies, and standards. Load ratings must be completed for all Michigan legal and overload vehicles, use the appropriate load rating analysis method (LFD or LRFD) based on date of construction, and meet all current MDOT and FHWA requirements.

The load rating is to be performed using the current version of the AASHTO Bridge Rating software (AASHTOWare\_BrR). The MDOT Assumption and Summary forms must be completed and all documentation necessary to meet the requirements of MDOT Bridge Advisory, BA-2019-03, will be uploaded to the MDOT MiBridge database by the responsible load rating engineer.

Electronic and/or hard copies of all load rating files and documentation are to be made available to the HCRC upon request for their bridge files.

### **Construction Assistance**

Full construction engineering services will not be required for this project. Only the following construction assistance services will be required:

- Assist with questions during bidding.
- Attend the Pre-Construction meeting to address questions or concerns.
- Review and approve any shop drawings.

### **Schedule**

The selected consultant will be responsible for completing all work described in this RFP in accordance with the MDOT Local Agency Planning Guide in order to submit an approved bid set to MDOT for bidding in the MDOT bid letting for November 2027.

### **Available Information**

The HCRC will provide all existing structure information to the selected consultant, including existing plans, the most current Bridge Safety Inspection Report (BSIR), Structure Inspection & Appraisal form (SI&A), and any existing load rating information, if available.

**PROPOSAL:**

Please provide the following information in your proposal:

- 1) Understanding of Service
- 2) Proposed design schedule, including milestone submittals, to meet the desired MDOT bid letting date.
- 3) Consultant Fee for design engineering and construction assistance work in the following format:

**Mosherville Road over the south branch of the Kalamazoo River**

Not to Exceed Cost for Design Engineering & Construction Assistance \$ \_\_\_\_\_

SHPO \$ \_\_\_\_\_

NEPA \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Mussel Survey \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Mussel Relocation & Monitoring, if necessary \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**Total Fee, not to exceed cost of services:** \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Cost per foot for additional soil boring depth (for information only) \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**Proposal Submittal:**

This proposal is due on **Thursday, April 2, 2026 at 3:00 p.m.** The proposal can be delivered to the Hillsdale County Road Commission at 1919 Hudson Road, Hillsdale, MI 49242 or emailed to me at [bobg@hillsdalecrc.org](mailto:bobg@hillsdalecrc.org). If you have any questions please feel free to contact me (517) 437-4458

The Hillsdale County Road Commission reserves the right to accept or reject any or all quotes or any part of same, to waive irregularities and/or informalities and to award in part or entirety as may appear in the best interest of Hillsdale County Road Commission.

Robert Griffis,  
Manager  
Hillsdale County Road Commission

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

STR 3355		BRIDGE SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT		
<b>Facility</b>	<b>Latitude / Longitude</b>	<b>MDOT Structure ID</b>	<b>Structure Condition</b>	
MOSHERVILLE ROAD	42.0582 / -84.6791	30324H00012B010	Serious Condition(3)	
<b>Feature</b>	<b>Length / Width / Spans</b>	<b>Owner</b>		
S BR KALAMAZOO RIVER	29.9 / 34.8 / 1	County: Hillsdale(30)		
<b>Location</b>	<b>Built / Recon. / Paint / Ovly.</b>	<b>TSC</b>	<b>Operational Status</b>	
0.1 MI E OF BORDEN ROAD	1947 / / 1947 /	Jackson(15)	P Posted for load(12NNNN)	
<b>Region / County</b>	<b>Material / Design</b>	<b>Last NBI Inspection</b>	<b>Scour Evaluation</b>	
University(6) / Hillsdale(30)	3 Steel / 02 Multi Str Non Comp	11/05/2025 / 2CW8	3 SC - Unstable	

**NBI INSPECTION** **2CW8**

Inspector Name	Agency / Company Name	Insp. Freq.	Insp. Date
Ryan Worden	Scott Civil Engineering	12	11/05/2025

**GENERAL NOTES**

Watch deck spalling, also section loss on beams 1S and 6S. Posted at 12 tons. Cross sections taken in 2022. Take cross-section at next inspection.

<b>Weight limit signs in place on both ends of bridge</b>	YES
<b>Weight limit shown on signs at bridge</b>	12nnnn
<b>Required advance warning weight limit signs in place</b>	YES
<b>Weight limit shown on advance warning signs</b>	12nnnn

**DECK**

	11/23	11/24	11/25	
<b>1. Surface (SIA-58A)</b>	6	6	6	Chip seal surface in lanes, some flushing in wheel paths. Gravel and vegetation on shoulders. (11/25) Newer chip seal surface in lanes. Gravel and vegetation on shoulders. (11/24) New chip seal surface in lanes. HMA overlay extended onto bridge at each end. Gravel and vegetation on shoulders. (11/23)
<b>2. Expansion Joints</b>	N	N	N	(11/25) (11/24) (11/23)
<b>3. Other Joints</b>	N	N	N	(11/25) (11/24) (11/23)
<b>4. Railings</b>	4	4	4	Steel panels and posts are rusting. Concrete end posts have been patched, patch material is full of cracks, spalling at top of SW & SE posts, NW & NE posts are crumbling with exposed rebar. South brush block fascia has cracking along length, fascia crumbling with exposed rebar. North brush block spalled at west end and midspan. (11/25) Steel panels and posts are rusting. Concrete end posts have been patched, patch material is full of cracks, spalling at top of SW & SE posts, NW & NE posts are crumbling with exposed rebar. South brush block fascia has cracking along length, fascia crumbling with exposed rebar. North brush block spalled at west end and midspan. (11/24) Steel panels and posts are rusting. Concrete end posts have been patched, patch material is full of cracks, spalling at top of SW & SE posts, NW & NE posts are crumbling with exposed rebar. South brush block fascia has cracking along length, fascia crumbling with exposed rebar; west 3ft of north brush block spalled. (11/23)
<b>5. Sidewalks or Curbs</b>	N	N	N	(11/25) (11/24) (11/23)

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

STR 3355		BRIDGE SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT		
<b>Facility</b>	<b>Latitude / Longitude</b>	<b>MDOT Structure ID</b>	<b>Structure Condition</b>	
MOSHERVILLE ROAD	42.0582 / -84.6791	30324H00012B010	Serious Condition(3)	
<b>Feature</b>	<b>Length / Width / Spans</b>	<b>Owner</b>		
S BR KALAMAZOO RIVER	29.9 / 34.8 / 1	County: Hillsdale(30)		
<b>Location</b>	<b>Built / Recon. / Paint / Ovly.</b>	<b>TSC</b>	<b>Operational Status</b>	
0.1 MI E OF BORDEN ROAD	1947 / / 1947 /	Jackson(15)	P Posted for load(12NNNN)	
<b>Region / County</b>	<b>Material / Design</b>	<b>Last NBI Inspection</b>	<b>Scour Evaluation</b>	
University(6) / Hillsdale(30)	3 Steel / 02 Multi Str Non Comp	11/05/2025 / 2CW8	3 SC - Unstable	

**6. Deck Bottom Surface (SIA-58B)**

4	4	4	<p>GENERAL: Hairline transverse cracks in all bays, spot delam along cracks. Some of the cracks are leaking with efflorescence. Up to 10% spalled/delaminated overall.</p> <p>BAY 1S: 2 sft spall with delam and exposed steel with section loss at deck drain; spall with exposed rebar at E end &lt;1'x1'.</p> <p>BAY 3S: Multiple delaminated areas at midspan and W abut (1ft). 12 sft delam east of midspan (3' by width of bay). Est 25%-30% of bottom delaminated in bay 3S.</p> <p>BAY 4S: 3" deep spall east of midspan, 12 sft (3' by width of bay), exposed rebar has section loss and lapped transverse bar ends are loose, adjacent to centerline construction joints. 1.5'x1' spall at east end, exposed steel with section loss, adjacent delam.</p> <p>BAY 7S(1N): Spall with exposed steel near deck drain (4 sft), additional delam around deck drain. 1 sft delam at east end. (11/25)</p> <p>GENERAL: Hairline transverse cracks in all bays, spot delam along cracks. Some of the cracks are leaking with efflorescence. Up to 10% spalled/delaminated overall.</p> <p>BAY 1S: 2 sft spall with delam and exposed steel with section loss at deck drain; spall with exposed rebar at E end &lt;1'x1'.</p> <p>BAY 3S: Multiple delaminated areas at midspan and W abut (1ft). 12 sft delam east of midspan (3' by width of bay). Est 25%-30% of bottom delaminated in bay 3S.</p> <p>BAY 4S: 3" deep spall east of midspan, 12 sft (3' by width of bay), exposed rebar has section loss and lapped transverse bar ends are loose, adjacent to centerline construction joints. 1.5'x1' spall at east end, exposed steel with section loss, adjacent delam.</p> <p>BAY 7S(1N): Spall with exposed steel near deck drain (4 sft), additional delam around deck drain. 1 sft delam at east end. (11/24)</p> <p>GENERAL: Hairline transverse cracks in all bays, spot delam along cracks. Some of the cracks are leaking with efflorescence. Up to 10% spalled/delaminated overall.</p> <p>BAY 1S: 2 sft spall with delam and exposed steel with section loss at deck drain; spall with exposed rebar at E end &lt;1'x1'.</p> <p>BAY 3S: Multiple delaminated areas at midspan and W abut (1ft). 12 sft delam east of midspan (3' by width of bay). Est 25%-30% of bottom delaminated in bay 3S.</p> <p>BAY 4S: 3" deep spall east of midspan, 12 sft (3' by width of bay), exposed rebar has section loss and lapped transverse bar ends are loose, adjacent to centerline construction joints. 1.5'x1' spall at end, exposed steel with section loss, adjacent delam.</p> <p>BAY 7S(1N): Spall with exposed steel near deck drain (4 sft), additional delam around deck drain. 1 sft delam at east end. (11/23)</p>
---	---	---	--

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

STR 3355		BRIDGE SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT		
<b>Facility</b>	<b>Latitude / Longitude</b>	<b>MDOT Structure ID</b>	<b>Structure Condition</b>	
MOSHERVILLE ROAD	42.0582 / -84.6791	30324H00012B010	Serious Condition(3)	
<b>Feature</b>	<b>Length / Width / Spans</b>	<b>Owner</b>		
S BR KALAMAZOO RIVER	29.9 / 34.8 / 1	County: Hillsdale(30)		
<b>Location</b>	<b>Built / Recon. / Paint / Ovly.</b>	<b>TSC</b>	<b>Operational Status</b>	
0.1 MI E OF BORDEN ROAD	1947 / / 1947 /	Jackson(15)	P Posted for load(12NNNN)	
<b>Region / County</b>	<b>Material / Design</b>	<b>Last NBI Inspection</b>	<b>Scour Evaluation</b>	
University(6) / Hillsdale(30)	3 Steel / 02 Multi Str Non Comp	11/05/2025 / 2CW8	3 SC - Unstable	

<b>7. Deck (SIA-58)</b>	4	4	4	<p>Bottom has hairline transverse cracks in all bays, some of the cracks are leaking with efflorescence. Spalled and delaminated concrete in several bays, some with exposed rebar, up to 10% spalled/delaminated overall.</p> <p>South deck fascia spalled over 50% of length, cracked and delaminated along remainder. Up to 3/8" gap between outside top flange of beam 1S and bottom of deck at midspan. North deck fascia spalled almost entire length with some exposed rebar. (11/25) Bottom has hairline transverse cracks in all bays, some of the cracks are leaking with efflorescence. Spalled and delaminated concrete in several bays, some with exposed rebar, up to 10% spalled/delaminated overall.</p> <p>South deck fascia spalled over 50% of length, cracked and delaminated along remainder. Up to 3/8" gap between outside top flange of beam 1S and bottom of deck at midspan. North deck fascia spalled almost entire length with some exposed rebar. (11/24) Bottom has hairline transverse cracks in all bays, some of the cracks are leaking with efflorescence. Spalled and delaminated concrete in several bays, some with exposed rebar, up to 10% spalled/delaminated overall.</p> <p>South deck fascia spalled over 50% of length, cracked and delaminated along remainder. North deck fascia spalled almost entire length with some exposed rebar. (11/23)</p>
<b>8. Drainage</b>				<p>North deck drain open, south plugged. (11/25) North deck drain open, south plugged. (11/24) North deck drain open, south plugged. (11/23)</p>

**SUPERSTRUCTURE**

	11/23	11/24	11/25	
<b>9. Stringer (SIA-59)</b>	3	3	3	<p>South fascia beam has rust with scale along length of top flange and top of web. Measured 0.325" (measured 0.41" in 2025) outside top flange near midspan, inside similar. Measured 0.625" outside bottom flange, 0.595" inside bottom flange.</p> <p>Beam 6S has rust scale with section loss along flanges and bottom of web, worst at midspan leaking deck cracks - measured in 2025(24)(23)(22): 0.48"(0.485") (0.51")(0.51") south side of bottom flange and (0.375") (0.43")(0.42") north side of bottom flange, estimate similar section loss to top flange (original flange thickness 0.686").</p> <p>Remaining beams have light rust/paint freckling along length with scale at beam ends and along top flange in spots. Inside of north fascia at midspan has heavy rust scale next to deck bottom spall. Rust scale along top flange of north fascia beam. (11/25) South fascia beam has rust with scale along length of top flange and top of web. Measured 0.325" outside top flange near midspan, inside similar. Measured 0.625" outside bottom flange, 0.595" inside bottom flange.</p> <p>Beam 6S has rust scale with section loss along flanges and bottom of web, worst at midspan leaking deck cracks - measured in 2024 (2023)(2022): 0.485" (0.51")(0.51") south side of bottom flange and 0.375" (0.43")(0.42") north side of bottom flange, estimate similar section loss to top flange (original flange thickness 0.686").</p> <p>Remaining beams have light rust/paint freckling along length with scale at beam ends and along top flange in spots. Inside of north fascia at midspan has heavy rust scale next to deck bottom spall. Rust scale along top flange of north fascia beam. (11/24) South fascia beam has rust with scale along length of top flange and top of web. Beam 6S has rust scale with section loss along flanges and bottom of web, worst at midspan leaking deck cracks - measured 2023(2022): 0.51" (0.51") south side of bottom flange and 0.43"(0.42") north side of bottom flange, estimate similar section loss to top flange (original flange thickness 0.686"). Remaining beams have light rust/paint freckling along length with scale at beam ends. Inside of north fascia at midspan has heavy rust scale next to deck bottom spall. Rust scale along top flange of north fascia beam. (11/23)</p>
<b>10. Paint (SIA-59A)</b>	3	3	3	<p>Estimate 25% of paint failed. (11/25) Estimate 25% of paint failed. (11/24) Estimate 25% of paint failed. (11/23)</p>

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

STR 3355		BRIDGE SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT		
<b>Facility</b>	<b>Latitude / Longitude</b>	<b>MDOT Structure ID</b>	<b>Structure Condition</b>	
MOSHERVILLE ROAD	42.0582 / -84.6791	30324H00012B010	Serious Condition(3)	
<b>Feature</b>	<b>Length / Width / Spans</b>	<b>Owner</b>		
S BR KALAMAZOO RIVER	29.9 / 34.8 / 1	County: Hillsdale(30)		
<b>Location</b>	<b>Built / Recon. / Paint / Ovly.</b>	<b>TSC</b>	<b>Operational Status</b>	
0.1 MI E OF BORDEN ROAD	1947 / / 1947 /	Jackson(15)	P Posted for load(12NNNN)	
<b>Region / County</b>	<b>Material / Design</b>	<b>Last NBI Inspection</b>	<b>Scour Evaluation</b>	
University(6) / Hillsdale(30)	3 Steel / 02 Multi Str Non Comp	11/05/2025 / 2CW8	3 SC - Unstable	

<b>11. Section Loss</b>	1	1	1	Section loss at west end of beam 1S and beam 6S flanges as noted above. (11/25) Section loss at west end of beam 1S. (11/24) Section loss at west end of beam 1S. (11/23)
<b>12. Bearings</b>	4	4	4	Moderate to heavy scale on fascia bearings and a few interior bearings. Other bearings have some rust with minor scale. (11/25) Moderate to heavy scale on fascia bearings and a few interior bearings. Other bearings have some rust with minor scale. (11/24) Moderate to heavy scale on fascia bearings and a few interior bearings. Other bearings have some rust with minor scale. (11/23)

**SUBSTRUCTURE**

	11/23	11/24	11/25	
<b>13. Abutments (SIA-60)</b>	6	6	6	Few hairline vertical cracks in each abutment. All slopewalls are cracked; SE, NE, NW are spalling with exposed rebar. (11/25) Few hairline vertical cracks in each abutment. All slopewalls are cracked; SE, NE, NW are spalling with exposed rebar. (11/24) Few hairline vertical cracks in each abutment. All slopewalls are cracked; SE, NE, NW are spalling with exposed rebar. (11/23)
<b>14. Piers (SIA-60)</b>	N	N	N	(11/25) (11/24) (11/23)
<b>15. Slope Protection</b>	N	N	N	(11/25) (11/24) (11/23)
<b>16. Channel (SIA-61)</b>	6	6	6	Flow S-N. Sand and gravel bottom, silt along west abutment. Channel is wider than bridge opening. Brush-covered banks upstream and downstream. (11/25) Flow S-N. Sand and gravel bottom, silt along west abutment. Channel is wider than bridge opening. Brush-covered banks upstream and downstream. (11/24) Flow S-N. Sand and gravel bottom, silt along west abutment. Channel is wider than bridge opening. Brush-covered banks upstream and downstream. (11/23)
<b>17. Scour Inspection</b>	6	6	6	Top of east footing is 1' to 1.25' below stream bottom entire length. Top of west footing is 2.25' to 2.75' below stream bottom. Both remain covered. (11/25) Top of east footing is 1' to 1.25' below stream bottom entire length. Top of west footing is 2.25' to 2.75' below stream bottom. Both remain covered. (11/24) Top of east footing is 1' to 1.25' below stream bottom entire length. Top of west footing is 2.25' to 2.75' below stream bottom. Both remain covered. (11/23)

**APPROACH**

	11/23	11/24	11/25	
<b>18. Approach Pavement</b>	8	8	6	Chip seal on HMA approaches with flushing in wheel paths, crack at each reference line. Transverse cracks away from bridge. (11/25) Newer chip seal on HMA approaches, crack starting at east reference line. (11/24) New chip seal on HMA on approaches. (11/23)
<b>19. Approach Shoulders Sidewalks</b>	6	N	6	Grass-covered shoulders. (11/25) Grass shoulders. (11/24) Grass shoulders. (11/23)
<b>20. Approach Slopes</b>				Vegetated and stable. No approach guardrail. (11/25) Vegetated and stable. No approach guardrail. (11/24) Vegetated and stable. No approach guardrail. (11/23)

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

**STR 3355 BRIDGE SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT**

<b>Facility</b>	<b>Latitude / Longitude</b>	<b>MDOT Structure ID</b>	<b>Structure Condition</b>	
MOSHERVILLE ROAD	42.0582 / -84.6791	30324H00012B010	Serious Condition(3)	
<b>Feature</b>	<b>Length / Width / Spans</b>	<b>Owner</b>		
S BR KALAMAZOO RIVER	29.9 / 34.8 / 1	County: Hillsdale(30)		
<b>Location</b>	<b>Built / Recon. / Paint / Ovly.</b>	<b>TSC</b>	<b>Operational Status</b>	
0.1 MI E OF BORDEN ROAD	1947 / / 1947 /	Jackson(15)	P Posted for load(12NNNN)	
<b>Region / County</b>	<b>Material / Design</b>	<b>Last NBI Inspection</b>	<b>Scour Evaluation</b>	
University(6) / Hillsdale(30)	3 Steel / 02 Multi Str Non Comp	11/05/2025 / 2CW8	3 SC - Unstable	

- 21. Utilities** Overhead lines, phone north side, electric south side (11/25)  
 Previously noted pipe under bridge along bottom of channel. Overhead lines each side. (11/24)  
 Previously noted pipe under bridge along bottom of channel. Overhead lines each side. (11/23)
- 22. Drainage Culverts** None noted. (11/25)  
 None noted. (11/24)  
 None noted. (11/23)

**MISCELLANEOUS**

<b>Guard Rail</b>		<b>Other Items</b>	
<u>Item</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Rating</u>
36A. Bridge Railings	0	71. Water Adequacy	8
36B. Transitions	0	72. Approach Alignment	7
36C. Approach Guardrail	0	Temporary Support	0 No Temporary Supports
36D. Approach Guardrail Ends	0	High Load Hit (M)	No
		Special Insp. Equipment	2
		Underwater Insp. Method	1

**False Decking (Timber) Removed to Complete Inspection** N/A - No False Decking

**Critical Feature Inspections (SIA-92)**

	<u>Freq</u>	<u>Date</u>
92A. Fracture Critical		
92B. Underwater		
92C. Other Special		
92D. Fatigue Sensitive		