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Why Incorporate RFAs in MiBRIDGE?

• Safety!
  – Issues That Must Be Addressed Prior To The Next Inspection
• Efficiency
  – Prioritizing Resources
  – Improve Document Organization
• Availability
  – Accessible From Nearly Anywhere
  – FHWA
• Compliance
  – Critical Findings
  – Load Rating
  – Monitoring
Previous Methods for Tracking RFAs

- Multiple Excel Spreadsheets
  - Organized By Each Region
  - Organized By Request Type
  - Organized By Year
- Variable Information Based on Author
- Corrupted Hyperlinks
Previous Methods for Tracking RFAs

- SOM Connection
- Export/Import Time
- Not Suitable for All Agencies
RFA Committee

- Established by Matt Chynoweth and Dave Juntunen
- Region Bridge, Bridge Development, and Bridge Field Services Staff
- Responsible for Reviewing, Prioritizing, Initiating Action, Monitoring, and/or Ensuring Resolution
RFA Committee

- **Priority Level 1, Emergency** - to be completed as soon as possible, either by the Statewide Bridge Repair Crew or emergency contract. Priority Level 1 often involves a critical finding requiring partial or full bridge closure and reporting to FHWA.

- **Priority Level 2, Critical** - to be completed within 90 days, either by Statewide Bridge Crew or contract.

- **Priority Level 3, Primary** – to be completed within 12 months

- **Priority Level 4, Non-Critical** - the Bridge RFA committee determines the distress is non-critical and repairs should be programmed through the normal Call for Projects process, or repairs made by routine maintenance.
MDOT Bridge RFA Coordination Committee
2/02/2016

Purpose
The MDOT Bridge Request for Action (RFA) Coordination Committee is intended to be a sub-committee of the MDOT Statewide Bridge Alignment Team, and will manage and report on RFA matters to the MDOT Statewide Bridge Alignment Team as a standing agenda item each month.

The MDOT RFA Coordination Committee is responsible for reviewing, prioritizing, initiating action, monitoring, and ensuring resolution and/or following up all on bridge RFA’s statewide for MDOT owned structures. The committee will also set goals and timelines and identify resources for addressing RFA’s based on the Priority Levels listed below, which may involve recommendations for partial or full bridge closure, emergency repairs, or contracting of work depending on current Bridge Repair Crew backlog and situational urgency.

Regions submit RFA’s based on what is found during various inspections such as routine, damaged, special, fracture critical or detailed inspections. RFAs have varying degrees of urgency requiring ongoing prioritization and monitoring of implementation. The Region where the RFA originates from will determine the initial priority level. The goal of this committee is to manage the active RFA’s, review the priority level set, and work towards addressing the RFA within the timeframes prescribed based on their priority level.

The MDOT RFA Coordination Committee will assess and prioritize on matters such as:
Priority Level 1 Examples

Examples of Priority Level 1 items are as follows:

- Severe section loss, holes, or buckling in webs or flanges of curved steel girders
- Severe section loss, holes, or buckling in web or flanges of fracture critical bridges
- Severe section loss, holes, or buckling in webs or flanges on 50% or more of the beams, or H-bearings of redundant bridges
- Severe section loss, holes, or buckling in webs or flanges on multiple adjacent beams or H-bearings of redundant and non-redundant bridges
- Structural crack(s) in primary load carrying members of redundant and non-redundant bridges
Priority Level 2 Examples

Examples of Priority Level 2 items are as follows:

- Severe section loss, or holes in webs and flanges of moderately skewed steel girders
- Severe section loss or buckling of single or non-adjacent beams of redundant bridges
- Structural cracks in welded connections that could propagate into primary members
- Severe section loss or cracks in H-bearing assemblies
- Required structural strengthening resulting from unsatisfactory load carrying capacity evaluation
- Fracture, crack, or concrete spalling under bearings at piers, no position dowels exposed
- Fracture, crack, or concrete spalling under bearings past position dowels on abutments with dependent backwalls
Priority Level 3 Examples

- Cracks in Diaphragm Connections that are not active
- Evidence of scour holes, footing undermining, or significant damage to required scour countermeasures
- Fracture, crack, or concrete spalling under bearings at abutments, no position dowels exposed
- Required cross frame or diaphragm additions from unsatisfactory load carrying capacity evaluation (Structure exhibits no signs of distress, continue to monitor until repairs are made)
- Missing bolts or damage to cross frames and diaphragms
- Bearing stiffener section loss in excess of 50%
- Beam End with active corrosion and 10% section loss
Typical Meeting Process

- Review RFAs Submitted Since Previous Meeting
- Updates On Critical Items/Emergency Contracts
- Work Completed During Previous Month
## Typical Meeting Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Bridge ID</th>
<th>Str. No.</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Request Date</th>
<th>Request By</th>
<th>Work Requested</th>
<th>Priority Level</th>
<th>Committee Review</th>
<th>Anticipated Date of Reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44062-B03</td>
<td>3519</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>US-223 over Raisin River</td>
<td>7/7/2014</td>
<td>L. Ramirez</td>
<td>Large delaminated and cracked area under north abutment at east abutment. West abutment separating from wingwall under south fascia beam. Beam end repairs due to section loss may be necessary.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/19/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>806-25132</td>
<td>2652</td>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td>1-475 over Attenioso Road</td>
<td>10/22/2014</td>
<td>A. Rychalski</td>
<td>Spall undermining area one at north abutment under beams 1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 12, 14, 15, 18 from west. Detailed inspection to determine if temporary supports are needed here. Also beams 7 &amp; 8 on span 1 and 2 (at south pier) should be evaluated for temporary supports. (Adam Rychalski 11/14/2014) Performed an on-site inspection detailed inspection with Christopher Idsoy on 1/7/2015 and inspected the problems/concerns listed above. For beams 7 &amp; 8W on Pier 15, determined that Bay Region now will monitor the beam ends by setting up an other inspection until scheduled construction in 2016 is completed. For concerns at Atteniesen 15, it was determined temporary supports will need to be installed.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2/19/2015</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>842-25132</td>
<td>2690</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>1-475 over Left Turn Lane No. 3</td>
<td>1/7/2015</td>
<td>B. Katenhus</td>
<td>North fascia beam in span 1 and 7 have cracks in the web at the larger cross bracing connection. Other cracks located at</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/28/2015</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Review Comments:**
- Transport area for section loss, structure cracking, and delaminated underneath fascia beam. Load testing required prior to further action (10/6/2014). Schedule special inspection in April to examine substructure. Special structures to propose contract during 2015. Load Rating Unit will continue analysis. Recommending 10 locations and 6 bearing stiffer locations. Need to verify amount of loss at midspan, but area is inaccessible. Review during next meeting (1/28/2015). Structure Technical Section to extract coupons soon, and testing will be performed in April. The Load Rating Unit will submit a repair memorandum now with possible additional repairs required contingent on test results. Perform special...
October 2014 MiBRIDGE Release

- Developing Data Entry Screen
  - Form 1887
  - Mockup
  - Implementation
Documentation and Files

- Emails To Multiple Individuals
  - Costs of Storing Data
  - RFA Information Is Not Always Stored In The Bridge File
  - “Readily Available?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of 2014 Inspections</th>
<th>Capacity Required for Each Bridge (MB)</th>
<th>Server Capacity Required for JPEG Files (MB)</th>
<th>Server Capacity Required for JPEG Files (GB)</th>
<th>Server Capacity Required for PDF Files (MB)</th>
<th>Server Capacity Required for PDF Files (GB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge File</td>
<td>3042</td>
<td>61.84</td>
<td>188,117</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3,894</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Distribution</td>
<td>Assumes 5% of Structures Require Distribution to 7 Personnel</td>
<td>65,841</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>253,958</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Request For Action Reports

- When Should An RFA Be Created?

### Table 5.13.13 RFA Examples for Superstructures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request for Action</th>
<th>Beam/Girder Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth Inspection Required</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element Quantities in Condition State 4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% or Greater Section Loss or Buckling</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% or Greater Reduced Bearing Surface</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposed Prestressing Reinforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam End Contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Section Loss on Temporarily Fixed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Cracking in Primary Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cracking in Welded Connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Strengthening or Reducing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resulting from Load Rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed Damage Meeting Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instable Bridge Sign Connection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.05.07 RFA Examples for Common Bridge Deck Wearing Surfaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request for Action</th>
<th>Concrete</th>
<th>Thin Overlay</th>
<th>Hot Mix Asphalt</th>
<th>Timber</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-Depth Inspection</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cracking Caused by Reduced Superstructure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification of Acceptable Skid Resistance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Deterioration resulting in unsafe ride</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.10.05 Deck Bottom Surface Defects Initiating a Request for Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request for Action</th>
<th>Concrete</th>
<th>Steel</th>
<th>Timber</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-Depth Inspection</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delamination/Spalling Above Vehicular or Pedestrian Routes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Cracking</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Loss Compromising Strength</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 2014 Release - RFA Report Folder

- Request for Action Report Folder
- Multiple Reports for Each Bridge
- Routine Inspection Must Be Assigned
October 2014 Release - Immediate Action Section

- Immediate Action Section for Documenting Critical Findings
- Requested By Requires User Name
- Completed By Variable Text Field

The Immediate Action section is used to document "Critical Findings"
October 2014 Release - Immediate Action Section

- Immediate Action Section Comments Field To Provide Additional Details
- Completed Date to note when the Critical finding occurred
- Date Traffic Restored/Signs Installed to Document Opening
Intermediate Action Section

- Intermediate Action Section Allows Multiple Requests To Be Added for Several Types
- Text Suggestions for Contact/User
- Reviewed Date, Priority Level, and Completed Date
Intermediate Action Section

- Comments area for Describing Work, Schedule, Etc.
- Cost and Location Information can be entered as well.
- Living Document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERMEDIATE ACTION REQUESTED (Add)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Image of Intermediate Action Section form]

2016 MBC Workshop
Final Action Section

- Final Action Completed Provides Confirmation That Immediate or Intermediate Needs Have Been Met
- RFA Complete Check Box Closes RFA and Archives Information
- Restricted to Bridge Owners
RFA Committee Section

- Committee Review Date
- Estimated Repair Date
- Comments Field For Information and Additional Reviews
Supporting Documents

- PDF Documents Supported
- Descriptions May Be Edited Until RFA Is Complete
- Files May Be Accessed After RFA Is Closed
- Viewed On Separate Browser Tab
Supporting Images

- Photo Descriptions May Be Edited Until the RFA Is Completed
- Displayed In Two Columns
- Future Improvements Will Be Made For All Reports
Supporting Images

- Limit Photo File Size Without Eliminating Necessary Details
- All Photos and Documents are Stored in the Projectwise Database.
# 2016 MBC Workshop

## PDF Output of the Report

### MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STR 10885</th>
<th>REQUEST FOR ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>US-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI RD</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>AT LIVINGSTON CO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region / County</td>
<td>University(6) / Washtenaw(81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>US-23</th>
<th>MI RD</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>AT LIVINGSTON CO.</th>
<th>Region / County</th>
<th>University(6) / Washtenaw(81)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### REQUEST FOR ACTION

Submitted By
Lindsay Renner

Agency / Company Name
MDOT University Region

Problems/Comments
- NB truck carrying man-lift impacted Span 3W. Point of impact was roughly 23' from east end of bridge. Damaged impact caused a 24x14x30' concrete shed to collapse. Diameters in bays north of beams along western diamagim in Span 3W. Diamagim in avitwin impact with traffic. (Lindsey Renner 03/10/2016)

### IMMEDIATE ACTION

Recommended Action
Close bridge

Requested By
Marilyn Hansen

Completed By
Doug Lyon

Comments
US-23 NB and both directions of 8 Mile Rd bridge were closed beginning at approximately 8:00 AM on Wednesday, March 23, 2016. This closure was necessary to allow construction crews to remove the debris and debris from the bridge. The closure was lifted at approximately 7:30 PM on Wednesday, March 23, 2016. The bridge was reopened at 7:30 PM on Wednesday, March 23, 2016. The bridge is currently closed for the night.

### INTERMEDIATE ACTION

Request For Detailed Inspection
Contact/User: Christopher Isayw

Engineer/Company Name: MDOT Bridge Field Services

No. of Locations

Comments
Christopher, will you please add your field notes from your measurements at the site structure? (Lindsey Renner 03/10/2016)

### FINAL ACTION COMPLETED

Comments

Beams 1-4 are shown, looking roughly west along Span 3W. Note condition of diamagim attachments to angle.

2016-03-11_13-01-58.jpg
Span 3W Removed

IMA_8216_JPG

- Beams 1-4 are shown, looking roughly west along Span 3W. Note condition of diamagim attachments to angle.
My Assignments

- Requests for Action Added
- When Immediate Action Not Assigned Database Query Required
- No Method to Prioritize
RFA Dashboard

- Consists of 5 Separate Sections
- Incorporates DataTables For Quick Sorting and Queries
- Export to Excel Feature Includes Additional Columns For Managing RFAs
RFA Dashboard – Request For Action Summary

- Incomplete and Complete RFAs
  - Periodic Review of Incomplete RFAs Necessary
- RFAs Submitted By Me Allows Copy and Paste of Similar Records
- Incomplete RFAs Assigned to Me
RFA Dashboard – Priority Level Summary

- Priority Level Aids In Determining Schedule
- Complete/In Progress for Performance Reporting
- Reports Reviewed By RFA Committee

**Dependent Upon Users With Intermediate Actions on RFA Committee Entering A Priority Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Priority Level</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Reviewed by Committee</th>
<th>Not Reviewed by Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RFA Dashboard – Critical Finding Type Summary

• Used for Metric #21 and Reporting
• Notification Necessary
• Ensure Documentation Is Entered In MiBRIDGE
• Review Incomplete Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Finding Type</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Incomplete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close Bridge</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Lane</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Shoulder</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load Reduction ≥ 20%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RFA Dashboard – Intermediate Action Type Summary

- Breakdown For Each Work Type (Intermediate Action)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate Action Type</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Reviewed</th>
<th>Not Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Inspection</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage Inspection</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scour Evaluation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Special Inspection</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Decking R&amp;R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load Rating</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load Reduction &lt; 20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Supports</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRJ Installation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel Repairs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Repairs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam End Repairs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scour Repairs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Concrete</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Actions</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Project</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RFA Dashboard – Table

- Multiple Column Display For Improved Tracking
## RFA Dashboard – Table

- **Multiple Column Display For Improved Tracking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Assigned to</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
<th>Complete Date</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
<th>Completed Date</th>
<th>Item 41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Damage Inspection</td>
<td>Christopher Idusu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>04/27/2015</td>
<td>05/27/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel Repairs</td>
<td>Christopher Idusu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>05/27/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Inspection</td>
<td>Christopher Idusu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>04/01/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Inspection</td>
<td>Christopher Idusu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>03/24/2015</td>
<td>03/24/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Inspection</td>
<td>Christopher Idusu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>04/10/2015</td>
<td>04/10/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load Rating</td>
<td>Creightyn McMun</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>01/28/2015</td>
<td>01/28/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel Repairs</td>
<td>Jose Garcia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel Repairs</td>
<td>Jose Garcia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>05/27/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RFA Dashboard – Table

**Jurisdiction**
- LA Statewide

**NBI Filter**
- All

**NHS Filter**
- All

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request For Action (RFA) Summary</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of Incomplete RFAs</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of Complete RFAs</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFAs Submitted by Me</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete RFAs Assigned to Me</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete RFAs Assigned to Me</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Findings</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Critical Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select</th>
<th>Struct. Nbr.</th>
<th>Bridge ID</th>
<th>Facility Carried</th>
<th>Features Intersect</th>
<th>RFA Start Date</th>
<th>RFA End Date</th>
<th>Assigned To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>12000100990000B010</td>
<td>LARK ROAD</td>
<td>LORING STREET</td>
<td>10/10/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>142000470000B010</td>
<td>O'KEEFE ROAD</td>
<td>DOWAGIAC CREEK</td>
<td>01/24/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>13555</td>
<td>242000400000S010</td>
<td>MIDDLE ROAD</td>
<td>GREENBRIAR (PV)</td>
<td>01/26/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>3303</td>
<td>302000390000B010</td>
<td>LITCHFIELD ROAD</td>
<td>SAND CREEK</td>
<td>03/30/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>3879</td>
<td>332000320000B020</td>
<td>OKemos ROAD SB</td>
<td>RED CEDAR RIVER</td>
<td>03/3879-1100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>3881</td>
<td>332000340000R010</td>
<td>MARSH ROAD</td>
<td>GRAND TRUNK ROAD</td>
<td>08/12/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amy Trahey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>4022</td>
<td>342000170000B010</td>
<td>DAVID HWY</td>
<td>LIBHART CREEK</td>
<td>09/02/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Lohrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>4032</td>
<td>342000350000B010</td>
<td>BORDEN RD</td>
<td>PRAIRIE CREEK</td>
<td>09/03/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Lohrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>4136</td>
<td>352000170000B010</td>
<td>MILL STREET</td>
<td>AUSABLE RIVER</td>
<td>06/18/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan Worden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Request For Action – Automated Emails

• Monthly Notification for Bridge Owners

• Instant Messages:
  – Bridge Owners Following Report Create and Save
  – Users Assigned With A New Intermediate Action
  – Users Assigned With An Incomplete Action and Another Immediate Action Is Completed

---

To: Andrew Young, MDOT - Bridge Field Services

Your agency currently has incomplete Requests for Action that require attention for the following bridges:

Structure: 11467 (62192113060348) M-101 (8 MILE RD), IN DETROIT at M-10 & RAMPS in Wayne County, Metro Region

Please sign in to MBridge to review the requests to ensure that appropriate actions are being taken to mitigate the issues that have been identified. Once you are in MBridge, click on the applicable structure number to open bridge specific information and then select the Request for Action folder to view the report.

You can connect to MBridge using the link given below:
http://mdotbros.state.mi.us/mbrs/mbrsignon.jsp

Caution: this is an automated message and replies are not accepted.

Disclaimer:
This email is intended for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain material that is confidential information. Any review or reliance by others of copying or distribution or forwarding of any or all of the contents in this message is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please discard this email and delete all copies; your cooperation in this regard is appreciated.
Request For Action – Automated Emails

BRIDGE OWNER: Olukayode Adefeso, MDOT

A new Request for Action has been created for the following structure:

Structure: 2173 (22122011000B010) M-95, 1.7 MI S OF KINGSFORD at MENOMINEE RIVER in Dickinson County, Superior Region


Please sign in to MiBRIDGE to review this request to ensure that appropriate actions are being taken to mitigate the issues that have been identified. Once you are in MiBRIDGE, click on the applicable structure number to open bridge specific information and then select the Request for Action folder to view the report.

You can connect to MiBRIDGE using the link given below:
http://mdotjboss.state.mi.us/mbrs/mbrslogin.jsp

CAUTION: THIS IS AN AUTOMATED MESSAGE AND REPLIES ARE NOT ACCEPTED.

DISCLAIMER:
This email is intended for the sole use of the intended recipient/s and may contain material that is CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION. Any review or reliance by others or copying or distribution or forwarding of any or all of the contents in this message is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you are not the intended recipient, please discard this email and delete all copies; your cooperation in this regard is appreciated.
Request For Action – Automated Emails

BRIDGE OWNER: Andrew Bouvy, MDOT - Bridge Field Services

Your agency currently has incomplete Requests for Action that require attention for the following bridges:

Structure: 11467 (821821120005348) M-102 (8 MILE RD), IN DETROIT at M-10 & RAMPS in Wayne County, Metro Region

Please sign in to MiBRIDGE to review the requests to ensure that appropriate actions are being taken to mitigate the issues that have been identified. Once you are in MiBRIDGE, click on the applicable structure number to open bridge specific information and then select the Request for Action folder to view the report.

You can connect to MiBRIDGE using the link given below:
http://mdotjboss.state.mi.us/mbrs/mbrslogin.jsp

CAUTION: THIS IS AN AUTOMATED MESSAGE AND REPLIES ARE NOT ACCEPTED.

DISCLAIMER:
This email is intended for the sole use of the intended recipient/s and may contain material that is CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.
Any review or reliance by others or copying or distribution or forwarding of any or all of the contents in this message is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you are not the intended recipient, please discard this email and delete all copies; your cooperation in this regard is appreciated.
Request For Action – Automated Emails

MiBRIDGE User: Christopher 00 Idusuyi, MDOT Bridge Field Services

A new Intermediate Request for Action task has been created for the following structure:

Structure: 1469 (15115011000C010) US-31, 4.6 MI N OF ANTRIM COL at INWOOD CREEK in Charlevoix County, North Region

Comments: Install 3 temp supports (.TEST MDOT .Bridge Owner 03/22/2015)

Please sign in to MiBRIDGE to review this request to ensure that appropriate actions are being taken to mitigate the issues that have been identified. Once you are in MiBRIDGE, click on the applicable structure number to open bridge specific information and then select the Request for Action folder to view the report.

You can connect to MiBRIDGE using the link given below:
http://mdotjboss.state.mi.us/mbrs/mbrslogin.jsp

CAUTION: THIS IS AN AUTOMATED MESSAGE AND REPLIES ARE NOT ACCEPTED.

DISCLAIMER:
This email is intended for the sole use of the intended recipient/s and may contain material that is CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION. Any review or reliance by others or copying or distribution or forwarding of any or all of the contents in this message is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you are not the intended recipient, please discard this email and delete all copies; your cooperation in this regard is appreciated.
Request For Action – Automated Emails

MiBRIDGE User: .TEST MDOT .Bridge Owner, MDOT Bridge Owner

An Intermediate Request for Action task has been completed for the following structure:

Structure: 1469 (15115011000C010) US-31, 4.6 MI N OF ANTRIM COL at INWOOD CREEK in Charlevoix County, North Region

INTERMEDIATE ACTION REQUEST COMPLETED

Request for Temporary Supports Contact/User Christopher 00 Idusuyi

Comments: Install 3 temp supports (.TEST MDOT .Bridge Owner 03/22/2015) SWC Installing temp supports tomorrow test, 4 required (Christopher 00 Idusuyi 03/22/2015) Supports Installed Test (Christopher 00 Idusuyi 03/22/2015)

Please sign in to MiBRIDGE to review this request to ensure that appropriate actions are being taken to mitigate the issues that have been identified. Once you are in MiBRIDGE, click on the applicable structure number to open bridge specific information and then select the Request for Action folder to view the report.

You can connect to MiBRIDGE using the link given below:
http://mdotjboss.state.mi.us/mbrs/mbrslogin.jsp

CAUTION: THIS IS AN AUTOMATED MESSAGE AND REPLIES ARE NOT ACCEPTED.

DISCLAIMER: This email is intended for the sole use of the intended recipient/s and may contain material that is CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.
Creating The RFA

Step #1 – Select “Add New”

Step #2 – Enter The Appropriate Date

Step #3 – Briefly Describe The Deficiency or Need
Immediate Action Section Used **ONLY** To Document Unplanned Bridge, Lane, or Shoulder Closures and Substantial Posting Reductions

**Step #4 – Select Immediate Action “Add” To Document A Critical Finding**

If there Is Not A Critical Finding Move To Step #10
Creating The RFA

Step #5 – Enter The Recommended Action (Usually Already Completed)

Step #6 – Enter The MiBRIDGE User That Requested The Recommended Action

Step #7 – Enter The Crew or Agency That Completed The Action

Step #8 – Enter The Date That The Critical Finding Was Resolved

Step #9 – Add Comments To Describe The Issue Requiring Immediate Resolution
Step #10 – Select Intermediate Action Requested “Add” To Create A Request

REQUEST FOR ACTION
Submitted By
MDOT - Big Bridge

Problems/Comments
In-depth inspection performed of beam end corrosion at Pier 3W. Request load analysis for section loss measurements recorded on existing steel beam end inspection form.

IMMEDIATE ACTION
(Add)

INTERMEDIATE ACTION REQUESTED
(Add)

FINAL ACTION COMPLETED

RFA COMMITTEE
Committee Review Date Estimated Repair Date
Creating The RFA

Step #11 – Select The Appropriate Request From The List

Step #12 – Enter The MiBRIDGE User That The Request Should Be Assigned To

Step #13 – If Needed Add Any Additional Comments

Step #14 – If Additional Actions Are Required, Select Add And Repeat Steps 11, 12, and 13
Creating The RFA

Step #15 – Add Supporting Documents

Step #16 – Add Description For File(s) Uploaded
Creating The RFA

Step #17 – Add Supporting Images

Step #18 – Add Description For Photos Uploaded

Step #19 – Select Save
Creating The RFA

Step #20 – Verify Record Has Been Saved
Responding To An RFA Assignment

- My Assignments For Intermediate Action Assignments
- Request For Action Dashboard For All RFAs
### Responding To An RFA Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1B</td>
<td>Select Request For Action Dashboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2B</td>
<td>Select Incomplete RFAs Assigned to Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3B</td>
<td>Select The Appropriate Structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responding To An RFA Assignment

Step #4 - Select The Request For Action Folder and Edit

Step #5 - Enter the Reviewed Date

Step #6 - Assign A Priority Number

Step #7 - Enter A Comment To Provide Any Beneficial Information
### Responding To An RFA Assignment

**Step #8** - If Necessary, Add And Assign Any Additional Intermediate Actions

**Step #9** - Scroll Down And Select Save

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Latitude / Longitude</th>
<th>Length / Width</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-13 &amp; M-84</td>
<td>43.57060444444444</td>
<td>508 / 40</td>
<td>MDOT Bridge Field Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Material / Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-CHANNEL SAGINAW RIVER</td>
<td>1 Concrete / 16 Movable-Bascule</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inspection (as shown below)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request For</th>
<th>Contact/User</th>
<th>Agency/Company Name</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Complete Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steel Repairs</td>
<td>Christopher Idusuyi</td>
<td>MDOT Bridge Field Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch. Spec. Inspection</td>
<td>Rich Kathrens</td>
<td>MDOT Bridge Field Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Error:** The table content seems to be incomplete or contains placeholders. It's unclear how to interpret the data presented. It might be helpful to have more context or actual data to fill in the blanks.
Responding To An RFA Assignment

Step #10 – Once The Action Has Been Completed, Enter The Completed Date

Step #11 - Enter A Comment Which Describes The Outcome Of The Intermediate Action
Step #12 - Add Any Supporting Documentation
Step #13 - If Necessary, Add And Assign Any Additional Intermediate Actions

Step #14 - Scroll Down And Select Save
Completing The RFA Report

Step #1 - After Selecting The Appropriate RFA, Review The Report To Ensure All Required Actions And Documentation Are Complete.

Step #2 - Enter A Comment In The Final Action Completed Section.

Step #3 – Mark The RFA Complete.

Step #4 – Provide Confirmation In The Warning Dialogue Window.

Step #5 - Scroll Down And Select Save.
Request For Action – Future Updates

- We need your feedback!
- Ability to delete RFA record
- Ability to reopen completed RFA
- Ability to link with Damage Inspection Report
- Ability to link with Maintenance Work Orders
- Enhanced mapping features
Time to get back to Spring Training