


**DEPARTMENT OF  
TRANSPORTATION**

**Bridge Office**  
Mail Stop 610  
3485 Hadley Avenue North  
Oakdale, MN 55128-3307

Phone No: 651/366-4500  
Fax No: 651/366-4497

March 28, 2017

<b>DISTRIBUTION:</b> MnDOT Bridge Office Web Site			
<b>TRANSMITTAL NOTICE (2017-01)</b>		<b>ISSUED BY</b>	Bridge Office
<b>MANUAL</b>	LRFD Bridge Design Manual	<b>DEVELOPED BY</b>	Bridge Office
<b>SUBJECT</b>	Title Page Table of Contents MEMO TO DESIGNERS (2017-01): Edge-of-Deck Thickness on Bridges and Wall Coping Height		

The MnDOT Bridge Office *LRFD Bridge Design Manual* is available for download in Adobe PDF (Portable Document Format) at <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/bridge/>. This website should be checked regularly for updates.

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

(for two-sided printing)

1. Remove from the manual:
  - Title Page
  - Table of Contents pages xi and xii
2. Print and insert in the manual:
  - Title Page
  - Table of Contents pages xi and xii
  - MEMO TO DESIGNERS (2017-01)

Note: The "MARCH 2017" update includes the following revisions to the BDM:

- Addition of MEMO TO DESIGNERS (2017-01), which contains changes to guidance regarding the edge-of-deck thickness and wall coping height.

Any **technical questions** regarding this transmittal should be directed to Dave Dahlberg, Bridge Design Manual and Policy Engineer, at [dave.dahlberg@state.mn.us](mailto:dave.dahlberg@state.mn.us) or 651/366-4491.



Kevin Western  
State Bridge Engineer

MANUAL

5-392

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

---

Bridge Office

# LRFD Bridge Design Manual

MnDOT BRIDGE OFFICE

# LRFD Bridge Design Manual

---

Minnesota Department of Transportation  
3485 Hadley Avenue North • Mail Stop 610  
Oakdale, MN 55128-3307  
Phone: 651/366-4500 • Fax: 651/366-4497

JULY 2003   OCTOBER 2003   JANUARY 2004   APRIL 2004   OCTOBER 2004   DECEMBER 2004  
FEBRUARY 2005   MARCH 2005   NOVEMBER 2005   MARCH 2006   APRIL 2006   MAY 2006  
AUGUST 2006   OCTOBER 2006   FEBRUARY 2007   JUNE 2007   JULY 2007   OCTOBER 2007  
APRIL 2008   MAY 2008   JUNE 2008   AUGUST 2008   SEPTEMBER 2008   OCTOBER 2008  
APRIL 2009   MAY 2009   OCTOBER 2009   MARCH 2010   JUNE 2010   DECEMBER 2010   JUNE 2011  
SEPTEMBER 2011   OCTOBER 2011   DECEMBER 2011   APRIL 2012   NOVEMBER 2012   APRIL 2013  
SEPTEMBER 2013   FEBRUARY 2014   JULY 2014   AUGUST 2014   DECEMBER 2014   MAY 2015  
JUNE 2015   AUGUST 2015   MAY 2016   JULY 2016   AUGUST 2016   DECEMBER 2016   MARCH 2017

---

---

14.6	Sole Plate Design (Steel Beams) .....	14-12
14.7	Tables .....	14-12
14.8	Design Examples .....	14-20
14.8.1	Fixed Elastomeric Bearing Design Example .....	14-21
14.8.2	Expansion Elastomeric Bearing Design Example.....	14-29
<b>15.</b>	<b>BRIDGE LOAD RATING .....</b>	<b>15-1</b>
15.1	General.....	15-1
15.2	Analysis .....	15-3
15.2.1	Computer Programs .....	15-3
15.2.2	Refined Analysis .....	15-3
15.3	Loads.....	15-4
15.4	Rating Equation Factors.....	15-6
15.5	Rating New Bridges.....	15-6
15.6	Re-rating Existing Bridges.....	15-6
15.7	Substructures .....	15-7
15.8	Non-Standard Bridge Types .....	15-8
15.9	Timber Bridges.....	15-8
15.10	Culverts .....	15-9.
15.11	Gusset Plates.....	15-11
15.12	Load Testing .....	15-11
15.13	Load Posting .....	15-11
15.13.1	General .....	15-11
15.13.2	Rating Factors for Posting .....	15-14
15.14	Overweight Permits.....	15-15
15.15	Physical Inspection Rating (PIR) .....	15-16
15.16	Forms and Documentation .....	15-17
15.17	Submittal / Filing.....	15-19
	APPENDIX 15-A: GLOSSARY.....	15-20
	APPENDIX 15-B: RATING FORMS .....	15-24
	APPENDIX 15-C: OVERWEIGHT PERMIT RESTRICTIONS FOR BRIDGES.....	15-25
	APPENDIX 15-D: MINNESOTA LEGAL (POSTING) LOADS .....	15-26.1
	APPENDIX 15-E: MINNESOTA STANDARD PERMIT TRUCKS G-80 .....	15-27

---

APPENDIX 15-F: MINNESOTA STANDARD PERMIT TRUCKS G-07 .....	15-28
--	-------

**APPENDIX A. MEMOS**

#2005-01	REMOVED
#2005-02	REMOVED
#2005-03	REMOVED
#2006-01	REMOVED
#2007-01	REMOVED
#2007-02	Adhesive Anchors Under Sustained Tensile Loads ..... (dated Oct. 3, 2007)
#2007-03	REMOVED
#2008-01	Prestressed Concrete Design – Calculation of Prestress Losses and Beam Camber & Deflection.....(dated Sept. 18, 2008)
#2008-02	Truss Bridge Gusset Plate Analysis ..... (dated Oct. 20, 2008)
#2011-01	REMOVED
#2011-02	REMOVED
#2011-03	Interim Guidance for Installation of Temporary Barriers on Bridges and Approach Panels ..... (dated December 23, 2011)
#2012-01	Discontinued Usage of Plain Elastomeric Bearing Pads and Substitution with Cotton-Duck Bearing Pads ..... (dated April 12, 2012)
#2012-02	Transition to New MnDOT Pile Formula 2012 (MPF12)..... (dated November 21, 2012)
#2013-01	Conversion from Metric to U.S. Cust. Rebar Designations ..... (dated April 17, 2013)
#2014-01	AASHTO LRFD Article 5.7.3.4 Concrete Crack Control Check (dated August 6, 2014)
#2014-02	Inclusion of Informational Quantities in Bridge Plans (dated December 23, 2014)
#2015-01	Concrete Mix Design Designations ..... (dated August 10, 2015)
#2016-01	Single Slope Barrier (Type S) Bridge Standards(dated December 09, 2016)
#2017-01	Edge-of-Deck Thickness on Bridges and Wall Coping Height (dated March 28, 2017)

## Memo

To: Bridge Design Engineers

From: Arielle Ehrlich   
State Bridge Design Engineer

Date: Mar. 28, 2017

### MEMO TO DESIGNERS (2017-01): Edge-of-Deck Thickness on Bridges and Wall Coping Height


---

For deck-on-beam type bridges, MnDOT's *LRFD Bridge Design Manual* (BDM) Figure 9.2.1 currently requires choosing an edge-of-deck thickness based on the type of deck to be constructed. For bridges with monolithic decks, an edge-of-deck thickness equal to 9" is required. When the deck consists of a 7" structural slab plus 2" concrete wearing course, an 8" edge-of-deck thickness is required. The current method for detailing the structural slab plus wearing course causes an abrupt vertical change in the coping line at the end of bridge expansion joints when the wingwalls are oriented parallel to the roadway. In order to simplify the current practice and provide a continuous coping line, the new practice is to require an edge-of-deck thickness that is equal to the deck thickness specified in BDM Tables 9.2.1.1 and 9.2.1.2 for all cases (typically 9", except for wide beam spacings). In the special case where a deck thickness less than 9" is specified (e.g., redecking of a bridge with existing deck thickness equal to 8½"), provide an edge-of-deck thickness equal to 9". For monolithic decks, the result is the same as current practice. For decks that include a concrete wearing course, the new practice will be accomplished by adjusting the top of deck as it passes beneath the barrier so that the edge-of-deck elevation is the same as the gutterline elevation. See Figure 1.


For wingwalls parallel to the roadway, current practice is to provide a coping on the outside face of the wall. For bridges with and without a wearing course, use a coping height that matches the edge-of-deck thickness. This will result in a continuous coping line on and off the superstructure. Figure 1 shows barrier details for the two cases of:

- 1) a barrier constructed on the approach panel
- 2) a barrier constructed on a wingwall


The cast-in-place concrete retaining wall standards currently show an 8" high coping. Revisions to the standards that show a 9" high coping will be published in the near future. Where a wingwall ties into a retaining wall, coordinate with the roadway designer as needed to set the retaining wall coping height to match the edge-of-deck thickness.




BARRIER SECTION ON DECK



BARRIER SECTION ON APPROACH PANEL



BARRIER SECTION ON WINGWALL



DETAIL A

- ① USE VALUE FOR "DECK THICKNESS" GIVEN IN BDM TABLES 9.2.1.1 AND 9.2.1.2.
- ② POLYSTYRENE, BACKER ROD, AND JOINT SEALANT ARE INCIDENTAL TO APPROACH PANEL CONSTRUCTION.

EDGE OF DECK AND COPING DETAILS FOR BRIDGES WITH A WEARING COURSE

Figure 1

These changes result in the following revisions to previous guidance found in the Memo to Designers (2016-01):

- 1) In the guidance regarding plumb vs. perpendicular barrier placement, the 5<sup>th</sup> bullet as well as Figures 2, 3, and 4 of Memo to Designers (2016-01) called for a level deck surface beneath the barrier. For decks that include a concrete wearing course, the top of deck under the barrier will not be level, but will slope as shown above in Figure 1 of this Memo to Designers. However, the barrier orientation will still remain plumb or perpendicular as defined in the previous memo.
- 2) For the deck overhang design, the net effect of the edge-of-deck change for decks that include a concrete wearing course is to reduce the deck thickness at the gutter line. Therefore, the entire section regarding deck overhang design is superseded by the following:

#### Deck Overhang Design

Deck overhang requirements are dependent on the overhang length and overhang location along the bridge.

- For deck overhangs (measured from centerline of beam to edge of deck) of up to 40% of the beam spacing that carry a Type S barrier, the BDM deck reinforcement Tables 9.2.1.1 and 9.2.1.2 may be used for the interior overhang regions. For the exterior overhang regions (applies to regions where the longitudinal barrier reinforcement is discontinuous, such as end of bridge joints and expansion joints), the following modifications to the overhang reinforcement are necessary to meet NCHRP 350 Test Level 4 (TL-4). Note that the modifications only apply when the gutter line is located outside the edge of the fascia beam flange. For cases where the gutter line is located inside the edge of the fascia beam flange, provide reinforcement per the BDM deck reinforcement Tables 9.2.1.1 and 9.2.1.2 with no modification.
  - For a 36" Type S barrier on a deck with wearing course supported by steel beams spaced greater than 12 feet apart, provide top transverse hooked #5 bars at 6" spacing over a distance of 8 feet from the joint. Lap these bars to the top transverse #6 bars at 6" called for by Table 9.2.1.2. Include 180 degree standard hooks on the edge-of-deck ends of the #5 bars.
  - For all other cases with a 36" Type S barrier, provide #5 bars at 5" spacing or  $A_s = 0.74 \text{ in}^2/\text{ft}$  for the top transverse bars over a distance of 8 feet from the joint. Include 180 degree standard hooks on the edge-of-deck ends of these bars. This can be accomplished either by providing hooked overhang bars that splice to the main transverse deck bars or by providing hooked transverse bars that run from edge to edge of the deck.
  - For the 42" Type S, where the deck consists of a 9" monolithic slab or a 7" structural slab plus a 2" concrete wearing course, include 180 degree standard hooks on the edge-of-deck ends of the top transverse bars over a distance of 9 feet from the joint. This can be accomplished either by providing hooked overhang bars that splice to the main transverse deck bars or by providing hooked transverse bars that run from edge to edge of the deck.



- For the 54" Type S, no modification is needed. Provide reinforcement per the BDM deck reinforcement Tables 9.2.1.1 and 9.2.1.2.
- Provide an edge-of-deck thickness that is equal to the deck thickness specified in BDM Tables 9.2.1.1 and 9.2.1.2 for all cases (typically 9", except for wide beam spacings). When edge-of-deck thicknesses are greater than 9", adjust the wingwall coping height to match the edge-of-deck thickness. Where the wingwall ties into a retaining wall, coordinate with the roadway designer as needed to set the retaining wall coping height to also match the edge-of-deck thickness.
- For deck overhangs that require a special design, use the following guidance for checking the extreme event limit state.
- Design collision loads  $F_{cdes}$  and  $M_{cdes}$  will be needed to complete the deck overhang design. For each barrier height  $H$ , values for  $L_c$ ,  $M_c$ , and  $R_w$  have been determined using the yield line method found in AASHTO LRFD Spec. Article A13.3.1. The TL-4 value of 54 kips for  $F_t$  was adjusted for the difference between the barrier height and height of  $F_t$  application. Then  $4/3 \cdot F_t$  was compared to  $R_w$ , and the smaller value distributed over  $L_c + H$  for end regions and  $L_c + 2H$  for interior regions. Also,  $M_c$  was adjusted when  $4/3 \cdot F_t$  governed. The results are the moments  $M_{cadj}$  and tension forces  $F_{cadj}$  given in Table 1 below.

	36" Type S		42" Type S		54" Type S	
	Exterior	Interior	Exterior	Interior	Exterior	Interior
$M_{cadj}$ (k-ft/ft)	20.5	9.4	18.8	7.8	17.4	6.7
$F_{cadj}$ (k/ft)	7.9	3.7	6.1	2.7	4.1	1.8

Table 1

In order to use these values, translate the moment  $M_{cadj}$  at the top of the deck to a moment  $M_{cdes}$  located at the center of the deck using the following method (refer to Figure 2):

$$e = M_{cadj} / F_{cadj}$$

$$F_{cdes} = F_{cadj}$$

For monolithic decks:  $M_{cdes} = F_{cdes} \cdot (e + 0.5 \cdot t_{deck})$

For decks consisting of structural slab plus wearing course:

$$M_{cdes} = F_{cdes} \cdot (e + 0.5 \cdot t_{str \text{ slab}})$$





Figure 2

Use the tension force  $F_{cdes}$  and moment  $M_{cdes}$  as the collision loads for the deck overhang design.

Revision of the edge-of-deck thickness and coping height per this memo is to begin immediately for all new preliminary bridge plans.

If you have any questions, please contact Dave Dahlberg ([dave.dahlberg@state.mn.us](mailto:dave.dahlberg@state.mn.us)) or (651) 366-4491) or me.

- cc: Kevin Western  
 Dave Dahlberg  
 Dave Conkel/Local Bridge Design Consultants  
 Colleen Lichtsinn/Bridge Design Consultants