Sloped and Mitered Concrete Headwalls

Report Number: KTC-18-12/SPR17-537-1F

DOI: https://doi.org/10.13023/ktc.rr.2018.12



Kentucky Transportation Center College of Engineering, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky

> in cooperation with Kentucky Transportation Cabinet Commonwealth of Kentucky

The Kentucky Transportation Center is committed to a policy of providing equal opportunities for al persons in recruitment, appointment, promotion, payment, training, and other employment and education practices without regard for economic, or social status and will not discriminate on the basis of race, color, ethnic origin, national origin, creed, religion, political belief, sex, sexual orientation, marital status or age.

Kentucky Transportation Center College of Engineering, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky

> in cooperation with Kentucky Transportation Cabinet Commonwealth of Kentucky

© 2018 University of Kentucky, Kentucky Transportation Center Information may no tbe used, reproduced, or republished without KTC's written consent.



Kentucky Transportation Center • University of Kentucky 176 Raymond Building • Lexington, KY 40506 • 859.257.6898 • www.ktc.uky.edu



Research Report KTC-18-12/SPR17-537-1F

Sloped and Mitered Concrete Headwalls

Kean H. Ashurst Jr., P.E. Research Engineer

> Brad Rister, P.E. Program Manager

Eileen Grady, B.A. Research Scientist

and

Jason K. Ward, P.E. Kentucky Transportation Cabinet

Kentucky Transportation Center College of Engineering University of Kentucky Lexington, Kentucky

In Cooperation With Kentucky Transportation Cabinet Commonwealth of Kentucky

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors, who are responsible for the facts and accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the University of Kentucky, the Kentucky Transportation Center, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, the United States Department of Transportation, or the Federal Highway Administration. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation. The inclusion of manufacturer names or trade names is for identification purposes and should not be considered an endorsement.

July 2018

1. Report No. KTC-18-12/SPR17-537-1F	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No			
 4. Title and Subtitle Sloped and Mitered Concrete Head 	 5. Report Date July 2018 6. Performing Organization Code 				
7. Author(s): Kean Ashurst, Brad Rister, Eileen (8. Performing Organization Report No. KTC-18-12/SPR17-537-1F				
9. Performing Organization Nat	ne and Address	10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)			
College of Engineering University of Kentucky Lexington, KY 40506-0281	11. Contract or Grant No. SPR 17-537				
12. Sponsoring Agency Name an Kentucky Transportation Cabinet	d Address	13. Type of Report and Period Covered			
State Office Building Frankfort, KY 40622		14. Sponsoring Agency Code			
15. Supplementary Notes Prepared in cooperation with the K	entucky Transportation Cabinet				
16. Abstract The Kentucky Transportation Cab headwalls, slope and flared headwa can pose a safety hazard to motoris through 2016 for Kentucky reve culverts/headwalls were coded as th with standard pipe culvert headwal sloped and mitered concrete headwal industry guidance and best practice concrete headwalls were used; dev headwalls, and evaluated specifica mitered concrete headwalls conforr of sloped and mitered concrete head unambiguous design and construct is installed. Furthermore, adding gra	inet (KYTC) currently uses several p alls, sloped and parallel headwalls, and its and those performing landscaping v al that 49 fatalities and 148 incapa he first harmful event on the police repu- ls is to use sloped and mitered concret alls for widespread use, Kentucky Tra- es; observed, documented, and analyze eloped cost comparisons for sloped ar tions for sloped and mitered concrete n with industry guidance and protect a dwalls used on KYTC projects attested ion criteria. Specifically, the grade sho ate bars will improve performance as w	bipe culvert end treatments, including standard d safety metal ends. These treatments, however, work (e.g., mowing). Crash statistics from 2012 acitating injuries occurred in incidents where ort. One solution to the safety hazards associated the headwalls instead. To evaluate the viability of ansportation Center (KTC) researchers reviewed ed several projects on which sloped and mitered and mitered concrete headwalls and conventional headwalls adopted by other states. Sloped and igainst significant vehicle damage. Observations d to the importance of establishing and applying ould be set before a slope and mitered headwall vill securing pipe ends to the headwall. A sample			

of headwalls should be chosen for long-term monitoring purposes, with inspections conducted each year. Overall, sloped and mitered concrete headwalls are an attractive option given they can be installed quickly and without special equipment, their robust performance, and low cost compared to standard pipe culvert headwalls.

17. Key Words headwalls, sloped and mitered concrete	18. Distribution Statement Unlimited with approval of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet		
19. Security Classification (report) Unclassified	20. Security Classification (this page) Unclassified	21. No. of Pages 80	19. Security Classification (report)

Introduction	1
Literature Review	1
Methodology	2
Findings	3
Kentucky Crash Statistics	3
KY 1600 Project	3
KY 54 Project	6
Headwall Cost Comparison	9
Review of State DOT Details1	0
Summary & Recommendations1	2
Appendix A Hardin County and Ohio County Photos1	4
Appendix B Hardin County Detail	5
Appendix C Ohio County Detail	7
Appendix D Florida DOT Detail	0
Appendix E Oklahoma DOT Detail	7
Appendix F Texas DOT Detail	0
Appendix G Oregon DOT Detail	4

Table of Contents

List of Figures

Figure 1 Headwall Installed On a Skew at STA 170+76 RT	4
Figure 2 Reconstructed Headwall at STA 170+76 RT	4
Figure 3 Depth of Cover For 24 Inch Pipe With 3-inch Wall Thickness	5
Figure 5 Grate Bars on 36-inch Sloped and Mitered Concrete Headwall	6
Figure 6 Existing Headwall	7
Figure 7 New Headwall and Improvements to the Clear Zone	7
Figure 8 Mitered Pipe End Secured to Headwall	8
Figure 9 Depression Above Pipe	8
Figure 10 Safety Type Box Inlet Grate Blocked	9

List of Tables

Table 1 KABCO Crash Data for Fixed Objects and Headwalls From 2012-2016	3
Table 2 Headwall Cost Comparison	9
Table 3 DOT Headwall Detail Summary Comparison	11

Introduction

The Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) generally uses the following pipe culvert end treatments: standard headwalls, slope and flared headwalls, sloped and parallel headwalls, and safety metal ends. Each end treatment has a typical slope; when the embankment slope varies from the headwall slope, the embankment slope is warped to fit the headwall. Portions of the headwalls that project above the ground and the embankment warping around the headwall present safety hazards to vehicles that leave the roadway, increasing the possibility of a vehicle overturning and injury to passengers. In addition, right of way (ROW) mowing activities have trouble traversing these areas. A recent incident involving a sloped and flared headwall illustrates these hazards — a tractor with a bush hog struck a headwall hidden under grass, overturning the tractor, injuring the KYTC operator, and damaged KYTC equipment.

Using a paved-to-slope type headwall with a mitered pipe end is one solution to this problem. These headwalls are cast in pace to match the embankment slope, eliminating the need to warp the embankment around the drainage end treatment and provide a traversable slope. Installation can be performed without special equipment, and a traversable grate can be installed when required. KYTC currently lacks a standard drawing for this type of headwall. The Cabinet does have a standard detail for sloped and mitered concrete headwalls and use this end treatment on select projects involved with the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP).

This report examines previous research undertaken on sloped and mitered concrete headwalls, identifies the current construction standard of practice used by state departments of transportation (DOTs), documents the installation of sloped and mitered concrete headwalls on select HSIP projects, and offers justifications for using this type of culvert end treatment in Kentucky.

Literature Review

There is ample support for use of a paved-to-slope type headwall in the literature. The *AASHTO Roadway Design Guide* instructs agencies to "design or modify drainage structures so they are traversable or present a minimal obstruction to an errant vehicle." The preferred method is to make cross drain structures traversable. For parallel structures, the preferred method is to eliminate the structure altogether. If the structure cannot be removed, a traversable design should be used. Single barrel cross drain pipes less than or equal to 36 inches in diameter can be mitered to the embankment slope without further modification. Cross drain pipes with a diameter greater than 36 inches can be made traversable by installing bar grates perpendicular to the direction of traffic on 30-inch-centers, but these should not decrease the hydraulic capacity of the pipe. Parallel pipe end treatments require grate bars installed on 24-inch centers.

Wilson, in NCHRP Synthesis 321: *Roadway Safety Tools for Local Agencies*¹, recommends eliminating hazardous concrete culvert headwalls by either breaking the headwall off at ground level or building up the soil to the level of the headwall top surface. Using paved-to-slope type headwalls in lieu of obtrusive headwalls would create a safely traversable surface and remove the need to correct these hazardous types of headwalls. The FHWA *Maintenance of Drainage Features for Safety*² also recommends replacing

¹ Wilson, Eugene M., Ph.D., consultant. NCHRP Synthesis 321: *Roadway Safety Tools for Local Agencies*. Washington, D.C.: Transportation Research Board, 2003.

² McGee, Hugh W., P.E., Daniel Nabors, P.E., and Timothy Baughman, P.E., eds. *Maintenance of Drainage Features for Safety, A Guide for Local Street and Highway Maintenance Personnel*. Tech. FHWA-SA-09-024. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, 2009.

potentially hazardous headwalls which extend above the surrounding ground with traversable culvert end treatments.

Safety grates (i.e., safety pipe runners) can be installed across mitered headwalls to further improve safety. Sicking et al. present their results of crash testing in *Safety Grates for Cross-Drainage Culverts*³. The simulated safety grate constructed for their tests consisted of 4-inch diameter schedule 40 steel pipes spaced at 30 inches to create a 20-ft x 20-ft unsupported span across a mock culvert. Crash test results were favorable, and Sicking et al. conclude that safety grates, as recommended by the AASHTO *Roadside Design Guide*, provide acceptable safety performance on slopes as steep as 3:1. Their results also support safety grates as the safety treatment for cross-drainage culverts with the highest cost-to-benefit ratio.

Methodology

At the time this report was completed, no route-specific crash statistics were available. Instead, the report presents a review of network-level crash statistics from 2012 to 2016 for Kentucky. The crash statistics are based on the KABCO injury scale, which law enforcement uses to classify the resultant injury severity of accidents. The two classifications of most concern are K and A, which are fatalities and incapacitating injuries, respectively. The remaining classifications — B, C, and O — refer to non-incapacitating injury, possible injury but not evident, and no injury detected, respectively. Each crash report identifies the location of the object struck during the first harmful event, second harmful event, and most harmful event. To understand the dangers posed by headwalls, the Kentucky Transportation Center (KTC) research team compared the number of crashes involving fixed objects to those which involved headwalls. For this project fixed objects were identified as the following: bridge pier abutment, bridge parapet end, bridge rail, fence, cable barrier, concrete barrier, culvert headwall, curbing, fire hydrant, guardrail end, guardrail face, light support, mailbox, median support, other fixed object, other non-movable object, other post/pole/support, overhead sign post, sign post, traffic signal support, tree, and utility pole.

Researchers selected two HSIP projects to document the installation of sloped and mitered concrete headwalls. The first project was KY 1600 in Hardin County (CID 16-4207) from MP 3.315 to MP 8.528. Researchers observed the construction of the sloped and mitered concrete headwalls and documented the installation of select headwalls. Documentation consisted of spot checks of the headwall slope, width, length, edge width, reinforcement type and configuration, and slab thickness, along with taking photos of the installation and headwalls. The second project was KY 54 in Ohio County (CID 17-4006) from MP 0.000 to MP 6.018. The only documentation of this project was photographs of the finished headwalls.

KTC researchers compared the cost of sloped and mitered concrete headwalls to standard headwalls of the same size. Four projects were selected to make this comparison, including the aforementioned KY 1600 project and the KY 54 project. Two other HSIP projects were examined to generate cost comparisons — the KY 1304 project (HSIP 9010, CID 17-4001) and the US 460 project (HSIP 4601, CID 17-4114). Researchers looked up the awarded unit bid costs for each project and compared the cost for each size headwall and type of headwall.

Researchers learned that the Kentucky standard for sloped and mitered concrete headwalls is based on the Florida Department of Transportation's (DOT) Cross Drain Mitered End Section Standard, but that other states may be using a similar structure. Therefore, the final portion of this report highlights other states

³ Sicking, Dean L., Robert W. Bielenberg, John R. Rohde, John D. Reid, Ronald K. Faller, and Karla A. Polivka. "Safety Grates for Cross-Drainage Culverts." *Transportation Research Record* 2060 (2008): 67-73.

using a sloped and mitered concrete headwall and compare their designs with Kentucky's design. A survey was sent out to DOT officials in each state asking about their state's use of sloped and mitered concrete headwalls and if the they had any construction specifications, standard drawings, or standard details. Six states responded — Oregon, Idaho, Illinois, New Jersey, South Dakota, and Virginia. Only Oregon confirmed the use of sloped and mitered concrete headwalls. An online specification search identified Oklahoma and Texas as other DOTs using this type of headwall. Researchers then found and compared the details or standards developed in these states to Kentucky's detail.

Findings

Kentucky Crash Statistics

The research team analyzed Kentucky crash statistics from 2012 to 2016 to find the percentage of accidents involving fixed objects. There were 770 fatalities associated with a fixed object for the first harmful event, and 49 of those were related to a culvert/headwall. Fixed objects accounted for 2,428 incapacitating injuries; 148 were attributed to a culvert/headwall. The second harmful event identified 668 fatalities associated with a fixed object, with 48 of these being associated with a culvert/headwall.

	First Event						
	Κ	А	В	С	0	Totals	
Fixed Object	770	2,428	6,273	8,198	58,917	61,966	
Headwall	49	148	353	456	1,645	2,651	

 Table 1 KABCO Crash Data for Fixed Objects and Headwalls From 2012-2016

	Second Event						
	Κ	А	В	С	0	Totals	
Fixed Object	668	1,873	4,526	5,495	20,139	45,504	
Headwall	48	111	211	261	728	1,359	

	Most Harmful Event					
	Κ	А	В	С	0	Totals
Fixed Object	846	1	0	15	7	1,189
Headwall	46	0	0	0	0	46

KY 1600 Project

Researchers made two initial observations on the KY 1600 project. The first pertained to the construction sequence for the sloped and mitered concrete headwall. Construction of the headwall preceded the final grading, and the contractor performing the installation was required to set the grade of the headwalls. The contractor expressed apprehension regarding this to researchers during their first day at the job site. KYTC's sloped and mitered concrete headwall detail (see Appendix B) has dimensions for 4:1 and 6:1 headwall installations. Sixteen headwalls were checked for slope, and 11 of those were installed on a slope steeper than a 4:1. The second observation was that headwalls for skewed pipes were installed in-line with the pipe rather than perpendicular to the roadway (Figure 1).



Figure 1 Headwall Installed on a Skew at STA 170+76 RT

Several issues arise due to this incorrect installation. It creates a launch point and potentially transforms a traversable slope into one that is non-traversable. Headwalls like the one mentioned above were reconstructed (Figure 2) to conform to the sloped and mitered concrete headwall detail and the intent of the project.



Figure 2 Reconstructed Headwall at STA 170+76 RT

Other ways in which this installation deviated from the standard detail were the minimum 3 foot-slab length past the crown of the headwall and the use of No. 5S deformed rebar rather than 6" x 6" - W2.9 x W2.9 welded wire fabric.

How far past the crown of the pipe a slab projects dictates the amount of earthen cover on the pipe. The detail gives the dimensions for the length of the headwall from the toe to the crown. If constructing a headwall on a 4:1 only using the longitudinal section and the dimension and quantities table, there will be

less than 5 inches of cover over the pipe when the headwall is projected the minimum 3 feet past the crown (Figure 3). Straight concrete headwalls and sloped and flared headwalls, which are used for pipes up to 27 inches in diameter, provide cover depths of 18 and 9 inches, respectively. Pipe culvert headwalls provide 12 to 13 inches of cover for pipes 30 to 42 inches in diameter. Given the proximity of these sloped and mitered concrete headwalls to the roadway the area may require future monitoring, especially for larger diameter pipes.



Figure 3 Depth of Cover For 24 Inch Pipe With 3-inch Wall Thickness

Comparing the amount of steel per foot, the use of No. 5 rebar does not appear to be an issue. The amount of reinforcing steel per foot when using the specified 6" x 6" - W2.9 x W2.9 welded wire fabric is 0.058 square inch per foot and No. 5 rebar on 12-inch centers each way has an area of 0.31 square inch.

The headwalls were constructed with the correct slab width and thickness specified by the detail. The raw metal exposed by mitering the CMP was protected. Before application of protection, evidence appeared of a separation between the mitered pipe end and the headwall (Figure 4), but there did not appear to be any signs that the pipe ends were secured to the headwall.

Construction of the headwalls generally took three days depending on whether they required grate bars. Multiple headwalls were formed in one day. Excavation, forming, placement of the reinforcement, and bedding took place one day, then pouring and finishing the concrete occurred the next day. Finishing the pipe and adding the grate bars occupied the final day. However, activities from excavation to finishing of the concrete could take place in one day.



Figure 4 Separation Between Headwall and Pipe End

The detail used does not distinguish between a headwall for a pipe crossing beneath a road and a headwall for a pipe that runs parallel to the road (e.g., an entrance pipe). This distinction is important because it determines the alignment and separation of the grate bars. Though it appears the grate bars were installed according to the detail, they were not installed in a manner that would allow a vehicle to traverse the headwall. Figure 5 shows the finished headwall with grate bars for a 36-inch pipe. This pipe is larger than 30 inches, and there is not a grate bar perpendicular to traffic as recommended by AASHTO. Appendix A contains the remaining photo documentation and notes.



Figure 5 Grate Bars on 36-inch Sloped and Mitered Concrete Headwall

KY 54 Project

This project used the sloped and mitered concrete headwall as well as the safety type box inlet. The project had been completed when it was selected for this study, however, the project proposal contained pictures

of existing headwalls on the project which illustrate the roadway improvement provided by the sloped and mitered concrete headwall. The project also used a revised detail (see Appendix C) for the sloped and mitered concrete headwall.

Figure 6 shows an existing straight headwall adjacent to the roadway with an inlet ditch 3-4 feet below the roadway grade. Figure 7 captures the improvement to the clear zone, which included extending the existing pipe, regrading of the foreslope, and installing a sloped and mitered concrete headwall. The headwall projecting above grade was removed and the slope is now traversable. This was a typical type of improvement for this project. Appendix A includes additional photos and notes.



Figure 6 Existing Headwall



Figure 7 New Headwall and Improvements to the Clear Zone

Pipe ends were secured to the headwall per the detail, but the raw metal from the mitered ends of the pipe was not protected (Figure 8).



Figure 8 Mitered Pipe End Secured to Headwall

There is a discontinuity in the slope in at Station 68+75 RT,. The depression is located above the pipe and around the headwall (Figure 9). This pipe was not included in the proposal, and there was no designed pipe profile sheet. The pipe was within the limits of a superelevation improvement and might have been added later.



Figure 9 Depression Above Pipe

The safety type Box inlet was the second type of headwall used on this project. Although not a part of this monitoring effort, there was a common observation in 6 of the 7 headwalls. Figure 10 shows a safety type

box inlet for a 24-inch pipe. The detail illustrates a grate that is 6.5-feet long and extends to the structure's toe. The grates on a majority of these type of headwalls have blockages ranging from 25% to 75%.



Figure 10 Safety Type Box Inlet Grate Blocked

Debris collects on the grate because it extends to the toe. This will require periodic maintenance as it could encourage water to pond and overtop the roadway (depending on site conditions) or compromise the roadway embankment by allowing the embankment material to remain saturated. Since these headwalls are installed parallel to the roadway and an approaching vehicle must be able to traverse the grate from the toe, one solution is to leave a sufficiently large opening at the toe of the headwall to let smaller debris pass. AASHTO recommends a the lower grate bar on parallel drainage to be 4 to 8 inches above the flowline of the headwall.

Headwall Cost Comparison

Table 1 lists the awarded unit bid prices for each headwall type by project. The most accurate form of cost comparison would be to compare the cost of the same sized sloped and mitered concrete headwall and a standard pipe culvert headwall from the same project. However, while the KY 54 project has both types of the same size headwall, including the safety box type inlet, the KY 1600 project lacks standard pipe culvert headwalls. Sloped and mitered concrete headwall were roughly 2/3 the cost of the standard pipe culvert headwall and a little over 1/2 of the cost of the safety type box inlet. Cost comparisons were also developed for two additional HSIP projects, the KY 1304 project (HSIP 9010, CID 17-4001) and the US 460 project (HSIP 4601, CID 17-4114). These projects had both headwall types of the same size. The price of sloped and mitered concrete headwalls ranged from 45% to 70% of the cost of the cost of the cost inlets.

Headwall Type	KY 1600	Project	KY 54 P	roject	KY 1304	Project	US 460 H	Project
	Unit Bid	Qty	Unit Bid	Qty	Unit Bid	Qty	Unit Bid	Qty
18" S&M	\$1,400	30	\$1,900	9	\$1,180	7	\$1,040	1
18" SBI	-	-	\$3,400	2	-	-	-	-

 Table 2 Headwall Cost Comparison

18" PC	-	-	\$2,600	5	\$1,650	7	\$1,600	1
24" S&M	\$1,800	11	\$1,900	7	\$1,300	7	\$750	4
24" SBI			\$3,500	2				
24" PC	-	-	\$3,000	4	\$1,800	7	\$1,655	2
30" S&M	\$2,000	8	-	-	\$1,350	4	-	-
30" PC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
36" S&M	\$2,500	3	-	-	\$1,375	1	-	-
36" PC	-	-	-	-	\$2,500	2	-	-
42" S&M	\$2,800	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
42" PC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Review of State DOT Details

A review of state DOT materials turned up limited results. No state standard specification mentions mitered to slope headwalls. However, the research team located either design details or standard drawings from the Florida, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Texas DOTs.

The Florida DOT's 2014 Design Standards include drawings for a cross drain mitered end section either on a 2:1 or 4:1 miter slope for pipes up to 72 inches in diameter depending on pipe material type. The end section can be used with round reinforced concrete pipe (RCP), corrugated metal pipe (CMP), high density polyethylene pipe (HDPE), polyvinyl-chloride pipe (PVC), and polypropylene pipe (PPP). Single and double barrel installations are permitted for elliptical RCP and arch CMP. The concrete slab must consist of Class NS concrete. Slab thickness can be 3 or 5.5 inches, but 5.5 inches is typical. The concrete is reinforced with 6 x 6 - W1.4 x W1.4 welded wire fabric. Slab dimensions vary with pipe size and mitered slope, but the length should be sufficient to provide adequate cover over the crown of the pipe with the slab bridging the crown. Slab width should extend 1.5 feet past the pipe on both sides. The upper corners of the headwall are to be rounded or beveled. The pipe joint's location under the headwall is also controlled. The detail also provides guidance on the use dissimilar materials when extending an existing pipe and adding the headwall. The detail, however, does not mention the use grates. Refer to Appendix D for more information.

The Oklahoma DOT design standards include culvert end treatments — both single and double pipe installations — and at 4:1 and 6:1 safety slopes. Concrete slab dimensions are similar to Florida's detail and must be constructed of Class A concrete 4 inches thick and reinforced with No. 4 bars. Safety grates are required for all side drains, with the grates running transverse to the face of the headwall on 30-inch centers max. Cross drains larger than 30 inches require that grate bars run longitudinally with the headwall. The grate bars are 3-inch schedule 40 steel pipe. Refer to Appendix E for more detail.

The Texas and Oregon DOTs both allow the use of a similar headwall on pipe up to 60 inches and 72 inches, respectively. Slab thickness is 4 inches and like Oklahoma, both agencies require use of a pipe runner down the long axis of the headwall to ensure the headwall is traversable for pipes larger than 30 inches. The Oregon DOT calls for $4 \times 4 - W4 \times W4$ welded wire fabric or No.4 rebar on 18-inch centers each way. It also requires the placement of anchor bolts around the perimeter on a maximum of 18-inch centers.

Table 2 compares the revised KYTC sloped and mitered concrete headwall detail used on the KY 54 project to similar headwall standards from other states. It does not compare the requirements for pipes on a skewed condition, but the Texas DOT has comprehensive dimensions for skewed pipe installations. The Florida, Oklahoma, and Texas DOT standards distinguish between cross drains and side drains, which affect

requirements and the alignment of grate bars. The required class of concrete is also not specified in the detail, however, Class A concrete is to be used. Florida and Oklahoma's DOTs require additional concrete above the crown of the pipe. If cover depth is a concern, adding protection to the crown should be considered.

	KY	FLA	OK	ТХ	OR	
Pipe Sizes	15" - 42"	15" - 72"	18" - 48"	12" - 60"	12" - 72"	
Pipe Material	not specified	RCP, CMP, HDPE, PVC, PPP	not specified	RCP, CMP	RCP, CMP, HDPE, PVC, PPP	
Slope	3:1, 4:1, 6:1	2:1, 4:1	4:1, 6:1	3:1, 4:1, 6:1	3:1, 4:1, 6:1	
Concrete Type	not specified	NS	А	not specified commercial grad		
Slab Thickness	5.5"	3", 5.5"	4"	4"	4"	
Extra Thickness Above Crown	no	yes	yes	no	no	
Slab Length Past Crown	3'	varies	varies	varies	varies	
Slab Width Past Pipe	2'	1.5'	2'	not specified	1.5'	
Slab Reinforcement	WWF 6"x6"W2.9 xW2.9	WWF 6"x6"W1.4 xW1.4	No.4 bar	not specified	WWF 4"x4"W4xW4 or No.4 bar 18" CCEW	
Requires Grate (cross drains)	36" - 42"	not specified	36" - 48"	> 30"	36" - 72"	
Requires Grate (side drain)	36" – 42"	n/a	18" - 48"	not specified	not specified	
Grate Size	2.5" ID	n/a	3.0"	varies	4.5" OD	
Grate Material	Sch40 galv. steel	n/a	Sch40 galv. steel	Galv. steel grade B	extra strong galv. steel	
Parallel Grate Spacing	24" max	n/a	30"	24"	n/a	

 Table 3 DOT Headwall Detail Summary Comparison

Summary & Recommendations

NCHRP Synthesis 321: *Roadway Safety Tools for Local Agencies* recommends mitigating the exposed portions of a headwall, while the FHWA suggests using a traversable headwall design to replace headwalls that are potentially hazardous. The *AASHTO Roadside Design Guide* endorses using traversable headwalls for cross drain pipes and parallel pipes with the toe of the foreslope and ditch being traversable, as this produces considerable safety benefits. Sloped and mitered concrete headwalls meet the criteria outlined in industry guidance by fabricating a traversable slope from one that is non-traversable, removing vertically projecting obstructions created by traditional headwalls, eliminating launch points on foreslopes, doing away with the opening an errant vehicle can drop into if traversing a headwall, and improving the safety of mowing operations.

Between 2012 and 2016, KABCO crash statistics for Kentucky indicated there were 49 fatalities and 148 incapacitating injuries in which culverts/headwalls were the location for the first harmful event. Sloped and mitered concrete headwalls are designed improve the safety of the roadway by providing a traversable slope for vehicles and reducing the likelihood of severe incidents shown in the statistics above.

The research team observed several issues on the KY 1600 project. The embankment's final grade was not set when the headwalls were installed, leaving the contractor responsible for installation to set the grade of the headwalls. An incorrect headwall alignment was used for pipes on a skew. Inadequate cover was placed over the pipe when field modifying the headwall and/or using the guidance in the detail to construct the headwall. There was evidence of the pipe ends separating from the headwall and that they had not been secured to the headwall. Lastly, grate bars perpendicular to traffic were not installed on the pipes with larger diameters. Issues observed on this project resulted from the convergence of several factors, including vague construction methods, lack of guidance on the standard detail for grate bars and skewed pipes, and inexperience by all parties with constructing this type of end treatment. Based on its analysis of the KYTC 1600 project, the research team suggests having the grade established before installing sloped and mitered concrete headwalls, adding grate bars, securing pipe ends to the headwall, and identifying select headwalls for long-term monitoring, with inspections being conducted annually.

The KY 54 project lacked skewed pipes, and pipe diameters were less than 30 inches. As such, grate bars were unneeded for the sloped and mitered concrete headwall. Although the pipe ends were secured to the headwall, the exposed metal was not protected. Before and after photographs show the improved embankment slope conditions resulting from the use of the sloped and mitered concrete headwall. Most the safety type box inlets have debris built up on the grate, which could cause maintenance and safety issues. Based on its examination of the KY 54 project, the research team recommends that exposed raw metal on the pipe ends be protected and the grates on the safety type box inlets undergo regular maintenance. Consideration should also be given to altering the grate length of safety type box inlets so as to reduce the blockage potential from debris.

DOTs in Florida, Oklahoma, Texas, and Oregon are a few of the agencies that use a headwall similar to the sloped and mitered concrete headwall. Kentucky limits the use of this type of end treatment to pipes 42 inches in diameter and smaller, whereas the other states permit installation of the headwall on pipes with larger diameters. In Florida and Oklahoma, concrete must be added above the crown of the pipe. If cover depth is a concern, requiring added protection to the crown should be considered. In Kentucky and Florida, a slab thickness of 5.5 inches is used rather than a 4-inch-thick slab. This allows dimensional lumber to be used as a form. KYTC requires the smallest grate bar diameter at 2.5 inches. Other states use mandate grate

bars on the range of 3 to 4.5 inches. AASHTO recommends the minimum of a 3-inch ID for the perpendicular grate bar with a span less than 12 feet. The greater the span the larger the pipe ID. If this type of headwall is to be used for side drains, the detail must be clear on the requirements and alignment of the grate bars for both types of applications. However, consideration of mowing operations may influence grate bar requirements.

A review of the awarded unit bid cost for the various headwall types found that sloped and mitered concrete headwalls are more cost effective than standard precast pipe end treatments and multiple headwalls can be constructed in two or three days. Maintenance operations will benefit from their use due to their being less expensive and taking less time to install than other headwall types. If problems arise with existing headwall, maintenance personnel will be able to install a sloped and mitered concrete headwall more rapidly than waiting for the fabrication and delivery of a precast headwall. In addition, installation of sloped and mitered concrete headwalls can be accomplished without any special equipment.

Appendix A Hardin County and Ohio County Photos

County	Hardin			
Route	KY-1600			
Headwall #	1s			
Station	105+85 Left			
Diameter	24			
Skew	2°37′ RT			
Comments	Pipe installed. Headwall formwork constructed. Rebar installed. Pipe mitered to slope. Vegetation established			
	Headwall slope was 3:1.			
	Contractor constructing headwalls remarked that keeping grade of headwall at 4:1 or better was problematic. Some pipes needed to be extended. 3-foot minimum length of slab beyond pipe crown would be difficult to attain in areas where embankment slope was steeper.			
	<image/>			





County	Hardin	
Route	KY-1600	
Headwall #	1n	
Station	105+85 Right	5.80.0
Diameter	24	A STATE
Skew	2°37′ RT	No.
Comments	Pipe installed. No. 5S rebar used rather than welded wire fabric. Pipe needed to be extended to achieve 4:1. Pipe mitered to slope. Vegetation established. Headwall slope was 4:1.	
	<image/>	





County	Hardin		
Route	KY-1600		
Headwall #	2n		
Station	161+97 Right		
Diameter	30		
Skew	35°05′ LT		
Comments	Headwall was not constructed perpendicular to the roadway. Pipe extended and joint located within mitered section of pipe. 3-foot minimum length beyond crown not achieved. Headwall was reconstructed perpendicular to roadway. Pipe mitered to headwall. Grate bars were added. Skewed headwall: slope was 3:1, length was 9 feet, width was 6.5 feet, edge width was 2 feet, slab thickness was 4-inches, length of slab above crown was 1.25 feet.		





County	Hardin	
Route	KY-1600	
Headwall #	2s	
Station	161+97 Left	
Diameter	30	
Skew	35°05′ LT	
Comments	Headwall was not constructed perpendicular to the roadway. 3-foot minimum length beyond crown not achieved. Headwall was reconstructed perpendicular to roadway. Pipe mitered to headwall. Grate bar was added. Skewed headwall: slope was 4:1, length was 8 feet, width was 6.5 feet, edge width was 2 feet, slab thickness was 4- inches, length of slab above crown was 1.75 feet.	



County	Hardin	-
Route	KY-1600	The of
Headwall #	3n	
Station	164+71 Right	
Diameter	42	
Skew	3°06′ LT	
Comments	Exposure at end is greater than 3.25-inches. 3-foot minimum length beyond crown not achieved. Pipe mitered to headwall. Metal grate bars were added on 24- inch centers. No longitudinal bar though the pipe is over 30 inches in diameter. Headwall: slope was 4:1, length was 11 feet, width was 7.5 feet, edge width was 2 feet, slab thickness was 4- inches, length of slab above crown was 1.75 feet.	





County	Hardin
Route	KY-1600
Headwall #	3s
Station	164+71 Left
Diameter	42
Skew	3°06′ LT
Comments	Headwall was not constructed perpendicular to the roadway. 3-foot minimum length beyond crown not achieved. Pipe Mitered to headwall. Metal grate bars were added on 24-inch centers. No longitudinal bar though the pipe is over 30 inches in diameter. Headwall: slope was 3:1, length was 10.5 feet, width was 7.5 feet, edge width was 2 feet, slab thickness was 4- inches, length of slab above crown was 2 feet, grates spaced on 24-inch centers.
	Contraction of the second seco





County	Hardin	220
Route	KY-1600	
Headwall #	4n	
Station	170+76 Right	6
Diameter	36	3 6.00
Skew	27°47′ RT	
Comments	Headwall was not constructed perpendicular to the	
	roadway. Pipe mitered to headwall. Metal grate bars	100
	were added on 24-inch centers.	
		10
	Headwall: slope was 3:1, length was 11.5 feet, width was	
	7 leet, edge width was 2 leet, slab thickness was 5.5-	and a
	inches, grates spaced on 24-inch centers.	and the second
		1990
and the second second	A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR O	
and the street of		
And a start of the		
R	the second second second	
A Carlos		
A Starter	E SHAMMAN THE COMPANY	
1		
1. 1. 1.		
20 . To 1		
The second		
N AND		
Sector Sector		
· · · · · · · · ·		





County	Hardin		
Route	KY-1600		
Headwall #	4s		
Station	170+76 Left		
Diameter	36		
Skew	27°47′ RT		
Comments	Headwall was not constructed perpendicular to the roadway. 3-foot minimum length beyond crown not achieved. Headwall was reconstructed perpendicular to roadway. Pipe mitered to headwall. Grate bars were added. No longitudinal bar though the pipe is over 30 inches in diameter. Headwall: slope was 2.5:1, length was 7.5 feet, width was 7 feet, edge width was 2 feet, slab thickness was 5.5- inches, length of slab above crown was 2.5 feet, grates spaced on 24-inch centers.		
	<image/>		





County	Hardin		
Route	KY-1600		
Headwall #	5n		
Station	212+97 Right		
Diameter	18		
Skew	31°14′ LT		
Comments	Headwall was not constructed perpendicular to the roadway. Headwall was reconstructed perpendicular to roadway. Headwall: slope was 2:1, length was 6.5 feet, width was 5.5 feet, edge width was 2 feet, slab thickness was 4- inches, length of slab above crown was 5 feet.	御たった たいとうしょうかい	



County	Hardin	
Route	KY-1600	
Headwall #	5s	
Station	212+97 Left	
Diameter	18	
Skew	31°14′ LT	
Comments	Headwall was not constructed perpendicular to the roadway. Headwall was reconstructed perpendicular to roadway. Pipe not mitered to headwall. Headwall: slope was 4:1, length was 6.5 feet, width was 5.5 feet, edge width was 2 feet, slab thickness was 4- inches, length of slab above crown was 4 feet.	

County	Hardin	
Route	KY-1600	
Headwall #	7n	
Station	308+53 Right	
Diameter	36	
Skew	44°19′	
Comments	Existing pipe extended. Pipe end mitered to slope of headwall. Single grate bar installed.	



County	Hardin	
Route	KY-1600	
Headwall #	8s	
Station	348+16 Left	
Diameter	30	
Skew	12°51′ RT	
Comments	Headwall was not constructed perpendicular to the roadway. Formwork to final grading. Pipe mitered to headwall. Headwall: slope was 4:1.	

County	Hardin	S. S
Route	KY-1600	a train a second
Headwall #	9n	
Station	361+79 Right	
Diameter	24	-
Skew	0°	ALC: CONTRACT
Comments	Pipe extended. Formed and No. 5S rebar installed on ~ 12-inch spacing. Final grading around headwall. Headwall: slope was 3:1. Rebar spacing was approximately 12-inches.	







County	Hardin	
Route	KY-1600	
Headwall #	10n	
Station	367+68 Right	
Diameter	18	
Skew	4°31′ LT	and the second s
Comments	Existing pipe extended. Headwall formed and rebar installed. Final grading. Small portion of pipe exposed was not mitered. Headwall: slope was 2.5:1.	

County	Hardin	
Route	KY-1600	
Headwall #	10s	
Station	367+68 Left	
Diameter	18	
Skew	4°31′ LT	
Comments	Headwall poured. Pipe end mitered and final grading. Exposed raw metal protected. Headwall: slope was 3.5:1, length was 7 feet, width was 5.5 feet, edge width was 2 feet, slab thickness was 4- inches, length of slab above crown was 3 feet.	




County	Hardin	
Route	KY-1600	
Headwall #	11s	
Station	183+65 Left	and the second s
Diameter	15	-
Skew	6°57′ RT	
Comments	3-foot minimum length beyond crown not achieved. Headwall formed and rebar installed.	

County	Hardin	and a start a start and a start a start and a start a start a st
Route	KY-1600	June Barris
Headwall #	12n	
Station	356+20 Right	A CONTRACT OF A
Diameter	18	Tanin and Aller
Skew	4°39′ RT	
Comments	Headwall formwork installed. Granular fill material placed. Rebar installed and concrete poured. Seeding Final grading around headwall. Pipe mitered to slope of headwall.	
	<image/>	





County	Hardin	
Route	KY-1600	
Headwall #	13n	
Station	375+41 Right	
Diameter	18	
Skew	3°25′ RT	
Comments	Headwall formwork installed. Granular fill material placed. Rebar installed. Final grading around headwall.	
	<image/>	

County	Hardin	
Route	KY-1600	
Headwall #	13s	
Station	375+41 Left	
Diameter	18	
Skew	3°25′ RT	
Comments	Headwall formwork installed. Granular fill material placed. Rebar installed. Concrete being finished. Pipe did not extend to end of headwall. Final grading around headwall.	
		<image/>

County	Ohio	
Route	KY-54	
Headwall #	1 Northside	
Station	26+80 Left	and
Diameter	24	and the second s
Skew		
Comments	Existing headwall replaced by safety type box inlet. Inlet blocked approximately 40%.	

County	Ohio	
Route	KY-54	
Headwall #	1 Southside	
Station	26+80 Right	
Diameter		
Skew		
Comments	Existing headwall replaced by safety type box inlet. Inlet more than 50% blocked. Grate extends to toe of headwall.	08/19/2016
	<image/>	

County	Ohio	
Route	КҮ-54	
Headwall #	2	
Station	33+20	
Diameter		
Skew	no	
Comments	Pipe mitered to headwall and secured to headwall. No evidence of added protection applied to the cut end of the pipe.	
		<image/>

County	Ohio	
Route	KY-54	
Headwall #	3 Northside	and the print of the state of the
Station	Approx. 50+60 Left	and the second se
Diameter	18	A PARTY AND A PART
Skew	no	
Comments	Inlet replaced by safety type box inlet. The safety type box inlet grate was covered ~40% by debris.	
	<image/>	



County	Ohio	
Route	KY-54	
Headwall #	4	
Station	Approx. 68+75	Constant Providence
Diameter		
Skew		
Comments	Mitered to slope headwall installed. Depression above headwall. Slope of headwall could have been increased.	
	<image/>	



County	Ohio	
Route	KY-54	
Headwall #	6 Northside	
Station	109+15 Left	
Diameter	15	
Skew	no	
Comments	Outlet sloped and flared headwall replaced by mitered to slope headwall. CMP was secured to headwall. No evidence of added protection applied to the cut end of the pipe.	
		<image/>

County	Ohio	
Route	KY-54	
Headwall #	6 Southside	
Station	109+15 Right	
Diameter	15	
Skew	no	and the second sec
Comments	Inlet sloped and flared headwall replaced by safety type box inlet Debris build up at inlet at toe of grate.	08/19/2016
	<image/>	



County	Ohio	
Route	КҮ-54	
Headwall #	8	A AND AND A
Station	Approx. 199+60	and the second sec
Diameter	24	
Skew	no	
Comments	Existing headwall replaced by mitered to slope headwall. CMP was secured to headwall. No evidence of added protection applied to the cut end of the pipe.	

County	Ohio	
Route	КҮ-54	
Headwall #	9	
Station	241+20	
Diameter		
Skew	no	
Comments	Double safety box inlet installed. Inlet is already blocked 50% and water is ponding.	

County	Ohio	
Route	KY-54	The section of the se
Headwall #	10 Southside	ALL
Station	Approx. 316+30 Right	
Diameter	18	The second s
Skew	no	
Comments	Existing outlet headwall replaced by mitered to slope headwall.	

County	Ohio	
Route	KY-54	
Headwall #	10 Northside	
Station	Approx. 316+30 Left	
Diameter	18	
Skew	no	
Comments	Existing inlet headwall replaced by mitered to slope headwall.	

County	Ohio	
Route	KY-54	
Headwall #	11	
Station	Approx. 317+10	
Diameter		
Skew	no	
Comments	Pipe mitered to headwall and secured to headwall. No evidence of added protection applied to the cut end of the pipe.	

County	Ohio	
Route	KY-54	
Headwall #	12 Northside	
Station	319+10 Left	
Diameter	18	
Skew	no	
Comments	Existing inlet headwall replaced by safety type box inlet. Inlet blocked 25%.	

County	Ohio		
Route	КҮ-54		
Headwall #	12 Southside		
Station	319+10 Right		
Diameter	18		
Skew	no		
Comments	Existing outlet headwall replaced by mitered to slope headwall on a 3:1 slope.		
		<image/>	

Appendix B Hardin County Detail



ARDIN COUNTY SIP 9010 (257)



KTC Research Report Sloped and Mitered Concrete Headwalls

Appendix C Ohio County Detail

Contract ID: 174006 Page 135 of 186



Contract ID: 174006 Page 136 of 186



IO COUNTY P 5078 (014) Appendix D Florida DOT Detail













Appendix E Oklahoma DOT Detail




Appendix F Texas DOT Detail







Appendix G Oregon DOT Detail



Effective Date: June 1, 2016 - November 30, 2016

