

As-Built Modelling and Assessment

Ioannis Brilakis, Ph.D.

Laing O'Rourke Lecturer in Construction Engineering

Civil, Structural and Environmental Engineering

Restoring and Improving Urban Infrastructure

- Engineering Grand Challenge (NAE, 2008)
- Lack of viable methods to map/label existing infrastructure
 - E.g. 2/3 of modelling effort spent manually converting raw data to geometric model (Jaselskis et al., 2008)
 - Result: As-built models not produced for most new and retrofit construction
 - Leads to rework and design changes (NAE, 2008)
 - Cost up to 10% of installed costs (Reddington, 2005)
 - Lead to reduced sustainability (significant material waste)











How do you build better infrastructure?

Novel construction materials may help address some of these challenges. <u>But dramatic</u> progress may be possible only by developing entirely new construction methods. Most of the basic methods of manual construction have been around for centuries — even millennia. <u>Advances in computer science and robotics should make more automation pos-</u> sible in construction, for instance, greatly speeding up construction times and lowering costs. Electricity networks linking large central-station and decentralized power sources will also benefit from greater embedded computation.









Material Based Image Classification





Multi-modal Image Retrieval





Graphics Program



Infrastructure Objects Recognition







From spatial/visual data to a 3D Model

- Point clouds / images have no knowledge of the elements they contain
 - What they are made of
 - Which points/pixels belong to which entities
- Cannot provide any other as-built information besides spatial measurements
 - i.e. material info, health info, etc.
- Purpose of as-built modelling = Convert spatial/visual data to information rich, object-oriented model







Infrastructure Objects Recognition





Results – Columns Detection



- 89.1% precision (TP/TP+FP)
- 79.1% recall (TP/TP+TN)
- 320x240, 25 fps on a netbook







As-Built Geometry







Real World Infrastructure to 3D Points

- Measuring object size needs 3D data
- Getting adequate/accurate 3D data is costly
 - Device costs (i.e. laser scanner) + Labour (data collection + post processing man-hou)
 - Result: Small/medium sized on-going and completed projects cannot afford it
 - Let alone getting 3D data frequently, throughout the construction phase











Coordinating Efforts

Marie Curie IRSES Program



Consortium established in 2008 to formalize the as-built modeling













Damage and Defects Assessment







Post-Earthquake Structural Safety Assessment

- FEMA 306 (rapid)
- ATC-20 (rough)
- FEM (detailed)

	Damage Level	Performance Level		Qualitative Performance Description		Quantitative Performance Description				
	I	Cra	cking	Onset of hairline cracks		Barely visible residual cracks				
	п	Yielding		Theoretical first yield of longitudinal reinforcement		Residual crack width ~ 0.008 in (0.2 mm)				
	III	Init Loc Me	tiation of cal chanism	Initiation of inelastic deformation. Onset of concrete spalling. Development of diagonal cracks.			Residual crack width 0.04in – 0.08in (1 – 2mm). Length of spalled region > 1/10 cross-section depth.			
	IV	Full Development of Local Mechanism		Wide crack widths/spalling over full local mechanism region.			Residual crack width > 0.08in. (2mm). Diagonal cracks extend over $2/3$ cross-section depth. Length of spalled region > $\frac{1}{2}$ cross-section depth.			
1	V	V Strength Degradation		Buckling of main reinforcement. Rupture of transverse reinforcement. Crushing of core concrete.			Lateral capacity below 85% of maximum. Section depth expands to > 5% of original member dimension.			
of e.	Field Observations							Conclusions		
	Pronounced Horizontal Cracks		Pronounced Diagonal Cracks		Incipient Concrete Curshing/ Spalling	Long. Bar Buckling		Damage Level	Possible Failure Type	
	No		Yes		No	No		III	Shear	
	No or Yes		Yes		Yes	No or Yes		IV or V	Shear	

No

Yes

Yes

II or III

IV

V

No

No

Yes

Flexure

Flexure

Flexure

Severity	Description of Damage					
Insignificant	Criteria: • No crack widths excee	d 3/16 in., <u>and</u>	V	Strength		
	 No shear cracks exceed 	 No shear cracks exceed 1/8 m., and 				
	 No significant spalling 	or vertical cracking				
$\lambda_K = 0.8$	Typical Appearance:					
$\lambda_Q = 1.0$		Note:	Fiel			
λ _D = 1.0		l _p is length of plastic hinge. See Section 5.3.3	Pronounc Horizont Cracks	ed Pronou tal Diago Crack		
			No	Yes		
	XI		No or Ye	es Yes		
	2 <i>l</i> _p		Yes	No		
			Yes	No		
			Yes	No		

Problem Statement & Objectives

- Problem
 - Earthquakes create huge inspection demand within seconds takes weeks to months to assess all structures
 - In the mean time
 - ERs risk their lives in unsafe buildings (FEMA codes)
 - People stay out waiting for assessment (ATC codes)
- Objective
 - Shift the research focus from accuracy to speed
 - Get useful measurements automatically



Rapid Safety Assessment

Grant #1000700 Co-Pls: R. DesRoches, L. Lowes Video Frames Vision Tracking Processed New Scene Scene Parts Parts Concrete **Concrete Columns** Columns Detection Column Damage Damage Detection Assessment Damage Column Properties Damage Index

Collapse

Probability Assessment

Fragility Curve

Database

Risk

Translate them to remaining bearing capacity

Video camera

Get rapid measurements from video

Warn if collapse is imminent • $|\Delta|$ -|Δ| - L $|\Delta|$ - Max W / W* Orientation W* 3.29° 2.21% 0.35% Average 2.70° Std 2.90% 0.49%

m

d

h

...and there is much left to do







Future Research Directions

- Automation solutions for improved productivity and sustainability in construction
- Building objects detection and inference methods
- Sustainable pavement assessment methods
- As-is bridge modeling (BrIM) / highway asset mapping
- Vehicle classification and tracking for congestion pricing, stop-and-go waves estimation, etc.
- Automation advances in structural safety inspection
- UAV navigation for post-disaster structural assessment





Questions?



