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ABSTRACT

This research provides realistic techniques to visualize the process of damage to residential building caused by hurricane force winds. Three methods are implemented to make the visualization useful for educating the public about mitigation measures for their homes.

First, the underline physics uses *Quick Collision Response Calculation*. This is an iterative method, which can tune the accuracy and the performance to calculate collision response between building components. Secondly, the damage process is designed as a *Time-scalable Process*. By attaching a damage time tag for each building component, the visualization process is treated as a geometry animation allowing users to navigate in the visualization. The detached building components move in response to the wind force that is calculated using qualitative rather than quantitative techniques. The results are acceptable for instructional systems but not for engineering analysis. *Quick Damage Prediction* is achieved by using a database query instead of using a Monte-Carlo simulation. The database is based on HAZUS® engineering analysis data which gives it validity. A reasoning mechanism based on the definition of the overall building damage in HAZUS® is used to determine the damage state of selected building components including roof cover, roof sheathing, wall, openings and roof-wall connections. Exposure settings of environmental aspects of the simulated environment, such as ocean, trees, cloud and rain are integrated into a scene-graph based graphics engine. Based on the graphics engine and the physics engine, a procedural modeling method is used to efficiently render residential buildings. The resulting program, *Hurricane!*, is an instructional program for public education useful in schools and museum exhibits.
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CHAPTER 1:  INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

In a recent yearly progress report on the Florida Hurricane Alliance (FHA), Leatherman (2005) provides a persuasive case for hurricane research to improve our response to hurricanes and to prepare for them [LEA05]:

“Extreme hurricane events in recent years have, with an increasing sense of urgency, reinforced the proposition that the nation must continue to work on, but also move beyond weather prediction and evacuation to achieve significant damage reduction. Against this background, increasing population and urban development in coastal areas highlight the dynamic nature of our vulnerability to hurricanes and the urgency of the problem.”

The Florida Hurricane Alliance (FHA), the sponsor of the research reported in this dissertation, has done much to develop techniques for mitigating hurricane damage. Techniques to achieve this have included data collection, social and behavioral research, communication technology, computer modeling, simulation and visualization (the technique used in this dissertation project). The FHA is a multidisciplinary cooperative research effort, which brings together capabilities and evolving expertise of the public universities in Florida to focus on hurricane loss reduction. Public education regarding hurricane effects on residential buildings and mitigation techniques is one of the missions of the FHA, which this dissertation addresses.

Much research relating to hurricane damage mitigation has already been conducted. For example, the Hurricane Loss Reduction Project, conducted by research teams from Clemson University, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, the University of Illinois at
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Urbana-Champaign, Johns Hopkins University and the University of Florida, aims to strengthen the relevant scientific and engineering base [POW03], [COP04]. This program has included a coordinated series of research activities in areas like wind load magnitudes, wind characteristics, physical modeling and simulation of structural capacities, simulation and modeling tools for database-assisted, reliability-based design. The Florida Coastal Monitoring Program (FCMP) is another unique joint venture conducting full-scale experiment to quantify near-surface hurricane wind behavior and the resultant loads on residential structures [MAS03]. The FCMP aims to provide the data necessary for identifying methods to cost-effectively reduce hurricane wind damage to residential structures. FCMP is a contribution to improve the understanding of ground level hurricane winds and to develop the ability to simulate wind loading on low-rise structures in hurricane prone regions. In addition, the State of Florida Department of Insurance sponsors the development of an open catastrophic loss model to assess the risk to insured residential property due to damaging hurricane winds. This model allows for user input at all stages in order to examine various risk scenarios. Using a component approach, its Monte Carlo Simulation engine generates damage information for typical Florida homes and compares deterministic wind loads with the probabilistic capacity of vulnerable building components to determine the probability of damage.

In the wake of hurricane Katrina, data on damage to wood-frame residential structures along the U.S. Gulf Coast was collected under the direction of J. van de Lindt of Colorado State University [LIN05]. Residential buildings damage caused by hurricane Katrina shows that even small violations of building code can result in great damage. The general public tends not to understand building codes, that are mainly based on complicated engineering data and
meteorology. It is important to make hurricane damage and mitigation measures understandable to the general public. Previous hurricane visualization projects [WAT04], mostly focused on the macroscopic impact of hurricanes. A visualization system shows what happened in detail and is useful for educating the general public knowledge about hurricane mitigation measures.

Research shows that interactive simulation has a much more intuitive educational effect than a passive video [BOS88], [NET88], [FLE90] and [MUL92]. As a member of FHA, the University of Central Florida was tasked to develop an interactive simulation application for wind damage visualization to include a variety of structures and environmental conditions. The development of procedures and algorithms for automating and facilitating the creation of these visualizations were seen as necessary.

1.2 Problem Statement

The goal of this research is to realistically depict hurricane damage to typical residential buildings using an interactive simulation. To ensure the validity of the visualization, we use engineering analysis results (hurricane damage predictions), as an input to the visualization engine. However, the output is only an approximation of what would be achieved by engineering analysis, but sufficient for a computer-based training application. Figure 1.1 shows the damage prediction methodology used in engineering analysis. This process of hurricane damage prediction uses engineering analysis in an accurate and reliable fashion. With visualization, what matters is how it looks, and how much effort it takes to produce. Visualization for training purposes must be rendered in near real time, which is difficult if results suitable for engineering analysis are required.
Figure 1.2 shows comparison of a real picture of a residential building with shingles loss and a simple animation of shingles flying with the wind. Obviously, visualization is not a strict replication of real-life. In a real hurricane event, it could take hours to lose shingles. An effective visualization, suitable for education and training, should show shingles being lost in a much shorter time.

Figure 1.1 Damage prediction methodology (Image courtesy of K. Gurley)

Figure 1.2 A real-life picture of residential building with shingle loss (left) and an animation (right)

Hence, the visualization technique relies on a number of simplifications that would be unacceptable in an engineering context. The problem is how to simplify the damage process to
make the visualization understandable by the general public yet maintain enough engineering realism for educational purposes.

1.3 Research Contribution

The first research contribution is the development of a solid framework with graphics and physics engines to visualize the residential building damage process. The user defines both the residential building and the hurricane event. Interactivity between the program and the user typically makes for compelling instruction; it supports the process of “learn by doing”.

The second research contribution is to achieve an acceptable visual update frame-rate without over-simplifying the visualization to the point that it loses its realism. We implemented three methods.

1) **Quick Collision Response Calculation.** An iterative method is used to calculate collision response among building components. This results in objects converging in a realistic way based on preset thresholds.

2) **Time-scalable Damage Process Visualization.** The damage process visualization is treated as a geometry animation by attaching a damage time tag for each building component. Detached building components are allowed to move in response to the wind force that is calculated using qualitative rather than quantitative techniques. The results are acceptable for educational purposes but not for engineering analysis.
3) **Quick Damage Prediction.** We use a database query for damage prediction instead of using a Monte-Carlo simulation. The database is currently based on HAZUS® software. However, its flexible structure allows easy modification.

Based on the graphics engine and the physics engine, a procedural modeling method is used to model the residential building. Compared to the traditional way of modeling buildings offline, this method saves many hours of artists’ work. Use of the procedural modeling method also allows visualizing damage to multiple buildings during a hurricane event.

### 1.4 Dissertation Outline

The remainder of this document is organized as follows: Chapter 2 presents the overview design of the hurricane visualization system and the graphics engine. Chapter 3 describes the residential building static model. Chapter 4 describes the physics engine used in this research. Chapter 5 discusses the dynamic residential building model based on engineering analysis results relating to hurricane damage. Chapter 6 presents conclusions and recommendations for future research. Component-based software engineering (CBSE) is used in the system design and implementation. Unified modeling language (UML) is used to depict each component in detail.
CHAPTER 2: BUILDING DAMAGE VISUALIZATION SYSTEM OVERVIEW

This chapter gives an overview analysis and design of the system interface and the real-time simulation engine. Following the component-based software engineering (CBSE) method, a mix of bottom-up and top-down design approaches are used.

2.1 System Interface

System inputs consist of data relating to the surrounding terrain (the exposure setting) and the components of the building (building structure setting). The visualization system database structure is based on building damage data drawn from HAZUS®. The exposure definition includes incident wind, terrain type and amount of trees surrounding the building.

Wind speed used in HAZUS® ranges from 50 to 250 miles per hour (shown at 5 mph intervals). Table 2.1 shows the six categories wind speeds according to the Saffir-Simpson scale, along with a description of typical damage for each category.
Table 2.1 Hurricane category and its effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Wind Speed</th>
<th>Tree and Building Damage</th>
<th>Storm Surge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tropical Storm</td>
<td>39 - 73 mph</td>
<td>Minor damage to trees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1 Hurricane</td>
<td>74 - 95 mph</td>
<td>Normally almost no real damage to building structures. Damage to unanchored mobile homes and trees, with some damage to poorly constructed signs.</td>
<td>Some coastal road flooding and minor pier damage can occur. Storm surge is generally 4-5 feet above normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2 Hurricane</td>
<td>96 - 110 mph</td>
<td>Some roofing material, door, and window damage to buildings. Considerable damage to shrubbery and trees, some trees blown down. Considerable damage to mobile homes, some signs, and piers.</td>
<td>Coastal and low-lying escape routes flood 2-4 hours before arrival of the hurricane center. Storm surge is generally 6-8 feet above normal. Small craft in unprotected anchorages break moorings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3 Hurricane</td>
<td>111 - 130 mph</td>
<td>Some structural damage to small residences and utility buildings with some wall failures. Damage to shrubbery and trees with foliage blown off trees and large trees blown down. Mobile homes and poorly constructed signs are destroyed.</td>
<td>Low-lying escape routes are cut by rising water 3-5 hours before the arrival of the center of the hurricane. Storm surge is generally 9-12 feet above normal. Coastal flooding destroys smaller structures, larger structures damaged by battering from floating debris. Terrain lower than 5 feet above sea level may be flooded inland 8 miles or more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Wind Speed</td>
<td>Tree and Building Damage</td>
<td>Storm Surge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4</td>
<td>131-155</td>
<td>More extensive wall failures with some complete roof structure failures on small residences. Shrubs, trees, and all signs are blown down. Complete destruction of mobile homes. Extensive damage to doors and windows.</td>
<td>Low-lying escape routes may be cut by rising water 3-5 hours before arrival of the center of the hurricane. Storm surge is generally 13-18 feet above normal. There is major damage to lower floors of structures near the shore. Terrain that is lower than 10 feet above sea level may be flooded, requiring massive evacuation of residential areas as far inland as 6 miles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurricane</td>
<td>mph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5</td>
<td>Greater than 155 mph</td>
<td>All shrubs, trees, and signs are blown down. Complete destruction of mobile homes. Severe and extensive window and door damage.</td>
<td>Low-lying escape routes are cut by rising water 3-5 hours before arrival of the center of the hurricane. Storm surge is generally greater than 18 feet above normal. Major damage to lower floors of all structures located less than 15 feet above sea level and within 500 yards of the shoreline. Massive evacuation of residential areas on low ground within 5-10 miles of the shoreline may be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurricane</td>
<td>mph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both terrain types and amount of trees surrounding the building are important exposure settings because they contribute to terrain roughness which is a critical component in the modeling of wind effects, damage, and loss to buildings and facilities as increasing terrain roughness generally decreases wind speed, and damage to buildings.
Types of terrain include: open, light suburban, suburban, light trees and trees. Table 2.2 shows their corresponding surface roughness defined in HAZUS®.

Table 2.2 Surface roughness of different types of terrain defined in HAZUS®

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terrain Type</th>
<th>Surface Roughness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Sururban</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Trees</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the ground surface becomes rougher, the wind speeds near the ground decrease, relative to wind speed at 5-15 meters. Consequently, the wind loads experienced by structures located in a typical suburban, treed, or urban environment are much lower than those experienced by buildings located in waterfront and open field locations. The wind loads experienced by one- and two-story structures located in areas with many trees may be as low as one-half of those experienced by similar structures located in an open environment. Two types of terrain, open terrain and suburban terrain are defined in the current visualization system. Figure 2.1 is an example of suburban terrain (top) and open terrain (bottom) used in current visualization system. Open terrain consists of open land with only one or just a few houses. Suburban terrain typically consists of many houses on relatively large lots and has more open space and fewer houses than an urban region.
Three types of trees amounts are: no trees, few trees and many trees. A house with a few trees around it is less likely to be damaged by a hurricane than a house with no trees (assuming a tree is not blown down onto the house. Proper pruning tips should be followed. A house with many trees around it is even less likely to be damaged by a hurricane providing that the correct variety of trees are selected and planted at least 30 feet from the house.
Figure 2.1 An example of suburban terrain in current visualization system.

Figure 2.2 An example of open terrain used in current visualization system.
Figure 2.3 An example of a building surrounded by many trees

Figure 2.4 An example of a building surrounded by few trees
Types of building in HAZUS® are complicated. They are combinations of general building types, roof types, roof-deck attachment method, roof-wall connection methods, number of stories and four mitigation measures.

General building types are categorized according to basic construction: e.g., wood frame, masonry, concrete, steel or manufactured home. Our visualization system currently includes only two types: masonry and wooden houses. Normally a wooden house is less resistant to wind than a masonry house.

Roof types in HAZUS® include hip, gable and flat roof. The shapes of the buildings are all either square or rectangular in plan and have either flat, hip or gable shape roofs. Our visualization system considers two roof types: hip roof and gable roof. The hip-roof type house has all sides of the roof supported by rafters which slope down to the walls of the house while the gable-roof type house consists of two sloping planes that meet at a peak. The two planes of the gable roof are supported at their ends by triangular, upward extensions of walls known as gables. Figure 2.5 and Figure 2.6 show peak pressure coefficients on a hip roof and a gable roof in open terrain (Meecham, 1988). The figures clearly show that the gable roof is susceptible to higher pressure at a given hurricane wind speed. As a result, it is less resistant to hurricane force wind than a hip roof.
Figure 2.5 Peak pressure coefficients on hip roof in open terrain (Meecham, 1988)

Figure 2.6 Peak pressure coefficients on gable roof in open terrain (Meecham, 1988)
There are several types of roof-deck attachment methods defined in HAZUS®. Typical types include:

1) 6d Nails @ 6/12” uses 2 inches long nails spaced at 6 inches along the edge of the sheathing and 12 inches in the interior of the sheathing.

2) 8d Nails @6/12” differs only in its use of 2.5 inches long nails.

3) 8d Nails @6/6” uses 2.5 inches long nails on both the edge of the sheathing and the interior of the sheathing. This connection pattern is seen mostly in newer homes built to high wind standards.

The roof wall connection refers to how the trusses are anchored to the wall to resist the upward force that strong winds can sometimes exert on the roof. HAZUS® defines whole roof failure as a relatively simple model, where the roof is considered to fail as a complete unit if the wind induced uplift loads exceed the total resistance of the roof provided by the roof-wall connections and the weight of the roof. In the case of gable roofs, roof trusses are assumed to be spaced at 24” on center along two walls of the building. In the case of hip roofs, a roof-wall connection is assumed to exist at 24” intervals along the entire perimeter of the building (i.e., for a square building, the hip roof has twice as many roof-wall connections as the gable roof). Two types of roof-wall connection are used in our visualization system setting: toe nails and straps. Toe nails are nails or screws that are driven at an angle through the truss into the top plate of the wall as is shown as Figure 2.7 (left). Straps are wrapped over the top of the truss and attached to the wall on the same side as the truss as shown as Figure 2.7 (right).
Four mitigation measures are window with shutters, wall with masonry reinforcing, secondary water resistance, and door with shutters. Only one and two story houses are included in the current system.

![Figure 2.7 Types of roof-wall connection: toenail (left) and strap (right)](image)

In summary, the system input analysis shows that the visualization system is designed to visualize different types of terrain, trees, water and residential buildings, the structure of which can be damaged at the component level.

### 2.2 System Structure

The system requires a 3D graphics library for visualization purposes. The current system uses the Virtual Environment Software Sandbox (VESS). VESS is a suite of libraries developed based on years of virtual environment research and is used to create the software for various virtual reality research applications at the Institute for Simulation and Training at the University of Central Florida. Its use simplifies and expedites the development of applications in which virtual environments are required. It does this by providing a simple interface into the underlying
graphics API, while integrating support for various input devices, such as joysticks and motion tracking systems, and display devices, such as head-mounted displays and shutter glasses. Additionally, VESS provides behaviors and motion models to allow the user to manipulate his or her viewpoint as well as control and interact with objects in the virtual environment. Such features have enabled VESS to evolve into a virtual reality system and enhance its utility for use with educational software. VESS itself has been developed using CBD methods. The version of VESS used in the current research utilizes components from OpenScenegraph, a scene graph based rendering engine. OpenScenegraph is built using OpenGL API. Using VESS frees the developer from implementing and optimizing low-level graphics calls, and provides many additional utilities for rapid development of graphics applications. Figure 2.8 shows the graphics API hierarchy of the system.

![Diagram of API hierarchy]

Figure 2.8 API hierarchy of the system

Figure 2.9 shows the functional structure of the whole system, which is composed of two parts: the interface module and the real-time simulation engine. The interface module is further decomposed into the tutorial system, window system and a macro-scopic hurricane wind field model. The tutorial is basically made up of animations to give users an overview of building
types, mitigation measures, and hurricane categories. It helps users change input to the visualization system. The window system accepts users’ input and provides users feedback. The macro-scope hurricane wind field model changes wind direction and speed. The interface module and the real-time engine can run as either two different processes or the same process. This feature eliminates the limitation of interface application dependency such as Operating Systems, developing tools and programming languages. Hence, it enables the use of different advanced interface design technology to make the interface useful for a general audience. The interface application allows users to change system input settings as discussed in the last section.

![Figure 2.9 Framework of hurricane visualization system](image)

Once the setting is determined, it is passed to the real-time simulation engine. The graphics engine and the physics engine combine into the real-time simulation engine. We use the component name, `GraphicsManager` to represent the real-time simulation engine. Shown in Figure 2.11, ten key operations of `GraphicsManager` provide the user with interaction capability and they are self-explained. Its key members are shown as Figure 2.10. Building damage is evaluated by a query to the HAZUS® database using the component `HazusQuery` (in lieu of a detailed engineering analysis). Damage time of each building is pre-computed according to each
building’s component damage state. The process of damage visualization is controlled by the component *Timer* using damage time value of each building component. Motion of the damaged building components is determined by the components *PhysicsWorld* and *WindModel*. Exposure setting is described by the component *WindModel*, amount of trees and terrain type. The later two are attributes of the component *GraphicsManager*. The component *HazusQuery* uses exposure setting and the component *House* to conduct operation *queryDamageInfo*. This operation determines the damage state of the whole building.

![Diagram showing key components of real-time simulation engine](image)

Figure 2.10 Key components of real-time simulation engine
The current system only allows for one building with comprehensive damage visualization. Two simulation worlds are created in the real-time simulation engine. One is the physics world (the component $PhysicsWorld$) governed by the physics engine, which is presented in Chapter 4. The other is the component $Scenegraph$ governed by the graphics engine.
shown as Figure 2.12. The terrain model consists of three visual models created offline representing open terrain, light suburban terrain and suburban terrain, respectively. The component *Rain* is based on a scrolling-texture method [WAN04]. This method uses minimal processing power. Although this method offers a limited amount of interaction with the environment, it is low-cost and it provides convincing effects for heavy rain.

The component *Cloud* uses a texture-based method based on Perlin noise. Ocean and trees are vital for showing wind effect. The next section describes the component *Ocean* used in current research followed by another section describing the component *Tree*.

![Scene Graph Diagram](image)

Figure 2.12 Components of scene graph
2.3 Ocean Component

2.3.1 Model Selection

An “ideal” ocean wave model for hurricane visualization would have the following features. It would represent different sea states ranging from calm to stormy conditions with the appropriate response to winds of various speeds. It would interact with the seabed to generate surf, spray and wave refraction. Finally, it would provide physical information such as speed, pressure effects on vessels, and pressure effects on off-shore and coastal structures.

The Navier-Stokes model provides visual and physical information such as velocities and forces. Since it is computationally intensive, it requires “simplification” for our purposes. The Gerstner wave formulas use a sum of weighted sinusoids as exact solutions of the equations of motion for a homogeneous incompressible fluid with a free surface. The realism of this model is limited by difficulties of picking weight coefficients of sinusoids and it provides no physical information, let alone wind response.

The ocean wave model in the current research is spectrum-based. This model is also based on the theory that wave height field can be decomposed to a sum of sinusoids and cosines. A spectrum-based ocean model is used for the following reasons:

1) It enables a seamless large water surface generation in real-time.

2) Most importantly, it has wind response.

3) The fast Fourier transforms (FFT) and the inverse FFT (IFFT) allow us to quickly solve the equations on a standard PC.
2.3.2 Model Implementation

It has been shown that wave height amplitudes of developed seas are statistically stationary, independent, Gaussian fluctuations with a spectrum. One of the several analytical, semi-empirical, wind-driven models in a fully developed sea is the Phillips spectrum given in [TES01]:

\[
P(K) = A \exp\left(-\frac{1}{(kL)^2}\right) \frac{V^2}{k^4} | \hat{k} \hat{\omega} |^2 \exp(-k^2l^2)
\] (2.1)

Table 2.3 shows parameters of equation (2.1) and their meanings. Table 2.4 has explanation for wave vector.

Table 2.3 Parameter of Phillips spectrum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Physical Meaning</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Wind speed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>( L = \frac{V^2}{g} )</td>
<td>( g ) is the gravitational constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A numeric constant</td>
<td>This is used to tune the magnitude of the wave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Smallest wave length</td>
<td>Waves with wavelength smaller than this value will be suppressed because of the multiplication of ( \exp(-k^2l^2) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \hat{\omega} )</td>
<td>Direction of the wind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \hat{K} )</td>
<td>Direction of the wave vector ( K )</td>
<td>(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Magnitude of wave vector ( K )</td>
<td>( k = \sqrt{x^2 + z^2} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The amplitudes of a wave height field is produced as equation (2.2). Its parameters are shown in Table 2.4.

\[ h(\vec{X}, t) = \sum_k h(k, t) \exp(ik \cdot \vec{X}) \]  

(2.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Computation method or physical meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\vec{X}$</td>
<td>$\vec{X} = (x, z)$, 2 Dimensional mesh spatial representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>the wave vector, $K = (k_x, k_z)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_x$</td>
<td>$k_x = 2\pi n / L_x$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>grid number along x direction,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_x$</td>
<td>Spatial resolution along x direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_z$</td>
<td>$k_z = 2\pi m / L_z$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>grid number along z direction,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_z$</td>
<td>Spatial resolution along z direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega$</td>
<td>$\omega = \sqrt{gk \tanh(kD)}$, $k$ is the magnitude of wave vector $K$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Sea depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Current time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_0(k)$</td>
<td>$\tilde{h}_0(k) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{P(K)}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\hat{h}(k, t)$</td>
<td>Final spectrum, $\hat{h}(k, t) = \tilde{h}_0(k)((a + ib))\exp{i\omega(k)t} + \tilde{h}_0(-k)\exp{-i\omega(k)t}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>ordinary independent variables drawn from Gaussian random generators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Another random variable like a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table, once the 2D dimension of the spectrum grid is specified as M and N, the calculated point coordinate is:
To calculate the light response for visualization purpose, the normal of the wave surface is computed as equation (2.3).

\[ n(\vec{X}, t) = \nabla h(x, t) = \sum_{k} i k \tilde{h}(k, t) \exp(ik \cdot \vec{X}) \]  

(2.3)

To integrate the Ocean component into the SceneGraph component, we set a callback process for the component Ocean so that the render operation of the SceneGraph component will call the render operation of the Ocean component automatically.

Key operations of component Ocean are initialization, setWind, update, and render. The initialization operation generates random numbers. The setWind operation take wind speed magnitude and direction to compute spectrum P(k), Fourier amplitude \( h_0(k) \). The update operation calculates the final spectrum \( \tilde{h}(k, t) \) and conducts a Inverse Fourier Transform (IFT) on \( \tilde{h}(k, t) \) to get the height field \( h(\vec{X}, t) \). Thus, only with wind speed change, will the Fourier amplitude \( h_0(k) \) e recalculated.

In the current research, only the real part of final spectrum is used. Therefore, only the real part of the Fourier amplitude is calculated as equation (2.4).

\[ \tilde{h}(k, t) = \tilde{h}_0(k) (a \cos(\omega t) - b \sin(\omega t)) \]  

(2.4)

2.3.3 Result and Discussion

A key assumption of spectrum-based ocean wave model is that the ocean surface is a mesh with a regular grid size. The vertices of the mesh are mapped to a height field generated by applying an Inverse Fast Fourier Transformation (IFFT) to the spectrum data. The number of
points requiring calculation via the IFFT has a significant effect on the realism of the rendered scene and on the performance of the rendered model as does the resolution. Figure 2.13, Figure 2.14 and Figure 2.15 show the ocean visualization. Their fidelity increases with the increase of mesh size.

Figure 2.13 Mesh size 32 x 32

Figure 2.14 Mesh size 64 x 64

Figure 2.15 Mesh size 128 x 128
One problem is that when the ocean component is integrated with the terrain, the part of a wave under the terrain will occasionally appear above the terrain. We define an area near the terrain. In this area, only the lighting normal of calculated ocean wave is used, the actual geometry of the wave surface is flat.

### 2.4 Tree Simulation

A blend of existing methods has been employed to visualize trees in the simulated environment. Lindenmayer systems, or L-systems, are evolving grammars that are capable of rapid generation of biologically realistic trees with a scalable level of detail. The use of L-systems for this purpose was demonstrated in [MIC04]. This method is preferred to image based rendering due to the expected dynamic nature of the simulation, a condition under which the benefits of image based rendering are only marginal.

With the generation of the trees complete, the dynamics system described in [SAK99] was implemented. This simplified, object oriented approach to physics modeling is capable of real time calculations and well suited for our hurricane visualization environment. Although gravity is neglected by the existing mathematics, wind is accounted for with adjustable behaviors that depict realistic movement of branches and leaf clusters in the wind. Thresholds may be used for defining forces at which tree branches will break.
CHAPTER 3: BUILDING STAIC MODEL

Each structure setting change causes the change to the graphical model of the building. To avoid building many graphical models for different types of building, procedural modeling method is used to generate geometry of a building by just specify topology information. This chapter treats the problem of how to design this topology information and how to generate geometry of the whole building and position, orientation of shingles, plywood, bricks automatically.

3.1 Building Model Structure

A little field investigation shows a residential building includes a foundation construction, a wall construction and a roof construction. Roof construction is the most complicated process. Normally, it consists of a roof frame, attached sheathing (typically plywood), felt paper and roof shingles. For example, a gable roof frame is constructed using rafters, ridge board and trusses. Since the goal of modeling the residential building if for visualizing the damage process, we decompose the building following concept of [PIN04], i.e. the building model is composed of a: roof cover model, roof sheathing model, wall model, roof-wall connection model and opening model. We limit our roof cover to shingles, and limit our sheathing to plywood.

A pure data structure for describing the topological information is shown in Figure 3.1. The Struct House has all the dimension-related information and it holds four sub Structs: DamageState, Roof Wall and Foundation. Five tables, roof cover table, roof sheath table, roof-wall connection table, wall table and opening table are incorporated into this data structure. They
serve as interpolation tables for building components to determine their damage states. Five Boolean values show whether building components are damaged or not. They are leveraged for implementing damage rules in Chapter 5.

Figure 3.1 Pure topological Information Struct House

The current research assumes the footprint of the house is a rectangle. As shown in Figure 3.2, its origin (0,0,0) lies at its center. The X axis is along the top edge of the footprint.
with right direction as positive. The Y axis is along the right edge of the footprint with upside
direction as positive.

![Diagram of gable-roof house and hip-roof house](image)

**Figure 3.2 Top view of gable-roof house and hip-roof house**

Component *House* is shown using UML as Figure 3.3. Following the CBSE method, we
first generalize a base-stone component *BuildingComponent* which has the attributes of all high
level building components including shingle plane, plywood plane, wall, truss, and window.
Attributes of the basic building component are classified into physics properties and graphics
properties. Physics properties includes volume, center points of mass, mass, position and
orientation. Graphics properties includes geometry shape, lighting attributes, texture, color,
position, orientation and a parent node from the component *Scenegraph*. With this node, the
render operation of component *Scenegraph* will automatically call the render operation of
component *BuildingComponent* as well as component *Ocean*. The properties of building
components include: position, orientation, texture, lighting attributes, geometry, parent node,
velocity, angular velocity, center point of mass, mass, and volume. Every sub-component of
component *House* originated from class *BuildingComponent* except *WoodWall* class.
Figure 3.3 Static diagram of component House
3.2 Roof Model

The roof cover is made up of many shingles, most of which have rectangular shape. The roof sheath is made up of plywood sheets, most of which have rectangular shape, too. A masonry wall is made up of bricks. We define a 2D plane on which shingles, plywood or bricks lie. For example, a gable-roof house has two planes for shingle and plywood and a hip-roof house has four planes for shingles and plywood. A rectangular house with four walls has four planes for bricks. Hereafter, we refer a single piece of shingle, plywood or brick as a tile.

Each tile is assigned a detachment time, the time a tile will be detached from the plane. This value could also be assigned according to the data obtained from a wind tunnel test.

1) Information for each shingle

\[
\text{TILE\_SHAPE\_TYPE shape;}
\]

\[
\text{float top1,bot1,top2,bot2;}
\]

\[
\text{float texCoordX, texCoordY;}
\]

\[
\text{float thickness;}
\]

\[
\text{double position[3];}
\]

\[
\text{float detachTime;}
\]

\[
\text{long countOfForce;}
\]

2) Information for shingles on one roof plane

- TILE\_DIRECTION: This flag identifies the 2D plane, currently supports maximum four 2D planes. It could easily be modified to support more 2D planes for buildings with complex shapes.

- A rectangular bounding box used for each shingle with width, length and height.
• Overlap-Width, overlap-Length is width, length for overlapping among shingles respectively.

• Roof plane orientation.

• m_row number of rows of shingle on the roof plane.

• m_col number of columns of shingle on the roof plane.

• m_number total number of shingles

• m_numberOfRow: indices of the position to start lay shingle

• m_startColumn: indices of the position to start lay shingle

• TILE_ARRAY_TYPE array;

• getWindForce(vsVector &windSpeed, vsVector &shingleSpeed, float angle);

• calculateShingleNumber(double top, double bot, double height);

• cut(TileInformation *s, Rect2D &rect, LineSegment2D &line);

• Generate shingles on a hip roof

• clippingCode(double x, double y, double xcl1, double ycl1, double xcl2, double ycl2);

• intersect(double x0, double y0, double x1, double y1, double xclipl, double yclipb, double xclipr, double yclipt);

• isLeftCut(TILE_SHAPE_TYPE shape);

We assume that the house size along Y axis ($Ysize$) Y axis of a house is assumed to always be greater or equal to the house size along the X axis ($Xsize$). Hence for the hip roof, trapezoidal-shaped roof planes only appear along the Y axis. Roof planes along the X axis always have a triangular shape. The normal shape of a shingle or a sheet of plywood is
rectangular. To properly fit the gable roof, all shingles and plywood are rectangular. But for hip roof, shingles, and plywood with triangular, trapezoidal or pentagon shapes are needed near the ridge of the roof plane. We take triangle and rectangle shapes as special case of trapezoids. Now the shingles and plywood automating generation problem is as follows: Given a trapezoid, how do we use small rectangles which are aligned to cover it. This is shown as Figure 3.4.

To find out position and orientation of all tiles, three steps are involved. First, we grid the trapezoid. The size of grids along the X and Y axes are exactly the size of shingles. Secondly, we use the Bresham algorithm to determine shingles that are at the edge. Finally, the Cohen-Sutherland Line-Clipping algorithm (CSLC) is used to calculate the intersection point coordinate between the roof edge and the shingle to determine the shape of the shingle at the edge. Figure 3.5 shows different shapes of tiles on the edge of a hip roof. The different shapes are a result of a rectangle cut by the edge line.
Figure 3.5 Six different shapes of tiles on the edge of hip roof

The CSLC algorithm is the key algorithm to reduce the process time for automatically generating shingles on a roof. The more efficient CSLC Algorithm performs initial tests on a line to determine whether intersection calculations can be avoided. To perform trivial accept and
reject tests, we extend the edges of the clip rectangle to divide the plane of the clip rectangle into nine regions. Each region is assigned a 4-bit code determined by where the region lies with respect to the outside half-planes of the clip-rectangle edges. Each bit in the out-code is set to either 1 or 0. The 4 bits in the code correspond to Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Out-code definition in CSLC algorithm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>outside half-plane of top edge, above top edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>outside half-plane of bottom edge, below bottom edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>outside half-plane of right edge, to the right of right edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>outside half-plane of left edge, to the left of left edge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Steps for Cohen-Sutherland algorithm is as following:

1) End-points pairs are check for trivial acceptance or trivial rejected using the out-code.

2) If not trivial-acceptance or trivial-rejected, a clip edge is divide into two segments.

3) Iteratively clipping by testing trivial-acceptance or trivial-rejected, and divided into two segments until completely inside or trivial-rejected.

In summary, the C-S algorithm is efficient when out-code testing can be done cheaply (for example, by doing bitwise operations in assembly language) and trivial acceptance or rejection is applicable to the majority of line segments. (For example, with large windows - everything is inside, or with small windows - everything is outside).
Trusses are represented using a combination of cubes. We use three rectangular shapes bounded together to represent one truss. Its solid shape and wire-frame shape are shown as Figure 3.6 and Figure 3.7 respectively.

![Figure 3.6 Solid shape of truss](image)

![Figure 3.7 Wire-frame shape of truss](image)

### 3.3 Wall and Openings Model

This section describes the model for walls and openings.

Slabs are used to represent all the basic component of walls and windows. A slab is essentially a collection of one or more chunks that are composed of the same material and are defined relative to the same centerline plane shown as Figure 3.8. Every slab can move in a world governed by physics. To represent walls using slabs, the key step is to triangulate walls which have holes.
The triangulation of a simple polygon is a very old problem in computer science. The problem is: given a simple polygon in two-dimensional space, how to construct segments between the vertices of the polygon, such that the resulting figure is a collection of triangles only. A simple polygon means a polygon that does not have any intersecting edges. The polygon can be either convex or concave and may also have holes in it. Throughout this paper, whenever we give examples of simple polygons we will refer only to simple polygons without holes.

The first algorithm for solving the problem in $O(n \log n)$, where $n$ is the number of vertices of the polygon to be triangulated, was published in [GAR78]. After that, the focus was creating $O(n)$ algorithms for special kinds of polygons, or creating $O(n \log k)$ algorithms for polygons that have special properties that are dependent on $k$. The question, of whether there was any algorithm that could run in $O(n)$ time, remained unanswered until 1984. Fournier and Montuno showed that the triangulation problem can be solved by using a trapezoidization process [FOU84]. Although the triangulation itself worked in $O(n)$ time, the algorithm depended
on the trapezoidization method, which was a $O(n \log n)$ algorithm, thus making the whole algorithm run in $O(n \log n)$ time. Tarjan and van Wyk in 1986 published another algorithm which has the advantage that it could be adapted to solve other problems in linear time [TAR86]. In 1991, Chazelle announced a deterministic algorithm that runs in $O(n \log^* n)$. Although it produced a good result, it was very complicated to implement. In 2000, Amato, Goodrich, and Ramos finally discovered a randomized algorithm that runs in $O(n \log^* n)$ time, but which did not use complicated data structures [AMA00], and thus was considered better and easier to implement. The current research uses the trapezoidization method by Fournier and Montuno.
CHAPTER 4: BUILDING COMPONENT DYNAMICS

Both BuildingComponent Class and WoodWall class have an important member, 
rigidBody shown as Figure 4.1. It is this member which links the graphics property of 
BuildingComponent and physics property of BuildingComponent. The operation of component 
House, damageProcess calls damageProcess of all different classes associated with component 
House. At the last stage, operation of component BuildingComponent, updatePhysics is called. 
This operation uses PhysicsWorld output, positions and orientations to change its own position, 
orientation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Component</th>
<th>WoodWall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Geometry</td>
<td>-Triangular Mesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-position</td>
<td>-Rigid body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-orientation</td>
<td>-Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-velocity</td>
<td>-Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-volume</td>
<td>+preDamageProcess()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Rigid Body</td>
<td>+damageProcess()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+addToParent()</td>
<td>+recover()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+removeFromParent()</td>
<td>+setStatic()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+setMotionState()</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+setGraphicsPosition()</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+setGraphicsOrientation()</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+setDensity()</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+getWindForce()</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+enablePhysics()</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+setStatic()</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+addForce()</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+updatePhysics()</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1 UML of BuildingComponent class and WoodWall

PhysicsWorld conducts rigid body simulation. This chapter focuses on the design and 
implementation of the component PhysicsWorld.
The physical simulation visualizes a complicated process thereby helping us to understand it more easily [BAR93]. Real world experiments such as wind tunnel tests, which are difficult and costly to perform, can be replicated using physical simulation. A simulated physically based hurricane visualization can be used as a natural, intuitive means of interacting with buildings and understand the cause of damage. Most building components, like walls, shingles, and plywood, are rigid unless broken. Shingles and plywood normally can be assumed to have a convex shape and constant density. Therefore, the rigid body simulation technique used in video games can be used for solving the motion of building components. In rigid body simulation, motion is determined by a combination of unconstrained motion and constrained motion. Shingles or plywood freely flying with the wind is an example of unconstrained motion. Constrained motion is illustrated by these objects colliding with each other, a wall, or the ground. Constrained motion does not allow building components to penetrate into each other.

“Non-penetration constraints” require us to deal with two types of contact at the instant that objects meet each other. One is when two objects are in contact, and they have a velocity towards each other, as in the shingle striking the ground. This is called colliding contact. Colliding contact requires an instantaneous change in velocity. Whenever a collision occurs, the velocity of a body undergoes a discontinuity. The other case is when bodies are resting on each other at some contact point (e.g. a shingle which lies on plywood with zero velocity). This is resting contact. For resting contact, the force that prevents the shingle from accelerating towards plywood needs to be computed. Essentially, this force is the weight of the shingle due to gravity (or whatever other forces due to the attachment method).
Constrained motion has been the object of many studies. Moore and Wilhelms [MOR88] provide one of the earliest treatments of two fundamental problems in dynamics simulation: collision detection and collision response. Collision detection determines over a given time interval whether any points of the two objects occupy the same location in space simultaneously [HAD04]. Collision response determines the objects’ velocity and acceleration after a collision is detected.

The rest of this chapter is organized as following. First, unconstrained motion representation of rigid body i.e. ODE, is established. Second, collision detection methods used in the current research are described. Finally, these collision responses are discussed.

4.1 Equation of Unconstrained Motion

Given an object shown as Figure 4.2, its mass of center lies at \( x(t) \), applying force \( F(t) \) at point \( r(t) \) on this object, equation of unconstrained motion will give us the linear velocity, angular velocity, position and orientation of this object. Then linear velocity \( v(t) \) is defined as:

\[
\dot{v}(t) = x(t)
\]  

(4.1)

Linear momentum \( P(t) \) is given by:

\[
P(t) = Mv(t)
\]  

(4.2)
The rate of change of the momentum $P(t)$ is given by:

$$ F(t) = P(t) = \frac{d}{dt} (Mv(t)) $$

If the point applying force is $r(t)$, then the torque that is applied to an object is given by:

$$ \tau(t) = (r(t) - x(t)) \times F(t) $$

A 3x3 rotation matrix $R(t)$ is used to describe the rotation of the body. The shape of an object is defined in terms of a fixed and unchanging space called body space. Given a geometric description of the object in body space, $x(t)$ and $R(t)$ can be used to transform the body-space description into world space. If $r_0(t)$ is an arbitrary point on the rigid body in body space, then the world-space location $r(t)$ of this point is the result of first rotating about the origin and then translating it. The velocity of point applying force is:

$$ \dot{r}(t) = \frac{d}{dt} (x(t) + R(t)r_0(t)) $$
We build the body space by specifying the center of mass of the body, which lies at the origin; the world-space location of the center of mass is always given directly by \( x(t) \). We write out the components of \( R(t) \) as:

\[
R(t) = \begin{pmatrix}
  r_{xx} & r_{yx} & r_{zx} \\
  r_{xy} & r_{yy} & r_{zy} \\
  r_{xz} & r_{yz} & r_{zz}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

Spinning of a rigid body is described as a vector \( \omega(t) \). The direction of \( \omega(t) \) gives the direction of the axis about which the body is spinning. The magnitude of \( \omega(t) \) tells how fast the body is spinning. \( \omega(t) \) and \( R(t) \) can be connected using:

\[
\dot{R}(t) = \omega(t) \times \begin{pmatrix}
  r_{xx} \\
  r_{xy} \\
  r_{xz}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

From equation (4.5), we have

\[
\dot{r}(t) = x(t) + \omega(t) \times r(t)
\]

To simplify \( \dot{R}(t) \), we define \( \omega^* \) as matrix

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
  0 & -\omega_z & \omega_y \\
  \omega_z & 0 & -\omega_x \\
  -\omega_y & \omega_x & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\]

where \( \omega_x \), \( \omega_y \), and \( \omega_z \) are component of \( \omega(t) \). Then we have

\[
\dot{R}(t) = \omega(t)^* R(t)
\]

The shape and mass distribution of the body is described by inertia tensor \( J(t) \). \( J(t) \) is a 3x3 matrix. It can be thought of as a scaling factor between angular momentum and angular
velocity. This matrix is computed in body space and then transformed as needed to world space. Inertia in body space is pre-computed. The conversion of inertia from body space to world space is:

\[
I(t) = R(t)I_{body}R(t)^T
\]  

(4.7)

Where,

\[
I_{body} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{xx} & -I_{xy} & -I_{xz} \\ -I_{xy} & I_{yy} & -I_{yz} \\ -I_{xz} & -I_{yz} & I_{zz} \end{pmatrix}
\]  

(4.8)

Assume the object occupy a volume, then

\[
I_{xx} = \int_{\text{volume}} (y^2 + z^2)dm
\]  

(4.9)

\[
I_{yy} = \int_{\text{volume}} (x^2 + z^2)dm
\]  

(4.10)

\[
I_{zz} = \int_{\text{volume}} (x^2 + y^2)dm
\]  

(4.11)

\[
I_{xy} = \int_{\text{volume}} (xy)dm
\]  

(4.12)

\[
I_{xz} = \int_{\text{volume}} (xz)dm
\]  

(4.13)

\[
I_{yz} = \int_{\text{volume}} (yz)dm
\]  

(4.14)

Angular momentum \(L(t)\) is computed by

\[
L(t) = I(t)\omega(t)
\]

The rate of change of the angular momentum is given by
\[ \tau(t) = L(t) = \frac{d}{dt}(I(t)\omega(t)) = I(t) \frac{d}{dt}(\omega(t)) + \frac{d}{dt}(I(t))\omega(t) \]

\[ = I(t) \frac{d}{dt}(\omega(t)) + \frac{d}{dt}(RI_{\text{body}} R^T)\omega(t) \]

\[ = I(t) \frac{d}{dt}(\omega(t)) + (\frac{d}{dt}(R)I_{\text{body}}R^T + RI_{\text{body}} \frac{d}{dt}(R^T))\omega(t) \]

\[ = I(t) \frac{d}{dt}(\omega(t)) + (\omega^* RI_{\text{body}} R^T + RI_{\text{body}}(\omega^* R)^T)\omega(t) \]

\[ = I(t) \frac{d}{dt}(\omega(t)) + \omega^* RI_{\text{body}} R^T \omega + RI_{\text{body}} R^T (\omega^*)^T \omega(t) \]

Since \((\omega^*)^T \omega(t) = 0\)

Hence we got the Euler equation:

\[ \tau(t) = I(t) \frac{d}{dt}(\omega(t)) + \omega^* RI_{\text{body}} R^T \omega \]

The system state \(Y(t)\) that each body has associated with it is described as:

\[
Y(t) = \begin{pmatrix}
  x(t) \\
  R(t) \\
  P(t) \\
  L(t)
\end{pmatrix}
\]

From this state, other important quantities may be computed.

\[ V(t) = \frac{P(t)}{M} \]

\[ \omega(t) = I(t)^{-1} L(t) \]

The derivatives of each component of the state are given by:

\[
\frac{d}{dt} Y(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix}
  x(t) \\
  R(t) \\
  P(t) \\
  L(t)
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
  V(t) \\
  \omega(t)^* R(t) \\
  F(t) \\
  \tau(t)
\end{pmatrix}
\]
This is the differential equation to be solved to compute the trajectories and orientations of the bodies at various points in time.

4.2 Collision Detection

A distinct area of research concerns itself with the problem of detecting the intersection or the computing separation of two bodies. GJK [GIL90] and Lin-Canny algorithms [LIN91] both handle convex polyhedral collision detection very well. Other algorithms are variations on these basic two algorithms. Quinlan (1994) uses a collision detector that can return contacts for all collision situations between vertices, edges and faces [QUI94]. Schmidl (2004) uses a method of fast update of OBB trees for simulations with thousands of contacts [SCH04].

Collision detection is usually divided into two phases. The task of the broad phase is to quickly determine which bodies may be in contact and which bodies cannot collide. The narrow phase then goes through the list of possibly colliding objects and determines the detailed contact information. Bergen [Berg04] gives a good collision detection overview. Two very efficient algorithms for the narrow phase are Mirtich's Voronoi Clip (V-Clip) algorithm [Mirt98b] and the Gilbert-Johnson-Keerthi (GJK) algorithm [GiJK88]. Both are explained in detail in Coutinho [Cout01]. Many algorithms for the narrow phase only return information about the pair of closest points of two bodies. This is not enough for the simulation as a whole contact set is needed, which often involves more than one contact. Mirtich [Mirt98c] shows how the V-Clip algorithm can be used to model contact regions. Redon [Redo04] gives an overview on recent works on continuous collision detection methods that guarantee consistent simulations by computing the time of first contact.
Collision detection methods are categorized into two types: discrete methods and continuous methods. Discrete collision detection methods sample the objects’ trajectories at discrete times and report inter-penetrations only. This method must use backtracking methods to compute the time of the first contact. Backtracking methods attempt to compute the first time of contact by recursively subdividing the time interval after an inter-penetration has been detected. Assume that the current time interval is \([t_0, t_0+\Delta t]\), and assume an inter-penetration has been detected at time \(t_{n+1}\). Essentially, one time of first contact \(t_e\) is estimated in this interval (for example, by taking the midpoint of the time interval). Then the objects’ positions are computed at this instant and an inter-penetration detection is performed again. Depending on whether the objects interpenetrate or not, the algorithm decides that the first time of collision is in \([t_0, t_e]\) or \([t_e, t_0+\Delta t]\), respectively, and loops on this new interval. The process stops when the amount of interpenetration is smaller than a predetermined threshold. Apparently, the computational cost of backtracking can be high when objects are complex or when they have interpenetrated much. Besides, since backtracking is only performed when an inter-penetration has been detected, non-connected objects, or even non-convex objects, can enter a configuration from which they could not get out. As a result, they can miss collisions when the objects move rapidly or are small. Moreover, even when an inter-penetration detected, it is often difficult to reposition the objects in a contacting position. One reason is that computing the penetration depth for general objects is difficult because the objects’ motion is not taken into account. Consequently, discrete collision detection methods cannot guarantee the existence of complete interpenetration-free paths, and can lead to inconsistent, unrealistic, or even unreachable states.
Continuous collision detection methods guarantee consistent simulations by computing the time of first contact and the contact state for colliding objects. We describe techniques to perform continuous collision detection for rigid and articulated bodies. The time-parameterized equations for continuous collision detection between rigid triangle primitives are presented and methods are described to solve them efficiently. Continuous overlap tests between hierarchies of bounding volumes, which help achieve efficient collision detection for complex models, are presented as well.

Contacts can be non-penetrating or penetrating. If a point of one body is inside the other body, it is called penetrating contact or overlapping contact. Otherwise it is non-penetrating. The penetration depth is the minimum length along the collision normal that the penetrating point has to move to leave the body.

4.2.1 **Box-Box Collision Detection**

During the destruction process, building components might collide with each other or collide with the ground which impart forces to each other and change their motion. To be able to
handle the forces acting on bodies that collide, collision must first be detected. Over 80 percent of collisions in the building damage process are box-box collisions. The subsection gives a detail description about the collisions between boxes and serves as one of the cornerstones for our performance increase measure in the next subsection.

The statement of the problem is: There are two boxes. One box is located at position $p_a$ with orientation matrix $R_a$. Its dimension is described using 3D vector $e_a$. We put it this way: Box A ($p_a$, $R_a$, $e_a$). Another box is described as Box B ($p_b$, $R_b$, $e_b$). Now we need to determine whether they collide or not. If yes, we need to know the number of contact points, each contact normal, the maximum penetration depth along that normal and the type of contact.

We start with the separating hyperplane theorem, a result of convex analysis. Given two convex sets A and B, either the two sets are intersecting or there exists a separating hyperplane $P$ such that A is on one side of $P$ and B is on the other. A separating axis is a line $L$ perpendicular to $P$. Two polyhedral objects may come into contact in three different ways with respect to their features: face-face, face-edge, and edge-edge if we consider a vertex as part of an edge. For the face-face and face-edge cases, the face normal is used to project axes separately. For the edge-edge case, the separating axis is the cross product of these two edges. In summary, to test the separability of two polyhedral objects, the following separating axes test should be performed:

1) Axes parallel to each face normal of object A
2) Axes parallel to each face normal of object B
3) Axes parallel to the vectors resulting from the cross products of all edges in A with all edges in B
For two general polytopes with the same number of faces (F) and edges (E), there are 2F+E² potential separating axes test need be performed.

In the case of the box-box situation, since each box has two parallel faces and four parallel edges. The actual number of test will be

\[2 \times (\text{number of faces 3}) + (\text{number of edges 3})² = 15\]

The test criterion is that- if for every separating axis L, the sum of their projected radii is less than the distance between their projected centers. (See the following figure). That is, if for arbitrary L

\[\left| \overrightarrow{PP} \cdot L \right| > r_a + r_b\]

then the two boxes are separate.

For face-face test cases, defining three faces of box A as the reference face and box B as the incident object, we have the first three contact types: AF1, AF2, AF3. Likewise, we have another three contact types: BF1, BF2, BF3. For edge-edge test cases, defining edge 1 of box A as the reference edge, box B as incident object, we have AE1_BE1, AE1_BE2, AE1_BE3. Same,
we will have AE2_BE1, AE2_BE2, AE2_BE3, AE3_BE1, AE3_BE2, AE3_BE3. Accordingly, the test criteria computation is summarized in the following table.

Table 4.1 Separating axis test of box-box collision for different contact types

| Contact type | \(|T.L| \) | \(r_1 \) | \(r_2 \) |
|--------------|----------|----------|----------|
| AF1          | | \(e_0^A \) | \(e_0^B|r_{00}| + e_1^B|r_{01}| + e_0^B|r_{02}| \) |
| AF2          | | \(e_1^A \) | \(e_0^B|r_{00}| + e_1^B|r_{01}| + e_0^B|r_{02}| \) |
| AF3          | | \(e_2^A \) | \(e_0^B|r_{00}| + e_1^B|r_{01}| + e_0^B|r_{02}| \) |
| BF1          | \(|t_0 r_{00} + t_1 r_{10} + t_2 r_{20}|\) | \(e_0^B|r_{00}| + e_1^B|r_{01}| + e_0^B|r_{02}| \) | \(e_0^B \) |
| BF2          | \(|t_0 r_{01} + t_1 r_{11} + t_2 r_{21}|\) | \(e_0^B|r_{00}| + e_1^B|r_{01}| + e_0^B|r_{02}| \) | \(e_1^B \) |
| BF3          | \(|t_0 r_{02} + t_1 r_{12} + t_2 r_{22}|\) | \(e_0^B|r_{00}| + e_1^B|r_{01}| + e_0^B|r_{02}| \) | \(e_2^B \) |
| AE1_BE1      | \(|t_2 r_{10} - t_1 r_{20}|\) | \(e_1^A|r_{20}| + e_2^A|r_{10}| \) | \(e_1^B|r_{02}| + e_2^B|r_{01}| \) |
| AE1_BE2      | \(|t_2 r_{11} - t_1 r_{21}|\) | \(e_1^A|r_{21}| + e_2^A|r_{11}| \) | \(e_0^B|r_{02}| + e_2^B|r_{00}| \) |
| AE1_BE3      | \(|t_2 r_{12} - t_1 r_{22}|\) | \(e_1^A|r_{22}| + e_2^A|r_{12}| \) | \(e_0^B|r_{01}| + e_1^B|r_{00}| \) |
| AE2_BE1      | \(|t_0 r_{20} - t_2 r_{00}|\) | \(e_0^A|r_{20}| + e_2^A|r_{00}| \) | \(e_1^B|r_{12}| + e_2^B|r_{11}| \) |
| AE2_BE2      | \(|t_0 r_{21} - t_2 r_{01}|\) | \(e_0^A|r_{21}| + e_2^A|r_{01}| \) | \(e_0^B|r_{12}| + e_2^B|r_{10}| \) |
| AE2_BE3      | \(|t_0 r_{22} - t_2 r_{02}|\) | \(e_0^A|r_{22}| + e_2^A|r_{02}| \) | \(e_0^B|r_{11}| + e_1^B|r_{10}| \) |
| AE3_BE1      | \(|t_1 r_{00} - t_0 r_{10}|\) | \(e_0^A|r_{10}| + e_1^A|r_{00}| \) | \(e_1^B|r_{22}| + e_2^B|r_{21}| \) |
| AE3_BE2      | \(|t_1 r_{01} - t_0 r_{11}|\) | \(e_0^A|r_{11}| + e_1^A|r_{01}| \) | \(e_0^B|r_{22}| + e_2^B|r_{20}\) |
| AE3_BE3      | \(|t_1 r_{02} - t_0 r_{12}|\) | \(e_0^A|r_{12}| + e_1^A|r_{02}| \) | \(e_0^B|r_{21}| + e_1^B|r_{20}\) |
In the above table, $e_0^A$, $e_1^A$ and $e_2^A$ is the half length of box A’s three sides respectively and $e_0^B$, $e_1^B$ and $e_2^B$ is the half length of the box B’s three sides respectively. Vector $T=(t_0, t_1, t_2)$ is the center position of Box B relative to Box A. Matrix $R$ is the relative rotation between $R_a$ and $R_b$.

If there the test criterion is met, then a collision occurs and the response computation requires the following contact point information:

1) Contact type which tells the reference to the two colliding bodies
2) Position
3) Normal vector, which is normal to the touching surfaces
4) Penetration depth

### 4.2.2 GJK Collision Detection

Box-box collision is the most common collision type in the current research. However, shingles and plywood at the ridge of hip-roof could have triangular, trapezoidal or pentagon shapes, as shown in Figure 3.4. The GJK algorithm computes the distance between a pair of convex objects. The distance between objects $A$ and $B$, denoted by $d(A,B)$, is defined by:

$$d(A,B) = \min \{ \| x - y \| : x \in A, y \in B \}$$

The algorithm can be tailored to return a pair of closest points, which is a pair of points: point $a$ is in object $A$ and point $b$ is in object $B$ for which $\| a - b \| = d(A,B)$.

We express the distance between $A$ and $B$ in terms of their Minkowski sum $A - B$ as:

$$d(A,B) = \| v(A - B) \|$$

where $v(C)$ is defined as the point in C nearest to the origin, i.e.,
Clearly, for a pair of closest points, we have $a-b=v(A-B)$.

GJK is essentially a descent method for approximating $v(A-B)$ for convex objects $A$ and $B$. In each iteration a simplex is constructed that is contained in $A-B$ and lies nearer to the origin than the simplex constructed in the previous iteration.

The basic step of GJK algorithm is as following:

1) Arbitrarily construct a simplex inside the object.

2) Find the point $V$ of this simplex closest to the origin.

3) Compute support point $w$ for the vector $-V$.

4) Add support point $w$ to the current simplex to get a simplex.

5) Compute the new point $V_{new}$ closest to the origin of the new simplex.

6) Discard all vertices that do not contribute to $V_{new}$ to get another simplex

7) Loop to the second step.

### 4.3 Collision Response computation

Approaches suggested to compute collision response include penalty methods, impulse-based methods and constraint based methods.

Penalty methods are generally used when no precise contact information is available, as they compute the contact forces from the amount of interpenetration between contacting objects [WIT87], [KAC03]. This correction force tries to push the point back to the valid position. An energy function is defined using constraints. The energy is zero if constraints are met. Otherwise, the energy grows. The penalty force minimizes energy and it acts in the direction of the
maximum descent of energy. The penalty force is acting like a spring force with a spring constant of $K$. Colliding contact and resting contact can both be approximated by (hypothetically) inserting a spring between the contact points of each body. For the resting contact, springs are removed if the bodies are separating, so bodies keep their contact. For the colliding contact, one spring with constant $K_{\text{approach}}$ is used if bodies are approaching while another spring with constant $K_{\text{separate}}$ is used if bodies are separating. The advantage of the penalty methods is its simplicity. It automatically corrects deviations from valid positions and thus can be used for error correction. However, an appropriate spring constant has to be chosen. This constant depends on the properties of the current object in the scene (for example coefficient of restitution and mass). However, the simulated scenario requires a large stiffness value, and so the differential equations become “stiff” making them increasingly more difficult to solve. Consequently, accuracy can be hard to achieve in real time.

Impulse-based methods model all the forces between bodies through a series of impulses. For example in Figure 4, the ball receives a series of impulses as it bounces and collides with the floor after falling off the slope. Even when the ball has stopped bouncing and is rolling we still model the forces between the ball and floor as impulses. Imagine a block resting on the ground. Instead of there being a constant force being applied upwards counteracting gravity and keeping it at rest, in the impulse model the block receives a rapid series of impulses being applied at each of its corners. It is these impulses that keep it from accelerating downwards. However they will also cause the block to vibrate rapidly but the values can be chosen such that the amplitude of the vibration is less than a pixel, hence it appears stationary to the user. Although this seems like a departure from what happens in reality, it is in most cases an acceptable tradeoff for
computational speed. So in some sense, the impulse method preserves important physical quantities, such as the average velocity of the object and the average forces on the object. All contacts are modeled as collisions. Between collisions, the bodies move along ballistic trajectories. If friction and restitution are incorporated into the collision model, then the resulting impulse trains can generate persistent phenomena such as rolling, sliding, and settling [Sch04]. Assuming that the relative velocity is already negative, impulse $J$ need to be computed which will instantaneously change the velocities of the two bodies.

The impulse acts in the contact normal direction, i.e., $J = j \hat{n}(t_0)$. The empirical law for frictionless collisions states that:

$$ v^{+}_{rel} = -\epsilon v^{-}_{rel} \quad (4.15) $$

Here $\epsilon$ is the coefficient of restitution. It can range from 0 to 1. A value of 0 means that all the energy is lost and there is no bounce. A value of 1 means that all the energy is kept in the system and the bodies will act perfectly bouncy.

Constraint based methods take into account all contact points at a given instant in time in order to compute the forces required at all contacts [HAR03]. Its basic idea is to convert each constraint into a force imposed on its related objects. The principle of virtual work [WIT90] is used; this stipulates that constraint forces do not add or remove energy. Hence, it is used to compute constraints forces. This principle also implies that the constraint force is opposed to the direction in which the system is forbidden to move. The rapid progress made in this method gives the rigid body simulation a fast, stable and realistic solution. Current research focuses on this method.
4.3.1 Constraint Analysis

A constraint is often defined for two points, one point Pi on body i and one point Pj on body j, as shown in following Figure. These points could be at arbitrary positions on the surface of the object and are called constraint anchor points. The positions of the anchor points are given by two vectors $p_i$ and $x_j$. They are provided by the collision detection module.

![Figure 4.4 A touching contact (a) and a penetrating contact (b)](image)

Penetrating contact in (b) should be avoided. Axes of the coordinate system $t_x$ and $t_y$ lie in the tangential plane of the contact. Contact normal $n$ is pointing away from reference body i. The distances of the points to the according centers of mass of the rigid bodies can be specified by two vectors $r_i$ and $r_j$. Hence the contact constraint are formulated as follows:

$$C_k = (p_j - p_i) n \geq 0$$
describes the separation distance in the direction of \( \vec{n} \). Hence relative contact velocity in the direction of \( \vec{n} \) is \( C_k \), and

\[
\dot{C}_k = n(p_j - p_i) + (p_j - p_i)(n)
\]

\[
\ddot{C}_k = n(p_j - p_i) + 2n(p_j - p_i) + (p_j - p_i)(n)
\]

\( (p_j - p_i)(n) \) and \( (p_j - p_i)(n) \) are much smaller than the other term on the right side since the penetration at the contact is small, therefore:

\[
\dot{C}_k = n(p_j - p_i) \tag{4.16}
\]

\[
\ddot{C}_k = n(p_j - p_i) + 2n(p_j - p_i) \tag{4.17}
\]

Having found a contact \( k \), \( C_k \) and \( \dot{C}_k \) are examined to classify the contact:

If \( C_k < 0 \), then it is a penetrating contact. If \( C_k = 0 \), then it is a touching contact without penetration. If \( C_k > 0 \), then it is not a contact and will not be reported by the collision detection. If \( \dot{C}_k < 0 \), then the bodies are moving towards each other. This is called colliding contact. If \( \dot{C}_k = 0 \), then the bodies are touching and neither separating nor colliding. This is called resting contact. If \( \dot{C}_k > 0 \), then the bodies are separating. This is called separating contact. In practice, a threshold limit is used instead of 0. For example resting contact are contacts with \( |C_k| < \text{thresholdLimit} \) and separating contact are contacts with \( \dot{C}_k > \text{thresholdLimit} \).
Considering equality constraints: If in one time step $C_k = 0$, then the constraint is satisfied at the moment. If $\dot{C}_k = 0$, then the constraint will be satisfied in the next time step. But if $\ddot{C}_k \neq 0$, the deviation will grow and the constraint will be violated in the next time step. If $C_k = 0$ and $\dot{C}_k = 0$, the constraint is satisfied and will be satisfied in the next time step. $\ddot{C}_k$ will stay zero as long as $\dddot{C}_k$ stays zero. With these considerations, different strategies can be formed to deal with equality constraints:

Position-based formulation: If the new position is violating the position constraint $C_k$, we compute a position change of all the bodies, so that the constraints are satisfied again.

Velocity-based formulation: Assume that position constraint $C_k$ is not violated and try to keep $\dot{C}_k = 0$. If $\dot{C}_k \neq 0$ in one time step, then we have to compute a change in the velocities, so that $\ddot{C}_k$ is corrected to zero.

Force-based formulation: Assume that both position constraint $C_k$ and velocity constraint $\dot{C}_k$ are met, try to keep acceleration constraint $\ddot{C}_k$ by calculating constraint forces.

For inequality constraints, it is satisfied as long as $C_k \geq 0$. As long as $C_k > 0$, $\dot{C}_k$ can take positive and negative values because the deviation is allowed to grow or shrink. Only if $C_k \leq 0$, $\ddot{C}_k$ has to be zero or positive: $\dot{C}_k \geq 0$. This means that equality constraints have to be actively enforced all the time, whereas inequality constraints only have to be enforced if $C_k$ reaches zero. If $C_k$ is greater than zero, the constraint solver has nothing to do.
4.3.2 LCP Formulation

Baraff [BAR89] first used a constraint-based method to calculate forces between rigid bodies in resting contact. The constraint force magnitudes must meet the following conditions:

1. The constraint forces do not allow bodies to inter-penetrate.
2. The constraint forces can push but not pull.
3. The constraint forces occur only at the contact point; Once two bodies have separated at a contact point, there is no force at that contact point.
4. Contact forces are continuous as a function of time.

Condition 1 may be written as:

\[ \dot{C}_k \geq 0 \quad (4.18) \]

For resting contact, we always have \( \dot{C}_k = 0 \). Classical mechanics tell us that acceleration \( \ddot{p}_j \) and \( \ddot{p}_i \) depend linearly on constraint force, while \( \dot{n}, \dot{n}, \dot{x}_j, \dot{x}_i \) are independent of constraint force. If we assume the system has \( n \) objects, then condition 1 is rewritten as:

\[ \ddot{C}_k = a_{k1} f_1 + a_{k2} f_2 + \ldots + a_{kn} f_n - b_k \geq 0 \quad (4.19) \]

Condition 2 is written as the inequality:

\[ \forall i \in [1, n], f_i \geq 0 \]

Denote

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    f_1 \\
    b_1 \\
    \vdots \\
    \vdots \\
    f_n \\
    b_n
\end{bmatrix}
\] as \( f \) and \( b \) as \( b \), \( A = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1n} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \cdots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n1} & a_{n2} & \cdots & a_{nn} \end{bmatrix} \).
Using matrix notation, equation (4.19) is written as:

\[
\ddot{C}_k = A \vec{f} - \vec{b} \geq 0, \quad \vec{f} \geq 0
\]  

(4.20)

From condition 3) and condition 4), if \( \ddot{C}_k > 0 \), the contact point is vanishing, the constraint force, \( f \), will be zero. Therefore we have

\[
\sum_{k=1}^{n} f_k \ddot{C}_k = 0
\]

(4.21)

From equation (4.20) and (4.21)

\[
\vec{f}^T A \vec{f} - \vec{f}^T \vec{b} = 0
\]

(4.22)

Finding a feasible solution of the two equations above, of \( \vec{f} \) is a quadratic programming problem. In general, this is a NP-hard problem. Baraff used a heuristic method to find an approximate solution. The heuristic is to find a minimum sum force solution that satisfy conditions 1) and 2) via solve a linear programming problem. Hopefully the solution for the constraint force will approximately minimize \( \sum_{k=1}^{n} f_k \ddot{C}_k \).

Baraff extended this method to colliding contact case, where \( \dot{C}_k < 0 \) i.e. bodies are moving towards each other. The collision impulses can be found by using the collision constraint equation:

\[
\dot{C}_k = v_k^+ + \epsilon v_k^- \geq 0
\]

Again according to classical mechanics, \( v_k^+ \) is a linear function of impulse \( J \). \( J \) is zero if \( v_k^+ \) actually exceeds \( -\epsilon v_k^- \). Hence like resting contact, we have
\[(v_k^+ + \omega v_k^-)J_k \geq 0 \text{ and } J_k \geq 0\]

An obvious problem of above method is how to solve the quadratic programming problem in a limited time. Generalized coordinate formulations are proposed as linear-time solution methods to tackle this problem, such as Featherstone’s Articulated Body Method (ABM) [FEA87]. To use them, a parameterization of the system in generalized coordinates has to be found *a priori*. This depends heavily on the current problem situation. However, there are no rules about how to find the right parameterization, and generalized coordinates only allow handling holonomic constraints but not nonholonomic constraints, such as joint limits or velocity-dependent constraints. To fill this gap, Baraff [BAR96] used Lagrange multipliers to give formulations with maximal coordinates and achieved the performance comparing to formulations with formulation generalized coordinates.

For convenience, positions and orientations of object with index i are gathered in one 6-dimensional vector: \[s_i(t) = \begin{pmatrix} x_i(t) \\ R_i(t) \end{pmatrix}\]. Then, we have:

\[
\dot{s}_i(t) = \frac{d}{dt}s_i(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} x_i(t) \\ R_i(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} V_i(t) \\ \omega_i(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I_3 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_i^*(t) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} V_i(t) \\ R_i(t) \end{pmatrix}
\]

Where \(I_3\) is 3 by 3 identity matrix. Denote

\[
H_i = \begin{pmatrix} I_3 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_i^*(t) \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } u_i(t) = \begin{pmatrix} V_i(t) \\ \omega_i(t) \end{pmatrix}, \text{ then } \dot{s}_i(t) = H_iu_i(t)
\]

Now we concatenate \(s_i(t), u_i(t)\), of all bodies into a single vector respectively:

\[
s(t) = (s_1(t), s_2(t)...s_n(t))^T
\]

\[
u(t) = (u_1(t), u_2(t)...u_n(t))^T
\]
And denote matrix \( n \) by \( n \) matrix \( S \) as

\[
S = \begin{pmatrix}
H_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & H_2 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & 0 & H_3 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & H_n
\end{pmatrix}
\]

We have:

\[
s(t) = H u(t) \quad (4.23)
\]

Forces and torques are combined into one vector: 

\[
f_i(t) = \begin{pmatrix} F_i(t) \\ \tau_i(t) \end{pmatrix}
\]

and we concatenate all \( f_i(t) \) into: 

\[
F(t) = (f_1(t), f_2(t) \ldots f_n(t))^T
\]

The mass property matrix of object with index \( i \) is also gathered in one 6 by 6 matrix as:

\[
M_i = \begin{pmatrix}
m & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & m & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & m & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -I_{xx} & -I_{xy} & -I_{xz} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -I_{xy} & I_{yy} & -I_{yz} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -I_{xz} & -I_{yz} & I_{zz}
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} m_i & 0 \\ 0 & I_i \end{pmatrix}
\]

The global mass matrix

\[
M = \begin{pmatrix}
M_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & M_2 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & 0 & M_3 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \cdots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & M_n
\end{pmatrix} \quad (4.24)
\]

The inverse of the global mass matrix
\[
W = \begin{pmatrix}
  m_1^{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\
  0 & I_1^{-1} & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\
  0 & 0 & m_2^{-1} & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\
  0 & 0 & 0 & I_2^{-1} & \ldots & 0 \\
  \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots \\
  0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & I_n^{-1}
\end{pmatrix}
\] (4.25)

According to Newton’s law, we have \( \dot{u}(t) = WF(t) \)

Using the Euler method to make it discrete, we have:

\[
u(t + \Delta t) = u(t) + WF(t)\Delta t
\]

(4.26)

A constraint \( C_k \) is a function of positions: \( C_k(t) = C_k(s(t)) \). Hence

\[
\dot{C}_k(t) = \frac{d}{dt}(C_k(s(t))) = \frac{\partial C_k}{\partial s} s'(t)
\]

From equation (4.23),

\[
\dot{C}_k(t) = \frac{\partial C_k}{\partial s} Hu(t)
\]

Define

\[
J = \frac{\partial C_k}{\partial s} H
\]

\( J \) is called the contact Jacobian. It is a 1 by 6n matrix. We have:

\[
\dot{C}_k(t) = Ju(t) = J_1 u_1(t) + J_2 u_2(t) + \ldots + J_n u_n(t)
\]

(4.27)

Since each contact only involves two objects, assume the two indexing numbers are \( i \) and \( j \), then only \( J_i, J_j \) are not zero. Hence, we have:

\[
\dot{C}_k(t) = J_i u_i(t) + J_j u_j(t)
\]

(4.28)

From equation (4.27),
\[
\ddot{C}_k(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \left( J u(t) \right) = J \dot{u}(t) + \frac{d}{dt} (J) u(t) = J \dot{u}(t) + c_k
\]

Where \( c_k = \frac{d}{dt} (J) u(t) \)

Hence according to the non-interpenetration condition which says constraint force can push but not pull, we always have

\[
\ddot{C}_k(t) = J \dot{u}(t) + c \geq 0 \tag{4.29}
\]

Using Lagrange multiplier method described in [WIT97], [BAR96], the constraint force

\[
F_i^c = \begin{pmatrix} J^T_i \\ \lambda_i \end{pmatrix} 
\]

Concatenate \( F \) into vector \( F \) and \( \lambda \) into vector \( \lambda \)

\[
F_{\text{constraint}} = J^T \lambda.
\]

Now the equation of the system motion is:

\[
M \ddot{u}(t) = J^T \lambda + f_{\text{ext}}
\]

where \( f_{\text{ext}} \) is the external force. Therefore, we have:

\[
\dot{u}(t) = WJ^T \lambda + Wf_{\text{ext}} \tag{4.30}
\]

From equation (4.30) and equation (4.29)

\[
C_k(t) = JWJ^T \lambda + JWf_{\text{ext}} + c \geq 0 \tag{4.31}
\]

Denote:

\[
A = JWJ^T \quad B = JWf_{\text{ext}} + c
\]

Equation (4.31) turns into:
\[ A\lambda + B \geq 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.32)

In series of equations shown above, \( \lambda = [\lambda_1, \lambda_2, ..., \lambda_n] \) and \( \lambda_1, \lambda_2, ..., \lambda_n \) could have unlimited combinations to satisfy constraints listed above. However, according to section 4.3.2, which says constraint force can only push, not pull, we have:

\[ \lambda_i \geq 0, \forall 0 < i \leq n \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.33)

Combing equation (4.32) and equation (4.33) is a Linear Complementarity Problem (LCP). Because the above formulation directly uses force constraint, it is called the force-based formulation method. One of the difficulties with this formulation method is that there is no guarantee of the existence of a solution, in the presence of contact with Coulomb friction.

Anitescu and Potra [AP97] proposed a velocity-based formulation that guaranteed solvability regardless of the configuration or number of contacts. Comparing to force-based LCP formulations, Velocity-based LCP formulations can also easily combine collisions and resting contacts. We use the analysis contained in section 4.3.1: For inequality constraints, it is satisfied as long as \( C_k \geq 0 \). As long as \( C_k > 0 \), \( \dot{C}_k \) can take positive and negative values because the deviation is allowed to grow or shrink. Only if in the case that \( C_k \leq 0 \) which means penetration, \( \dot{C}_k \) has to be zero or positive:

\[ \dot{C}_k \geq 0 \]

From equation (4.27), this turns into:

\[ Ju(t) \geq 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.34)

After time step \( \Delta t \), we still should have:

\[ Ju(t + \Delta t) \geq 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.35)
Apply a Euler integration scheme to equation (4.30), we have:

\[ u(t + \Delta t) = u(t) + WF(t)\Delta t \]  

(4.36)

Where \( F(t) = J\dot{\lambda} + f_{\text{external}} \)  

(4.37)

From equation (4.36) and equation (4.37), we have:

\[ J(u(t) + WJ\dot{\lambda}\Delta t + Wf_{\text{external}}\Delta t) \geq 0 \]  

(4.38)

Again, combining equation (4.38) and equation (4.33), we have a LCP problem to solve.

Practically, because the constraints are not about positions but about velocities, numerical errors stemming from internal approximations can sneak into the computations of the positions as the simulation proceeds. Most important of all, due to the time step method we use have to be fixed time step to maintain a fixed frame-rate ro have the simulation be suitable as instructional courseware. Using a fixed time step means that we have to allow a small penetration depth to avoid backtracking during the collision detection phase. From Figure 4.3, we can see that at the time of collision detection, \( t + \Delta t \), there is a little penetration depth. We adjust the velocity such that the error can be smaller in the next simulation step by adding a velocity error correction term to the right hand side (RHS) of the equation (4.34). Hence, we have:

\[ Ju(t) \geq b_{\text{contact}} \]  

(4.39)

Where

\[ b_{\text{contact}} = \frac{k_{\text{erp}}}{\Delta t}, \quad 0 \leq k_{\text{erp}} \leq 1 \]  

(4.40)

Error correction parameter \( k_{\text{erp}} \) is a measure of how much error reduction should occur in the next simulation.
Colliding surfaces between two objects are not always completely hard as if they were made of steel. Guided by the penalty methods, the current research uses a constraint force mixing (CFM) value to allow only a little penetration and making the constraint “soft”. The mixed constraint force allows a little penetration to happen at first and then slowly pushes the two objects away from each other. CFM is a square diagonal matrix. CFM simply adds to the diagonal of the original system matrix.

If CFM is set to zero, the constraint will be hard. If CFM is set to a positive value, it is possible to violate the constraint by “pushing on it” (for example, for contact constraints by forcing the two contacting objects together). In other words, the constraint will be soft and the softness will increase as CFM increases.

Using a positive value of CFM has the additional benefit of taking the system away from any singularity and thus improving the factorizer accuracy. If the system is near-singular, applying CFM can markedly increase stability.

After applying CFM, from equation (4.39) and equation (4.38), we have

\[ J(u(t) + WJ\lambda \Delta t + Wf_{external}\Delta t) \geq b_{contact} - K_{cmf} \lambda, \text{ i.e.} \]

\[ (JWJ + \frac{1}{\Delta t} K_{cmf})\lambda - \frac{1}{\Delta t}(b - Ju) + JWf_{external} \geq 0 \]

Now,

Denote:

\[ A = J_k WJ + \frac{1}{\Delta t} K_{cmf} \]

\[ B = -\frac{1}{\Delta t}(b - Ju) + JWf_{external} \]
We have:

\[ A\lambda + B \geq 0 \]

Combining equation (4.33), we have our final LCP formulation. In the next section, we will discuss how to solve it.

### 4.3.3 SOR method to solve LCP problem

In this section, our goal is to solve following LCP problem to find value of \( \lambda \):

\[ A\lambda + B \geq 0 \]

\( \lambda_i \geq 0, \forall 0 < i \leq n \)

Given a large sparse matrix system \( A \vec{x} = \vec{b} \), we decompose \( A \) into a strictly lower matrix \( L \), a diagonal matrix \( D \) and a strictly upper triangular matrix \( U \), i.e. \( A = L + D + U \)

Now the solution of the matrix system

\[ \vec{x} = D^{-1} \vec{b} - D^{-1} (L + U) \vec{x} \]

Using an iterative method, first write the i’th variable as

\[ \vec{x}_i = \frac{\vec{b}_i - \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} L_{i,j} \vec{x}_j - \sum_{j=i+1}^{n-1} U_{ij} \vec{x}_j}{A_{i,i}} \]

The iterative scheme is

\[ \vec{x}_i^{k+1} = \frac{\vec{b}_i - \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} L_{i,j} \vec{x}_j^{k} - \sum_{j=i+1}^{n-1} U_{ij} \vec{x}_j^{k}}{A_{i,i}} \]
It is noticed that when \( x_i \) is updated, \( x_j \) for \( j < i \) have already been updated. It appears that using the more recent values of \( x_j \) could lead to faster convergence. Applying this idea, the above equation becomes:

\[
\begin{align*}
\rightarrow^{k+1} x_i &= \frac{\rightarrow b_i - \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} L_{i,j} \rightarrow^{k+1} x_j - \sum_{j=i+1}^{n-1} U_{i,j} \rightarrow^k x_j}{A_{i,i}} \\
\end{align*}
\]

This iterative scheme is called the Gauss-Seidel method.

Introduce residual vector

\[
\rightarrow r = \rightarrow A x - \rightarrow b
\]

Gauss-Seidel method using

\[
\rightarrow^{k+1} x_i = \rightarrow x_i + \frac{\rightarrow^{K+1} r_i}{A_{i,i}}
\]  

(4.41)

This will make

\[
\rightarrow^{k+1} r_{i+1} = \rightarrow b_i - \sum_{j=0}^{i} A_{i,j} \rightarrow^{k+1} x_j - \sum_{j=i+1}^{n-1} A_{i,j} \rightarrow^k x_j
\]

\[
= \rightarrow b_i - \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} A_{i,j} \rightarrow^{k+1} x_j - \sum_{j=i+1}^{n-1} A_{i,j} \rightarrow^k x_j - A_{i,i} \rightarrow^{k+1} x_i = 0
\]

A better iterative scheme is \( x_i \) which makes the norm of residual vector \( \| r \| \) smaller. Modify equation (4.41) to

\[
\rightarrow^{k+1} x_i = \rightarrow x_i + \omega \frac{\rightarrow^{K+1} r_i}{A_{i,i}}, \quad \omega > 0.
\]  

(4.42)

There are certain values of \( \omega \) make norm of the residual vector to reduce and leads to faster convergence. \( \omega \) is called the relaxation parameter of the Gauss-Seidel method. The new
iterative scheme is called successive over relaxation (SOR). Equation (4.42) can be reformulated into a more implementation-friendly formula

\[ x_{i}^{k+1} = (1 - \omega) x_{i}^{k} + \frac{\omega}{A_{i,i}} \left( b_{i} - \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} A_{i,j} x_{j}^{k} - \sum_{j=i+1}^{n-1} A_{i,j} x_{j}^{k} \right) \]

In rigid body simulation the A-matrix is often symmetric and further the A-matrix is often positive semi-definite (PSD) or sometimes positive definite (PD). Even if it is PSD, CFM can be applied to make it PD. To make a long story short, the A-matrix can be made numerically more pleasant, such that we know a solution exists to the LCP problem.

### 4.4 Implementation and Conclusion

Experience with several existing physics engines shows that several approaches are useful to model constraints. There are many details which can interact. This is shown by applying CFM and error correction parameter in section 4.3.2.

A physical simulation for rigid body is a combination of their components: unconstrained motion (section 4.1), collision detection (section 4.2) and collision response computation (section 4.3). Timing step methods determine the calling sequence of these components. For the interactive simulation, fixed time step methods are needed. Fixed time step methods proceed by making steps of size \( \Delta t \) and do not subdivide this time step. This implies that collisions are not handled at the exact collision time. Fixed time step methods are of three types: explicit time step method, (semi) implicit time step method, and collision-contact-separated time step method.

Explicit time step method proceeds as follows:

1) Collision detection

2) Collision response computation
3) Solving ODE to update velocity and position

4) Error correction

5) Increase time step by $\Delta t$

(Semi)implicit time step method tries to detect all contacts that may occur until the time $t + \Delta t$ and it proceeds as follows:

1) Position and orientation update by solving ODE and use it to estimate positions and orientation

2) Collision detection

3) Collision response computation

4) Solving ODE again to get real velocity, position and orientation

5) Error correction

6) Increase time step by $\Delta t$

The collision-contact-separated time step method is presented by Guendelman [GUB03]. The explicit Euler integration method makes the separation of velocity update and position update easier. Two collision detections are used. After the first collision detection, all contacts are deemed as colliding contact. After the second collision detection, all contacts detected will naturally be at resting contact since they are not separating. Hence this method does not need to distinguish colliding contacts from resting contacts. It proceeds as follows:

1) Collision detection

2) Colliding contact response computation

3) Velocity update

4) Collision detection
5) Resting contact solver
6) General constraint solver (i.e. joint)
7) Position update
8) Error correction
9) Increase time step by $\Delta t$

Current research uses a fixed time step method. First of all, axis aligned bounding box (AABB) information of each object is updated for a broad-phase collision detection. Unconstrained motion (detailed in section 4.1) of all building components are solved by advancing the ODE integration one time step. The position, orientation, linear velocity and angular velocity of each building component are updated. Collision detection detailed in the previous subsection (4.2.2) is performed to generate contact points and their related information. Equations (4.8), (4.9)(4.10)(4.11)(4.12)(4.13) and (4.14) are used to pre-compute the inertial of each object at the object construction phase. Then, given the current object orientation, equation (4.7) is used to calculate inertial of each object at each frame. Naturally, matrix M in equation (4.24) and W in equation (4.25) are determined. Given velocity $u(t)$ which including both linear velocity and angular velocity, Jacobian $J$.

Time step method in current research includes seven steps:

1) Update AABB of each object
2) Predict unconstrained motion of each object
3) Perform collision detection
4) Compute contact graph
5) Solve contact constraints
6) Integrate transforms to update position and velocity of each object

7) Update activation state of each object according to the current frame information and previous information.

We first show the result of using SOR method to solve LCP formulation for constraint-based collision response computation. We put an axis-aligned cube with dimension of 2 at a height level of zero and put the ground at a height level of -9. Ideally, the mass center of the cube will fall to the height level of -9 and stay there if no bouncing in consideration. We first use values from Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Values for test 1

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time step</td>
<td>1/60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over relaxation coefficient</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision detection method</td>
<td>Box-box collision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The box-box collision detection method is from section 4.2.1. The value of the Lagrange multiplier of contact point 1 in each iteration number is shown as Figure 4.5. We can see that at the fifth iteration, the value converges at about 82. The Lagrange multiplier of contact point 1,2,3,4 is shown as Figure 4.6 and Figure 4.7. Since the collision is detected at time step 0, this shows that at step 1 the collision force reaches the maximum value and then it varies around the gravity force of the cube.
Figure 4.5 Lagrange multiplier at contact point 1 of each iteration in test1

Figure 4.6 Lagrange multiplier at contact point 1 and 2 in test1
Figure 4.7 Lagrange multiplier at contact point 3 and 4 in test1

Figure 4.8 Position changing with simulation step in test1
The position and the velocity of the cube changing with simulation steps, is shown as Figure 4.8 and Figure 4.9. The penetration error at this situation is very small.

In conclusion, we solved the collision response between building components based on the Lagrange multiplier method which is based on physics. The merit of the iterative scheme of the SOR method is especially useful for changing the application from engineering analysis to interactive simulation for instruction purposes. Engineering analysis requires highly accurate results while instructional applications need to show engineering processes in a reasonable time period with enough accuracy to appear reasonable. Based on this logic and taking into consideration the computational limitations of PCs used in classrooms, leads us to conclude that we can not necessarily run applications at 60 HZ. Therefore, we lower the simulation time step to 20 HZ , keeping the other values shown in Table 4.2, and conduct test 2 for the physics engine. Test 2 shows that penetration error is almost the same as with test 1. This give us the ability to speed up the simulation by a factor of 3 which is necessary for instructional purposes. With a
somewhat simplified physics engine we can proceed to build the residential building model
taking into consideration both the graphics world and the physics world. This is described in the
next chapter.
CHAPTER 5: DAMAGE PROCESS DYNAMICS

5.1 Wind Field Modeling

The wind field model determines the force applied to the building component. We describe the hurricane wind field model in three subsections. The first subsection is the overall mean flow field describing the upper level winds. The second subsection is the boundary layer model used to estimate wind speeds at the surface of the earth, given the upper level wind speeds. The third subsection describes how to calculate wind force on building components given a wind field.

5.1.1 Upper Level Wind Model

The computation grid of upper level models is normally in large scale space (1000 meter level) and large scale time frame (about 6 hours). Chow [CHO71] developed a moving vortex formulation for wind field modeling. This model is based on the equation of horizontal motion, vertically averaged through the depth of the PBL, written in coordinates fixed to the earth as

\[
\frac{DV_w}{Dt} + fK \times V_w = -\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla P + \nabla (k_H \nabla V_w) - \frac{C_D}{h} |V_w| V_w
\]

In this model, the vertical advection of momentum is neglected because it is small compared to the horizontal advection. Where:

\[
DV_w/Dt = d/dt + \nabla \cdot V_w;
\]

\(d/dt = \) time derivative local to the world coordinates;

\(\nabla = \) two-dimensional Laplace operator;

\(V = \) vertically averaged horizontal velocity;
f = Coriolis parameter;
K = unit vector in the vertical direction;
\( \rho \) = mean air density;
P = atmospheric pressure;
\( K_H \) = horizontal eddy viscosity coefficient;
\( C_D \) = drag coefficient;
\( h \) is depth of PBL.

Thompson and Cardone [THO96] gave a full nonlinear solution of the equations of motion of a translating hurricane. First, the pressure \( P \) is separated into two parts. One is pressure field \( P_c \) representing the tropical cyclone which is assumed to translate horizontally with the storm. The other part is the large-scale pressure field, \( P_0 \). \( P_0 \) is related to a constant geostrophic flow \( V_g \) by

\[
fK \times V_g = -\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla P_0
\]

By separate \( V_w \) into horizontal wind velocity relative to the hurricane low center \( V \), and velocity of the moving reference system relative to the fixed earth \( V_c \), they got

\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = fu - (u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial u}{\partial y}) - (fv_g + \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial P_c}{\partial x}) + H_u - F_u
\]

\[
\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} = -fu - (u \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial v}{\partial y}) - (-fu_g + \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial P}{\partial y}) + H_v - F_v
\]

Where \( u, v \) are x and y components of \( V \) respectively, \( u_g, v_g \) are x, y components of \( V_g \) respectively. \( H \), and \( F \) are functional operators which are defined as:

\[
H\dot{\bullet} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (K_H \frac{\partial \dot{\bullet}}{\partial x}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (K_H \frac{\partial \dot{\bullet}}{\partial y})
\]
\[ F \bullet = \frac{C_D}{h} [(u + u_e)^2 + (v + v_e)^2]^{1/2} (\bullet + \bullet c) \]

\( u_e, v_c \) are x, y components of \( V_c \) respectively.

Vickery, P.J., Skerlj, et al. [VIC00] simplified this model by writing it as:

\[ \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = -A_u + B_u + P_u + E_u + D_u \]

\[ \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} = -A_v + B_v + P_v + E_v + D_v \]

Where advection terms \( A_u \) and \( A_v \) are given by

\[ A_u = \left(u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial u}{\partial y}\right) \]

\[ A_v = \left(u \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial v}{\partial y}\right) \]

The components of \( B \) are given by

\[ B_u = f v \]

\[ B_v = -f u \]

The components of \( P \) are given by

\[ P_u = -f v g - \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial P_e}{\partial x} \]

\[ P_v = f u g - \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial P_e}{\partial y} \]

The components of \( D \) are given by

\[ D_u = \frac{C_D}{h} [(u + u_e)^2 + (v + v_e)^2]^{1/2} (u + u_e) \]
\[
D_v = \frac{C_D}{h} \left[ (u + u_c)^2 + (v + v_c)^2 \right]^{1/2} (v + v_c)
\]

The drag coefficient \( CD \) over the land takes a value of 0.005 according to Vickery and Twisdale [VIC95]. The PBL height \( h \) is taken as 1000 meters in all cases. Hence \( D_u, D_v \) can be neglected.

The components of \( E \) are given by

\[
E_u = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (K_H \frac{\partial u}{\partial x}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (K_H \frac{\partial u}{\partial y})
\]

\[
E_v = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (K_H \frac{\partial v}{\partial x}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (K_H \frac{\partial v}{\partial y})
\]

A sensitivity study that varies \( K_H \) by \( \pm 50\% \) shows that the influence of the horizontal eddy viscosity coefficient on the modeled hurricane wind speed estimates is negligible. Hence \( E_u, E_v \) will also be neglected. Hence the final simplified equation is:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} &= -\left( u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \right) + fv - fv_x - \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial P}{\partial x} \\
\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} &= -\left( u \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} \right) - fu + fu_x - \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial P}{\partial y}
\end{align*}
\]

Write the above two equations in a more compact way

\[
u_t = -(\nabla u)u - fu + fu_x - \frac{1}{\rho} \nabla \rho \tag{5.1}
\]

The wind velocity \((u,v)\) is a scalar field, i.e. it is a function defined on the two-dimensional Euclidean space \((x,y)\) with real values. The non-linear term \(-(u \nabla)u\) on the right hand makes these equations hard to solve. We approximate the solution of equation (5.1) by adding up the solution of following four equations:

\[
u_{1t} = -(\nabla u_{1})u_{1} \tag{5.2}
\]
\[ u_{2r} = -fu_2 \quad (5.3) \]
\[ u_{3r} = fu_3 g \quad (5.4) \]
\[ u_{3r} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla \rho \quad (5.5) \]

Equation (5.2) has a form of kinematic wave. It is also called advection of the fluid on itself. We use method of characteristics from reference [BIL00] to solve this equation. The implementation method is from reference [STA99].

Vickery compares the simulated data with real hurricane wind speed data. His results show that this model provides a good representation of the hurricane wind field, provided reasonable estimates of the radial pressure profile parameter, and radius to maximum winds of a hurricane, are available. HAZUS® predicts hurricane speed based on this model.

5.1.2 Boundary Layer Model

The boundary layer model is based on boundary layer theory. It is assumed that mean wind speed over some averaging time (one minute) vs. height at a location near a building might resembles the curve in Figure 5.1.
Figure 5.1 Wind speed vs. height at a location near a building

The log-law equations used to model the mean wind-speed profile are given in equation \( (5.6) \) and equation \( (5.7) \) [DYR97].

\[
U(z) = u_* \frac{1}{k} \ln \left( \frac{z}{z_0} \right) \tag{5.6}
\]

\[
u_* = \sqrt{\frac{\tau_0}{\rho}} \tag{5.7}
\]

In equation \((5.6)\), \(U(z)\) is the mean wind speed at height \(z\). \(k\) is the Von Karman constant which is approximately 0.4. \(z_0\) is the roughness length of the terrain over which the wind acts. It represents the size of a characteristic vortex created as the wind moves over the terrain. In equation \((5.7)\) \(u_*\) is the friction velocity which is defined by a ratio of the shear stress \(\tau_0\) at the ground surface and the density of air \(\rho\). [DYR97] gives how to modify the parameters \(u_*\) and \(z_0\) for each type of terrain.

Figure 5.1 shows the wind speed curve that might resemble the result after the turbulence component is taken into consideration. The turbulence component of the wind is often represented as a Gaussian random variable, with a zero mean and a standard deviation that varies
with height. Experimentation reveals that the standard deviation remains constant above the height of most structures and all low-rise structures. The standard deviation of the turbulence component in the direction of wind flow $\sigma_u$ can be calculated as an equation (5.8), where A is a constant that varies with the roughness length $Z_0$, and has a value of approximately 2.5 for open terrain. The intensity of turbulence intensity $I_u(z)$ is a function of height as equation (5.9).

$$\sigma_u = Au_*, \quad (5.8)$$

$$I_u(Z) = \frac{\sigma_u}{U(Z)}, \quad (5.9)$$

Recent research like the FCMP project provides insight about turbulence intensity and gust eddy size. Furthermore, it shows that hurricane wind behavior might be unique at the level of low-rise structures.

To show the building damage in real-time, techniques to solve the wind field can not be computationally intensive. Wejchert [WEJ91] visualized hundreds of leaves moving with the wind by breaking the 3D fluid regime into a linear fluid flow regime and an object boundary regime. Flow primitives, which are analytical solutions of linear systems (like uniform flow, source, sink and vortex flows) are used to combine into a wind field instead of numerically solving the fluid equations. Thus it provides a fast and simple technique for creating flows for animation. The limitation of this method is that the final wind field depends on how to combine different flow primitives. Yngve [GAR00] animated explosions by using a system including two-way coupling between solid objects and surrounding fluid. Technique used in this paper generated a variety of effects including shaped explosive charges, a projectile propelled from a chamber by an explosion, and objects damaged by a blast.
5.2 Roof Damage Visualization

5.2.1 Wind Force Computation

This subsection gives details on how to calculate the wind force acting on each shingle thus determining flight trajectory. The FCMP measured building envelope forces (specifically roof uplift) by instrumenting a set of 30 residential houses along the Florida coast. Collected data from an individual house included time histories of pressure at various locations on the roof, soffit, and attic as well as wind speed, and wind direction. Gurley (2006) made a field survey in Charlotte County, Florida, at zones experiencing a hurricane with a wind speed between 130 and 140 miles per hour [GUR06]. This survey showed that 15 percent of houses constructed from 2002 to 2004 had tile damage exceeding 5%, mostly ridge cap loss. This suggests that tiles at the ridge of the roof are likely to be subject to higher wind force than tiles in other roof locations.

It is common practice to represent aerodynamic loads in terms of dimensionless coefficients. Equations (5.10) (5.11) (5.12) compute loads given the value of a dimensionless coefficient.

\[ D = \text{Drag} = \frac{\rho V^2 S_{\text{ref}} C_D}{2} \]  
(5.10)

\[ L = \text{Lift} = \frac{\rho V^2 S_{\text{ref}} C_L}{2} \]  
(5.11)

\[ M = \text{Pitching Moment} = \frac{\rho V^2 l_{\text{ref}} C_M}{2} \]  
(5.12)

Here, \( C_D \) is the drag coefficient, \( C_L \) is the lift coefficient, and \( C_M \) is the pitching moment coefficient. The variable \( S_{\text{ref}} \) is a constant reference area, usually taken to be a projected area of the geometry, such as a cross-section area or a top-down projected area. The variable \( l_{\text{ref}} \) is a...
reference length, usually taken to be one of the physical dimensions of the object, such as the chord width of a wing or the diameter of a sphere-like object. The variable $\rho$ is the air density.

Finally, the variable $V$ is the speed of the fluid, measured relative to the object; that is, it is the speed of the fluid moving past the object, measured in world space. Given the velocity of the body where the force is applied to an object, $V_{\text{location-of-force}}$, in world space, and a wind velocity in world space, $V_{\text{wind}}$, it is easy to find the wind velocity relative to the object, $V_{\text{relative\_wind}}$, using Equation (5.13).

$$V_{\text{relative\_wind}} = V_{\text{wind}} - V_{\text{location-of-force}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.13)

The geometry of this situation is illustrated in Figure 5.2. The quantity $V$ in Equations (5.10) (5.11) (5.12) is simply the magnitude of $V_{\text{relative\_wind}}$.

![Figure 5.2 Relative wind of building component](image)

When calculating $V_{\text{location-of-force}}$, the translational velocity due to object rotation must be included.

$$V_{\text{location-of-force}} = V_{\text{point-of-rotation}} + (\omega \times (r_{\text{location-of-force}} - r_{\text{point-of-rotation}}))$$
Where \( r \) is the location of a point, measured in world space, and \( \omega \) is the rotational velocity about an axis through the point \( r \) point-of-rotation, measured in radians per second.

How to determine the correct value of wind force coefficient \( CD \), \( CL \) and \( CM \) and is the key for visualizing building component damage.

### 5.2.2 Wind Force Coefficient

One piece of plywood is covered with many shingles. For simplification, we assume that unless all shingles attached to the plywood are lost, the plywood is under no wind force. To discriminate among shingles on the same roof, instead of calculating the complex wind field near the building envelop, we vary the drag coefficient and lift coefficient according to the shingle distance along the wind direction.

According to boundary layer model theory, assuming that the incident wind is a simple uniform wind model for the residential building, the wind field around the building envelop could still be very complicated as in Figure 5.3.

![Figure 5.3 Flow topology in the upstream (left) and downstream (right) region [BEC02]](image-url)
Figure 5.4 Correlation coefficient on roof surface for cornering winds

Figure 5.5 Mean pressure coefficients for cornering winds

Figure 5.6 Correlation coefficient on roof surface for winds parallel to the ridgeline

Figure 5.7 Mean pressure coefficient for winds parallel to the ridgeline

Figure 5.8 Correlation coefficient on roof surface for winds perpendicular to the ridgeline
Results from Cope. (2005) serve as the theoretical basis for calculating an approximation of the roof surface wind. For the case of a gable roof, the windward roof plane is subject to much higher wind force than the leeward roof plane due to the fact that the wind field near the leeward roof plane is turbulent.
To simplify the wind force computation, we apply a scale coefficient for shingles on different roof planes. Shingles on the same roof plane have the same coefficient. Gable roof planes are tagged as \textit{YDecrease} and \textit{YIncrease}. The \textit{YDecrease} roof plane is closer than the Y axis and its X value is smaller than the \textit{YIncrease} roof plane.

The coefficient is computed by using the angle between the wind direction and the X-axis of the house. Wind angle is the angle between the right north and the wind direction as shown in Figure 5.12. The global wind angle is defined as the angle between the right north and the wind
direction. The local wind angle is the angle between the wind direction and the house X-axis. Both wind direction and house X-axis are 2D vectors. Hence, we have:

\[
\cos(\text{Angle}) = \text{Dot product of wind direction vector and local X-axis in world coordinate}
\]

The Scale Coefficient is determined by using the angle value to look up an array. We define the angle as the degree of the wind direction sweeping to the X axis, with counterclockwise as positive. The range of the angle is from [-180, 180]. The scale coefficient is determined from a table lookup, 5 rows by 2 columns for the gable roof. A linear interpolation is used to calculate the real wind force scale coefficient.

Table 5.1 Wind force scale coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Angle</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.3 Shingle and Plywood Damage Process

This subsection gives details on how to determine when a shingle or a plywood sheet will be detached from the roof due to wind lift force overcoming attachment force.

The basic idea of determining when and how a shingle will be lost is to compare the wind force on each shingle with the attachment force of each shingle. The attachment force is
determined by the attachment method and physical properties of a shingle, such as its size and density. However, since the wind force calculation is already simplified, we have to use a strategy to visually depict which shingle will be lost at what time. The idea is to assign each shingle a value called “time of lost” (TOL). This value for each shingle is computed before the start of the damage process, and is based on wind speed, roof shape and shingle size. Shingles are then sorted according to the value assigned to them. When the damage process starts, an internal counter keeps track of the number of shingles lost. If the counter value reaches a threshold in the damage prediction module, no further shingles will be lost. The following diagram describes this process.

To determine the TOL of a shingle according to hurricane wind, we start with a definition. For a general convex set, C, a point from the set most distant along a given direction is called a supporting point of C. More specifically, P is a supporting point of C if for a given direction, d, it holds that

\[ d \cdot P = \max \{d \cdot V : V \in C\} \]

That is, P is a point for which dot product d and P is maximal. A support mapping \( S_c \) of an object C maps vectors to points of C, such that

\[ P \cdot s_c(P) = \max \{P \cdot x : x \in C\} \]
For all shingles on one roof plane, their distance along the direction of the wind is calculated such that the larger the distance, the larger the TOL of the shingle. This assures that shingles at the edge of windward roof plane are blown away by the wind sooner than other shingles.

From, heuristics, the TOL of a shingle is affected by its position on the roof plane. In general, a shingle on the windward roof plane is more susceptible to loss than one on the leeward roof plane. We use two key values to represent this feature: the maximum TOLS and the minimum TOLS of a roof plane. Two indexing tables are used to determine these values. The local wind angle (defined in previous subsection) is used as an indexing input. The table we use for the gable roof contains five rows by three columns. The first column is the local wind angle value. The second and the third row are the maximum and the minimum TOLS respectively.
Table 5.2 Maximum TOLS and minimum TOLS indexing table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wind Angle</th>
<th>MaxTOL</th>
<th>MinTOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With these two values, a simple formula is used to finally determine the TOL of each shingle.

\[
TOL = (\text{MinTOL} + \frac{\text{MaxTOL} - \text{MinTOL}}{\text{MaxDis tan} ce - \text{MinDis tan} ce} \times (\text{Dis tan} ce - \text{MinDis tan} ce)) \times \text{WFactor}
\]

\text{WFactor} is a coefficient proportional to wind speed.
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Figure 5.14 Diagram of shingle losing
5.3 Wall and Opening Damage Visualization

The masonry wall damage process is simplified such that force is applied to each brick eventually which can lead to the wall collapsing, given enough force. Once a breach is detected, we apply forces on the four walls. The direction of forces is the external normal of the wall plane.

However, wooden walls and openings are subject to breaking in a hurricane. Damage of wooden walls and openings are common in that cracks and holes appear due to external forces. Objects with holes or cracks must therefore be subdivided into simple convex polygons before they can be rendered. Wooden walls or window glass break and fracture can be triggered by two factors: Pressure force which exceeds building component capacity; and strong collision impact.

[JOH04] uses both finite elements and meshless particles to compute projectile impact on a multi-plate target. The object is initially made up of elements and the deformation process is solved by finite element analysis. As the solution progresses, the highly strained finite elements are converted into meshless particles. This method combines the benefits of both finite elements and meshless particles. The use of finite elements allows for an accurate and efficient solution for the less distorted portion of the object. Meshless particles can accurately and robustly model highly deformation-induced fracture. Terzopoulos and Fleischer [TER88] presented a general technique for modeling viscoelastic and plastic deformations. Energy functions are defined using three fundamental metric tensors that measure deformation over curves, surfaces, and volumes. The continuous deformation model based on the energy functions are made discrete by a finite differencing technique which is defined by controlled continuity splines [TER86]. If setting the elastic coefficients between adjacent nodes to zero whenever the distance between the nodes
exceeded a threshold, certain fracture effects can be modeled. Norton [NOR91] presented a technique for animating 3D solid objects that break when subjected to large strains. Consider what modeling processes are needed to depict a teapot shattering. A spring-mass system is used to model this behavior. When the distance between two attached mass points exceed a threshold, the simulation severs the spring connection between them. O’ Brien (1999) pointed out two limitations of these two methods. First, when the material fails, the exact location and orientation of the fracture are not known. As a result, these techniques can only realistically model effects that occur on a scale much larger than the inter-node spacing.

Apparently, research done in the area of the fracturing of brittle materials is generally not published because of the fact that the underlying physics have been simplified in such a way that they can be used in interactive simulation. Therefore, we have based our algorithm on observations, intuition and some basic knowledge of breaking of glass found online.

Glass (SiO2) is an amorphous material, which has properties of both a solid and a fluid. On a microscopic level, Its atoms do not lie in straight lines but are arranged somewhat randomly. Therefore, it is almost impossible to describe exactly how a crack will propagate. However, it is reasonable to conclude that a crack will continue in the same direction as it started. Whether the window glass will crack at all depends on the force of the impact. The Weibull distribution, approximates the probability of cracks forming for a given input stress [ASK96]. Glass has a Weibull number of 5-8. Low numbers implying a wider distribution (steel has a Weibull number of about 40). A window will withstand a harder impact in the middle of the glass than at the edges. This is because, at the edges the glass is fixed to a frame and therefore it cannot flex as freely as in the center, thus breaking more easily when subject to a
given force. When glass is formed, tiny air bubbles are also formed. When a crack comes to an air bubble, its behavior is undefined; it can change direction completely, divide itself into several new cracks or perhaps stop completely. This is because the crack will continue in the direction where the “edges” in the air bubble are the weakest, and there may be several such spots. The number of air bubbles in a glass is impossible to tell in advance, but if there are visible ones, there are probably many more that are so small that they cannot be seen with the naked eye. A crack propagates at very high speed. This differs with different kinds of glass, but in general the speed is approximately 1950 m/s [WEE04], compared to a bullet that travels at about 800 m/s. This means that you will never be able to see a crack spread in a window glass. When a strike hits a window, cracks will form if the glass bends more than it can withstand. Glass as a material is non-elastic, which is why a window easily cracks. If a strike is hard enough, circumferential crack patterns will form. Also, the number of radial cracks will be larger [MEN02]. There is no way of telling how many cracks will form when the window is hit by a given blow, but in general you can say that if you hit harder, more cracks will form. There will almost always be cracks forming at opposite directions from each other, i.e. if one crack propagates out from the impact point at one direction there will be another that starts off with the angle of the other one plus 180 degrees. When you hit hard enough the holes in the window will no longer get larger, but smaller. This is because the object you hit with will go through the glass before it has time to expose the material to any significant amount of bending stress. This also means that the cracks that form become shorter [MEN02]. That is why there can be small holes of sizes almost equal to the bullets’ when certain types of glass windows have been shot. A glass that already has cracks
or holes or other flaws in it will break in response to a much lighter impact. The cracks will behave and propagate in an even less predictable way [ASK96].

The window-glass fracture visualization is broken into four separate steps, namely deciding whether and how the glass breaks, generating the crack pattern from the initial conditions, building a data structure to represent the pattern and finally identification of the loose pieces that may or may not have formed in the pattern. In the following sections, each of these steps are described more in detail.

When the window-glass is hit with a certain speed and at a certain place, the program calculates if the glass will break at all:

1) A random function is used to count the break limit of this glass according to the Weibull distribution.

2) The spot where the glass was hit is used to decide if the glass will break. If the glass does not break, no further calculations will be carried out.

3) Otherwise, the program continues with calculations of how many cracks will form, and their directions.

Our “window cracking” application is based on an algorithm to find all the holes in the window created by the crack pattern. The lines representing the crack pattern is created by iterating through the Vector containing all Points, and for every Point, lines are drawn to connected points. A boolean “flag” is used to indicate if a connection already has been drawn. The lines are drawn independent of the glass pane but in the same plane. This makes the lines to look as if they where a crack pattern in the glass pane. Figure 5.15 shows the preliminary result of visualizing cracks on a window panel.
Since many small pieces of glasses will increase the computing needs of the physics engine, we turn to texture replacing when window breaks. This is shown in Figure 5.16.
5.4 Damage Rule Incorporation

The *first damage rule* is the damage prediction result. A physical damage model shown in Figure 5.17 is used in HAZUS®. It predicts wind-induced pressure damage to openings, wall cladding, roof cladding, roof cover and connections. This model compares loads to resistances to determine hurricane-induced building damage. Both masonry and wood frame wall failures are due to inward and outward pressure loads, which are modeled. Failure of the connections between the roof frame and the perimeter walls are modeled for wood and steel roof framing systems. The inherent nature of this computation is Monte Carlo simulation. The output is statistical, i.e. it is based on the probability of certain kinds of damage. Hence this model cannot be used in our hurricane visualization which is an interactive simulation.

We come up with a simple database containing engineering data from the HAZUS® software program. The database assisted design also lead to a feature that changing the database will changing the damage prediction result.
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Figure 5.17 Damage prediction diagram used by HAZUS®
The whole building damage state is a combination of damage states of five types of building components: roof cover, roof sheath, truss, opening and wall. Table 5.3 defines building component damage according to its whole building damage state. This is the second damage rule we use in the visualization system. The damage state of each building component governs the visualization details including motion, breaking, and fracture of different type of building components.

Table 5.3 Damage state for residential buildings defined in HAZUS®

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Damage State</th>
<th>Qualitative Damage Description</th>
<th>Roof Cover Failure</th>
<th>Window Door Failures</th>
<th>Roof Deck</th>
<th>Missile Impacts on Walls</th>
<th>Roof Failure</th>
<th>Wall Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Damage or Very Minor Damages</td>
<td>&lt;2%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little or no visible damage from the outside. No broken widows, or failed roof deck. Minimal loss of roof cover, with no or very limited water penetration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minor Damage</td>
<td>&gt;2% and &lt;15%</td>
<td>One window, door, or garage door failure</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&lt;5 impacts</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum of one broken window, door or garage door. Moderate roof cover loss that can be covered to prevent additional water entering the building. Marks or dents on walls requiring painting or patching for repair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate damage</td>
<td>&gt;15% and &lt;50%</td>
<td>&gt;One item &amp; up to 20% overall damage</td>
<td>1 to 3 panels</td>
<td>Typically 5 to 10 impacts</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major roof cover damage, minor roof sheathing failure. Some resulting damage to the interior of building from water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage State</td>
<td>Qualitative Damage Description</td>
<td>Roof Cover Failure</td>
<td>Window Door Failures</td>
<td>Roof Deck</td>
<td>Missile Impacts on Walls</td>
<td>Roof Failure</td>
<td>Wall Failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Severe damage</td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
<td>Between 20 -50% overall damage</td>
<td>&gt;3 and &lt;25%</td>
<td>Typically 10 to 20 impacts</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Destruction</td>
<td>Typically &gt;50%</td>
<td>&gt;50% overall damage</td>
<td>&gt;25%</td>
<td>Typically &gt;20 impacts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We use a component approach to analyze building component damage. This approach estimates vulnerability by explicitly accounting for the resistance capacity of building components and load produced by wind. Since wind loading characteristics are heavily dependent on the shape and component make-up of the structure, [PIN04] and [COP04] gave a statistical analysis of the residential building to define residential structural models. [PIN04] defined five basic damage modes for structural building components, including: roof covering, roof sheathing, roof-to-wall connections, walls, and openings. However, damage modes must make sense from an architectural and structural engineering point of view. For example, for a building covered by conventional sheathing, it may be assumed that wall damage will not occur without some loss of sheathing. Similarly, although fairures of shingles and openings (e.g., windows and doors) do not necessarily cause roof-to-wall connection damage, it is reasonable to assume that no roof to wall connection damage will occur without some shingle loss and opening breakage. Jean Pinelli (2004) [PIN04] used Venn diagrams to represent the relations between basic damage modes consistent with the structural engineering view. This Venn diagram is our
third damage rule. Table 5.4 shows the tabulated Venn Diagram which is more convenient to represent in computer software.
Table 5.4 Tabulated Venn diagram

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \nu (\text{m/s}) )</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( P(O_0T_0) )</td>
<td>90.25%</td>
<td>81.90%</td>
<td>38.00%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P(O_1T_0) )</td>
<td>4.75%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>54.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P(O_0T_jS_0) )</td>
<td>4.75%</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P(O_0T_jS_k) )</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P(O_1T_jS_0) )</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P(O_1T_jS_kW_0C_0) )</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P(O_1T_jS_kC_1W_0) )</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P(O_1T_jS_kW_mC_0) )</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P(O_1T_jS_kC_1W_m) )</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>21.93%</td>
<td>34.00%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This process makes it feasible to avoid the complicated engineering analysis of the resistance capacity for visualization purpose yet the result is valid. For example, shingles being pulled away is not determined by comparing the uplift force and the attaching force. Instead, the number of shingles lost is determined by the extent of the roof damage and which shingles lost is determined by probability. The probability is roughly determined by the location of the shingle and wind direction. Thus the damage visualization is turned into a physical simulation problem.

Implementing the third rule also help us avoid the unstability caused by numeric error, we set all building components as initially static and set them as dynamic as a result of wind stress. This is represented as a contact graph and is implemented in the physics engine. After the generation of all contact points by the physics engine, an overall contact graph is calculated.
Weighted Quick Union with path compression is used to solve the resulting connectivity problem. The problem statement is: Given a sequence of pairs of integers of the form (p-q), input a sequence of pairs and tell whether a pair is redundant. If (p-q), this means that p is connected to q, and vice-versa (the connection relation is transitive). A pair (p-q) is said to be redundant if and only if p is connected to q via some other integers. Here the integers refer to the id of the object. The algorithm must therefore remember the pairs it has seen (or information related to the pairs) so that it can determine if a given pair is redundant. The general approach is to keep some sort of data structure indicating who is connected to who. When a new pair p-q is read:

1) If both p and q are in the same set skip it.

2) If one is in the set and the other is new add it to the set.

3) If one is in one set and the other is in a different set union the two sets.

Abstractly we can accomplish this if we have two operations working for us. Find the set containing a given item. Replace the sets containing two given items by their union. There are many ways we can implement Union and Find functions even if we use the same underlying data structure. Weighted Quick Union with path compression is the best means of doing this.

A tree from bottom to top which represents the contact relation in the building is formed based on the constructed contact graph. For example, the foundation is in the bottom of the tree, the damage to the foundation will never occur unless there is damage to the building components on the higher level of the tree. Another example is that damage to the roof ar upper sheath will never occur unless many shingles covering the sheath are lost.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION & FUTURE RESEARCH

6.1 Conclusion

We built a hurricane visualization system, which focuses on visualizing the damage process of a residential building. With an intuitive human-computer interface to change the exposure setting and the structure setting of the building, the system helps users to improve their understanding of mitigating hurricane damage. We use Unified Modeling Language (UML) to describe the system static diagram and program flow.

Collision response computation plays a significant role in the simulation and we use an iterative approach to render the simulation. Figure 6.1 shows the damage process with five iteration cycles solving the constraint force. Figure 6.2 shows the damage process with the same setting, except for ten iterations. The visual effect is almost the same, but the time to render a frame is reduced (from 64ms to 57ms) with fewer iterations.

Figure 6.1 Iterative method with ten iterations
In Figure 6.1 and Figure 6.2, to show the procedural modeling method, both the shingle size and the plywood size are made smaller than they appeared in previous figures.

Using scalable time for the damage process enables us to visualize hurricane damage events faster than in real time. Speeding up a slow process results in more interesting, and therefore better instruction. Figure 6.3 is the visual effect according to a simple equation as following to determine the TOL of each shingle:

\[
TOL = (MinTOL + \frac{MaxTOL - MinTOL}{MaxDis \tan \theta - MinDis \tan \theta}) \times (Dis \tan \theta - MinDis \tan \theta) \times WFactor
\]

By tweaking the TOL calculation such as adding random factor, we get visual effect as Figure 6.4. A TOL table measured from actual tunnel test should also be able to easily incorporate into the system.
Figure 6.3 Shingle loss process using deterministic TOL function

Figure 6.4 Shingle loss process using TOL function with some randomization
Using databases results in faster run time, which is useful in meeting our instructional objectives. We can change our settings and almost instantly see the resulting changes in degree of damage. Our visualization shows that at a wind speed of 120 mph, a hip-roof one-story house suffers almost no damage. Keeping every setting the same, except for a change to a hip roof and two story construction results in more noticeable damage. This is consistent with HAZUS®.

Figure 6.5 and Figure 6.6 show a gable-roof one-story residential building with minor damage state and severe damage, respectively. Figure 6.7 shows a gable-roof two-story residential building which is severely damaged. Figure 6.8 and Figure 6.9 shows a hip-roof two-story residential building with severe damage; the view is from a different side. Interpenetration is shown while using between box and non-box triangular mesh. But it does not quite affect the fidelity of the whole scene. Figure 6.10 shows total destruction of a hip-roof one-story residential building. The corresponding wind speed is 175 MPH. In reality, a hurricane with this wind speed would generally completely destroy a residential building.
Figure 6.5 Gable-roof one-story house at minor damage state

Figure 6.6 Gable-roof one-story house at severe damage state
Figure 6.7 Gable-roof two-story house at severe damage state

Figure 6.8 Hip-roof two-story house at severe damage state viewing from windward
Figure 6.9 Hip-roof two-story house at severe damage state viewing from leeward

Figure 6.10 Hip-roof one-story house at destruction state
6.2 Future Research

There are several obvious improvements to make to our simulation. We can improve the efficiency of the underlying algorithms, or use enhanced hardware to achieve the same result. We also should simulate damage to a group of buildings; currently the simulation only results in damage to a single building and the other buildings in the scene are not affected by the hurricane wind forces. We can also improve the complexity as well as the fidelity of the environment being simulated.

Wei (2004) presents an approach for simulating the natural dynamics that emerge from the interaction between a flow field and immersed objects in [WEI04]. The flow field is modeled with boundary conditions appropriate for moving objects. The computation is accelerated on commodity graphics hardware (GPU) to achieve real-time performance. The boundary conditions mediate the exchange of momentum between the flow field and the moving objects resulting in forces exerted by the flow on the objects as well as the back-coupling on the flow. We discussed the possibility of using GPU method with Wei for computing a more realistic building envelop wind field. We believe this method is promising because of its two-way coupling effect.

Mueller (2006) proposed a novel shape grammar for the procedural modeling of CG architecture in SIGGRAPH 2006. This method produces building shells with high visual quality and geometric detail. His examples demonstrate solutions to consistent mass modeling with volumetric shapes of arbitrary orientation. This method is shown to efficiently generate massive urban building models with unprecedented level of detail. Since we use the procedural modeling method to model the residential building, it is very promising for us to integrate Muller’s novel
shape grammar for visualizing damage brought by hurricane in an area with multiple residential buildings. Figure 6.11 shows visualizing multiple buildings in a hurricane event. Applying different building codes to buildings in a same neighbor area will improve understanding of mitigation measures for general public.

Figure 6.11 Visualizing damage process of multiple residential buildings in a hurricane event
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