Comparison between Two Methods of Non-Destructive Evaluation of Standing Trees

Shadabeh Fathi, Ferenc Divos, Laszlo Bejo

Presenter: Shadabeh Fathi







NDT in Canada 2019 | June 18-20 | Edmonton, AB

How the pulling test work?



Introduction of DynaRoot System

In this study for measuring the stability root were used DynaRoot system. Dynamic root stability determination using natural wind loads. Allows simultaneous assessment of multiple trees. DynaRoot System has 3 main part



Anemometer

An instrument for measuring wind velocity at or near the tree to be evaluated. The closer is better, depending on the wind velocity Dynaroot may provide reliable data even with measurements taken several kilometers/miles a way. The anemometer provides wind velocity data. Ideally the anemometer should be clear of buildings or other objects that may objects the wind, at a height at least 10 meter



Dual axis Inclinometer

An instrument affixed to the root collar that measures the inclination of trunk in two different direction the instrument provides very accurate inclination data, the sampling rate is 10 Hz. with sufficient frequency and measurement range ± 2 degree, resolution:0.001 degree.





Evaluation Software

The data was transferred into the DynaRoot Evaluation software, which estimated the critical wind pressure (Pwind), based on the statistical parameters of the data sets. Safety factor (SF) is calculated for a given wind velocity value of the area. In Hungary $V_{wind} = 33$ m/s and $\rho_{air} = 1.2$ kg/m3. $P_{wind} = \frac{\rho_{air}}{2} V^2$ $SF = \frac{P_{crit}}{P_{crit}}$

Data 1 Inclinometer Tree Location Folder 2 \Desktop\dynaroot fakkop\Larch behind DBUILDING\inclinometer Anemometer **Parameters** Device Ref. wind speed (km/h) 120 + -? Fakopp ultrasonic anemometer Folder Advanced parameters (=) UTC offset (hours:minutes) 00:00

Ienu | FAKOPP DYNAROOT 0.10.227 - *UNNAMED



Compare between pulling test and DynaRoot SYSTEM

Pulling test is the static method for measuring stability of tree roots. In this method, the main force is mechanical, and it can damage the tree. However, in DynaRoot system the static loading is replaced by actual wind loads. e .Dynamic methods are faster and simpler to carry out than the Pulling test, use a more realistic loading scenario, and there is no chance of damaging the tree

Result













Tree Nr.		1	2	3	4	5
ArborSonic	A (m ²)	25.3	27.2	21.3	13	9.4
	cch (m)	13.9	14.1	11	11	8.7
Pulling test	F _{max} (N)	11484	13245	22113	5889	4817
	M _{max} (Nm)	62761	64401	116732	30815	24695
DynaRoot	P _{crit} (Pa)	1043 ±313	572 ±144	1460 ±383	476 ±94	1329 ±1038
	F _{crit} (N)	6596	3889	7774	1547	3123
	M _{crit} (Nm)	91697	54843	85519	17017	27171

A - crown surface area, cch - crown centerpoint height F_{max} , M_{max} = Predicted uprooting force and torque, pulling test; P_{crit} , F_{crit} , M_{crit} = Predicted uprooting pressure, force and torque, DynaRoot



compare the SF obtained from Pulling test and DynaRoot system

The compare between the Torque of Dynaroot system and Torque of pulling test



Conclusions

5 severely decayed Ash (*Fraxinus Excelsior*) trees were evaluated for stability using the traditional pulling test and an innovative dynamic tree stability evaluation method. The comparision of the two methods yielded the following conclusions:

- The two methods yielded different, but comparable Safety Factor (SF) values at the same reference wind velocity level. Differences were due to differences in measurement direction, the effect of possible shielding on dynamic measurements, and differences inhetent in the two methods.
- The dynamic method provides more conservative SF values.
- Uprooting torque estimates correlate reasonably well between the two methods ($R^2 = 0.64$) The dynamic method, again, typically, but not consistenty, provided more conservative estimates.





Thank you for your time and your attention

