MSc. Geomatics

Integrated modeling of utility networks in the urban environment

Androniki Pavlidou

Supervisors: Giorgio Agugiaro, Jantien Stoter Co-reader: Bastiaan van Loenen External supervisor: Jan van der Voorst







Introduction/ Motivation





Problem statement





Literature review





Methodology

Results

Conclusions

Introduction/Motivation

- The ever-increasing need for the existence of the dual representation of the geographical information for the underground utility networks
- Improvement and development of the data-driven models
- The need for evaluation of the existing information related to the underground utility networks condition



Source: <u>https://www.city-journal.org/untangling-nyc-underground-utility-infrastructure</u>



Problem statement

\oslash

The limited availability of a detailed and accurate geo-referenced map for the underground utility networks



- Bad data quality
- Incomplete and/or unreliable datasets
- Information mostly in 2D
- Lack of metadata
- Not up-to-date





There is a need for a reliable and wellmaintained network

Research objective

Research question:

How is it possible to model underground utility networks in 3D, integrated with the above-ground objects, such that they can be suitable for multiple uses?

Sub-questions:

- How to represent a direct connection with the above-ground condition?
- Is it possible to achieve that connection?
- Is the 3D information useful?
- Is it possible a limited 3D information to be extended to a larger network?



Literature review

Developed models supporting utility networks mapping

- INSPIRE Network
- CityGML Utility Network ADE
- Industrial Foundation Classes -IFC
- ESRI Geometric Network
- Model for Underground Data Definition and Integration-MUDDI

Related work:

- **den Duijn et al., 2018**: Modelling below and above-ground utility network features with the CityGML Utility Network ADE: Experiences from Rotterdam
- Yan et al., 2018: Three-Dimensional Data Modelling for Underground Utility Network Mapping
- Fossatti et al., 2020: Data modeling for operation and maintenance of utility networks: implementation and testing
- Boates et al., 2018: Network modeling and semantic 3D city models: Testing the maturity of the Utility Network ADE for CityGML with a water network test case



Methodology







Data collection



| | Raster data | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Attributes | Geometry | Topology | Elevation | | | |
| Data features that describes their nature (e.g. network type, usage, semnatic information) | Information related to data shape, legnth and type of geometry (e.g. geometry: line, point) | Information about the connectivity between the stored entities and the between them relationships | Height information related to the surface of the study area, extracted from the corresponding Digital Terrain Model | | | |







Data analysis



Quantitative: Refer to numerical analysis; finding patterns, cause-effect relationships

Qualitative: Refer to the elements characterize the data



Refer to the study of the entities using their topological, geometric, and geographic properties.



e the data - Content analysis

Data analysis



Attributes: Analyze the stored records that characterize the network and network elements (e.g. available 3D information)

Qualitative Quantitative Spatial

Geometry: Clarification of the shapes and lengths of the available features.

Topology: Examine connectivity between the features stored in the vector data as well as the existing relationships



| Dataset/ | Total number | Rows with complete | Rows with incomplete | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| completeness | of rows | information | information | | |
| TU Cable or Pipe line Z | 1407 | - 3.7% | 1407 | | |
| TU Cable element point Z | 912 | 34 | 878 | | |
| TU Cable pipeline Z | 1407 | - | 1407 | | |
| TU Sewer knot point Z | 1986 | - 0.9% | 1986 | | |
| TU Sewer line Z | 2080 | 19 | 2061 | | |
| TU pipe element point Z | 1038 | - | 1038 | | |





















Data cleaning process: manual modifications









Perceelaansluitleiding / sewer infiltration

Sewage network Infiltration network Plot connection pipes

A × 11 11111 1.64 2.11 5 Perceelaansluitleiding / plot connection pipe



2. Data processing and integration:addition of fields to createinterdependencies between thedatasets and their components

| Network_id | Edge_id | Subnetwork_id | Node_start | Node_en |
|------------|---------|---------------|------------|---------|
| 2 | 2 | 130 | 157 | 55 |
| 2 | 1 | 174 | 73 | 56 |
| 2 | 2 | 167 | 173 | 57 |







3. Topology reconstruction:

Extract the significant nodes of the networks

associate them with the point datasets information





Maintenance of the attributes of the initial point dataset- *spatial overlay*

| Node_id | Network_id | Sub_network | OBJECTID |
|---------|------------|-------------|----------|
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 2563 |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | 3347 |
| 4 | 2 | 1 | 4272 |
| 5 | 2 | 2 | 3808 |
| 6 | 2 | 2 | 4492 |
| | | | |







4. Data integration - 3D model of underground utility networks



DTM: filled values







Draped features

Data integration



5.1 Utility network model integration with city objects (Buildings)



Base layer: BRT Achtergrondkaan LoD: 2.2



Building footprints Building centroid

.



Integrated undeground utility networks



- Virtual edges connected with buildings' centroid
- Connection between topological nodes and city object



Sewage network Infiltration network Fire pipes network Plot connection pipes



5.2 Utility network model integration with city objects (Addresses)



Addresses point approach

Building-centroid approach





Attributes

- House number id
- Postcode
- Building entity id

.

• Municipality

| | openbareru | isnumn | iuislette | isnumn | postcode | ponplaa | emeenten | irovinciei 📥 | verblijfso | ppervlal | verblijf_1 | peadre: | adresseerb | pandid | andstati r | ndbouv | nummeraand |
|----|----------------|--------|-----------|--------|----------|---------|----------|--------------|------------|----------|-------------|---------|-----------------|---------------|------------|--------|-----------------|
| 1 | Rotterdamseweg | 139 | В | 11 | 2628AL | Delft | Delft | Zuid-H | woonfu | 33 | Verblijfsob | VBO | NL.IMBAG.Verbl | NL.IMBAG.Pand | Pan | 2010 | NL.IMBAG.Nummer |
| 2 | Rotterdamseweg | 139 | В | 46 | 2628AL | Delft | Delft | Zuid-H | woonfu | 30 | Verblijfsob | VBO | NL.IMBAG.Verbl | NL.IMBAG.Pand | Pan | 2010 | NL.IMBAG.Nummer |
| 3 | Rotterdamseweg | 139 | В | 51 | 2628AL | Delft | Delft | Zuid-H | woonfu | 30 | Verblijfsob | VBO | NL.IMBAG.Verbl | NL.IMBAG.Pand | Pan | 2010 | NL.IMBAG.Nummer |
| 4 | Rotterdamseweg | 139 | В | 53 | 2628AL | Delft | Delft | Zuid-H | woonfu | 30 | Verblijfsob | VBO | NL.IMBAG.Verbl | NL.IMBAG.Pand | Pan | 2010 | NL.IMBAG.Nummer |
| 5 | Rotterdamseweg | 139 | В | 14 | 2628AL | Delft | Delft | Zuid-H | woonfu | 29 | Verblijfsob | VBO | NL.IMBAG.Verbl | NL.IMBAG.Pand | Pan | 2010 | NL.IMBAG.Nummer |
| 6 | Rotterdamseweg | 139 | В | 47 | 2628AL | Delft | Delft | Zuid-H | woonfu | 31 | Verblijfsob | VBO | NL.IMBAG.Verbl | NL.IMBAG.Pand | Pan | 2010 | NL.IMBAG.Nummer |
| 7 | Rotterdamseweg | 139 | В | 17 | 2628AL | Delft | Delft | Zuid-H | woonfu | 31 | Verblijfsob | VBO | NL.IMBAG.Verbl | NL.IMBAG.Pand | Pan | 2010 | NL.IMBAG.Nummer |
| 8 | Rotterdamseweg | 139 | В | 28 | 2628AL | Delft | Delft | Zuid-H | woonfu | 29 | Verblijfsob | VBO | NL.IMBAG.Verbl | NL.IMBAG.Pand | Pan | 2010 | NL.IMBAG.Nummer |
| 9 | Rotterdamseweg | 139 | В | 5 | 2628AL | Delft | Delft | Zuid-H | woonfu | 29 | Verblijfsob | VBO | NL.IMBAG.Verbl | NL.IMBAG.Pand | Pan | 2010 | NL.IMBAG.Nummer |
| 10 | Rotterdamsewed | 139 | В | 44 | 2628AL | Delft | Delft | Zuid-H | woonfu | 30 | Verbliifsob | VBO | VIL IMRAG Verbl | NL.IMBAG.Pand | Pan | 2010 | NL IMBAG Nummer |



Integrated underground utility networks with address points



Legend

OpenStreetMap

Sewage network **Plot connection** pipes



Storage

Storage

6. Relational database - using PostGIS/PgRouting extensions





- Initial tables:
 - □ Topological nodes
 - □ Topological edges
- Reconstructed tables:
 - □ Noded_network (table in the middle)
 - Routing tables (shortest path)

| ed | network) |
|----|----------|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Storage

Storage

6. Relational database - using PostGIS/PgRouting extensions





- Initial tables:
 - □ Topological nodes -addresses
 - □ Topological edges
 - Overlapping points
- Reconstructed tables:
 - □ Noded_network (table in the middle)
 - Routing tables (shortest path)

Case study: results

Application development **7. Case 1:** *Disaster management- shortest path algorithm for building service* **Case 2:** Cost-effective route detection





| e ID | Node From | Node To | Length (m) |
|------|-----------|---------|------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 15.3 |
| | 2 | 3 | 14.5 |
| | 3 | 4 | 17 |
| | 3 | 5 | 12.3 |
| | 3 | 6 | 11.9 |
| | 3 | 8 | 19.4 |
| | 8 | 7 | 8.5 |
| | 8 | 9 | 5.5 |
| | 8 | 10 | 17.6 |

Node

Vertex

E: Edge



Cost optimum path for building service





Case 2

Modification of the length from selected edges, to calculate the most optimum route based on the 'cost'

Cost optimum path for address(-es) service



Objectives







3D model of underground utility networks

- **Topology reconstruction**
- "DTM 3D information"

Integration with the above-ground objects

- Integration with the buildings of the study area Integration with the addreses of the study area
- Simulation of real-world scenarios applications

- data quality.

- network)



Many assumptions required due to poor

 Both approaches are based on assumptions. The connectivity must be confirmed by an expert.

 For connectivity applications topology is important (reconstruction)

 Gravity dependent applications 3D information is important (e.g. sewage

Comparison of the two approaches

Building- centroid

- Connectivity at the building level
- Simplified integration

- More realistic model
- Spatially refined connectivity

- Methods are based on assumptions regarding the connectivity
- the validity of the connections must be confirmed by an expert



Addresses

Conclusions

Research question:

How is it possible to model underground utility networks in 3D, integrated with the above-ground objects, such that they can be suitable for multiple uses?

Sub-questions:

- How to represent a direct connection with the above-ground condition?
- Is it possible to achieve that connection?
- Is the 3D information useful?
- Is it possible a limited 3D information to be extended to a larger network?



Conclusions

Strengths

Weaknesses

- The proposed methodology works for the transformation of the geographical information into the topological representation
- The assumptions made were operational and allowed for the utilization of the final model
- List of recommendations for improving data quality

- The integration was achieved using the topological nodes, not the survey points
- The current condition of the data does not allow for their compliance with one of the available standards
- Data quality cannot be improved by Geomatics experts only



Opportunities

- Time must be invested in the detection of the existing inconsistencies in the available data
 - Validity should be ensured
 - Spatial processing/cleaning
 - Harmonization/ integration with available models
- The data should be enriched by adding the missing information (e.g. depths) networks' depth - fieldwork

Thank you for your attention!

