

Computer Vision for Structural Dynamics and Health Monitoring

Dongming Feng | Maria Q. Feng







Table of Contents

<u>Cover</u>

<u>Title Page</u>

<u>Copyright Page</u>

List of Figures

<u>List of Tables</u>

Series Preface

Preface

About the Companion Website

1 Introduction

1.1 Structural Health Monitoring: A Quick Review

<u>1.2 Computer Vision Sensors for Structural Health</u> <u>Monitoring</u>

1.3 Organization of the Book

<u>2 Development of a Computer Vision Sensor</u> <u>for Structural Displacement Measurement</u>

2.1 Vision Sensor System Hardware

2.2 Vision Sensor System Software: Template-Matching Techniques

2.3 Coordinate Conversion and Scaling Factors

2.4 Representative Template Matching Algorithms

2.5 Summary

<u>3 Performance Evaluation Through Laboratory</u> <u>and Field Tests</u>

3.1 Seismic Shaking Table Test

3.2 Shaking Table Test of Frame Structure 1

<u>3.3 Seismic Shaking Table Test of Frame Structure</u> <u>2</u>

<u>3.4 Free Vibration Test of a Beam Structure</u>

<u>3.5 Field Test of a Pedestrian Bridge</u>

<u>3.6 Field Test of a Highway Bridge</u>

3.7 Field Test of Two Railway Bridges

<u>3.8 Remote Measurement of the Vincent Thomas</u> <u>Bridge</u>

<u>3.9 Remote Measurement of the Manhattan Bridge</u>

3.10 Summary

<u>4 Application in Modal Analysis, Model Updating,</u> <u>and Damage Detection</u>

4.1 Experimental Modal Analysis

<u>4.2 Model Updating as a Frequency-Domain</u> <u>Optimization Problem</u>

4.3 Damage Detection

4.4 Summary

<u>5 Application in Model Updating of Railway Bridges</u> <u>under Trainloads</u>

5.1 Field Measurement of Bridge Displacement under Trainloads

5.2 Formulation of the Finite Element Model

5.3 Sensitivity Analysis and Finite Element Model Updating

5.4 Dynamic Characteristics of Short-Span Bridges under Trainloads

5.5 Summary

<u>6 Application in Simultaneously Identifying Structural</u> <u>Parameters and Excitation Forces</u> 6.1 Simultaneous Identification Using Vision-Based Displacement Measurements

6.2 Numerical Example

6.3 Experimental Validation

6.4 Summary

7 Application in Estimating Cable Force

7.1 Vision Sensor for Estimating Cable Force

7.2 Implementation in the Hard Rock Stadium Renovation Project

7.3 Implementation in the Bronx-Whitestone Bridge Suspender Replacement Project

7.4 Summary

8 Achievements, Challenges, and Opportunities

8.1 Capabilities of Vision-Based Displacement Sensors: A Summary

8.2 Sources of Error in Vision-Based Displacement Sensors

8.3 Vision-Based Displacement Sensors for Structural Health Monitoring

8.4 Other Civil and Structural Engineering Applications

8.5 Future Research Directions

<u>Appendix: Fundamentals of Digital Image Processing</u> <u>Using MATLAB</u>

A.1 Digital Image Representation

A.2 Noise Removal

A.3 Edge Detection

A.4 Discrete Fourier Transform

<u>References</u>

<u>Index</u>

End User License Agreement

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Table 1.1 Comparison of sensors for measuring structural vibrations.

Chapter 2

Table 2.1 Typical hardware components of a vision sensor system.

Chapter 3

Table 3.1 Measurement errors of the vision sensor in shaking table tests.

Table 3.2 Different levels of subpixel resolution.

Table 3.3 Measurement errors: NRMSE (%).

Table 3.4 Test conditions of eight representative measurements.

Table 3.5 Errors between peak displacements measured by different sensors.

Chapter 4

Table 4.1 Parameters of the three-story frame structure.

Table 4.2 Comparison of identified natural frequencies of the frame structure...

Table 4.3 Parameters of the simply supported beam.

Table 4.4 Comparison of identified natural frequencies of the beam structure.

<u>Table 4.5 Stiffness identification results ($\times 10^{4}$ N/m).</u>

Chapter 5

Table 5.1 Design parameters of the bridge and track system.

Table 5.2 Parameters of the freight train.

Table 5.3 Dominant frequencies.

Chapter 6

Table 6.1 Parameters for the numerical example.

Table 6.2 Simulation cases.

Chapter 7

Table 7.1 Cable length, measured cable frequencies, and tension discrepancies...

Table 7.2 Cable geometric and material parameters.

Table 7.3 Measured suspender rope frequencies and tension.

List of Illustrations

Chapter 1

<u>Figure 1.1 Common displacement sensors: (a)</u> <u>LVDT; (b) laser vibrometer; (c) ...</u>

<u>Figure 1.2 Vision-based remote displacement</u> <u>sensor.</u>

Chapter 2

<u>Figure 2.1 Commercially available video cameras:</u> (a) CMOS image sensor with ...

<u>Figure 2.2 Vision-based multi-camera measurement</u> <u>system.</u> Figure 2.3 Time synchronization.

Figure 2.4 Procedure for 2D vision sensor implementation.

<u>Figure 2.5 Defining a template subset in a source</u> <u>image.</u>

<u>Figure 2.6 Surface plot of the NCC and template</u> <u>coordinates in image 1.</u>

<u>Figure 2.7 Surface plot of the NCC and template</u> <u>coordinates in image 2.</u>

Figure 2.8 Schematic of stereo camera calibration.

<u>Figure 2.9 Scaling factor determination: (a) optical</u> <u>axis perpendicular to t...</u>

<u>Figure 2.10 Error resulting from camera non-</u> perpendicularity: (a) effect of ...

Figure 2.11 Flowchart of the UCC implementation.

Figure 2.12 Orientation code (N = 16).

<u>Figure 2.13 Matching results for images in ill</u> <u>conditions: (a) searching for...</u>

<u>Figure 2.14 Bilinear interpolation for sub-pixel</u> <u>analysis.</u>

Figure 2.15 Flowchart of vision sensor based on OCM.

<u>Figure 2.16 User interface of the OCM-based</u> <u>displacement measurement softwar...</u>

Chapter 3

Figure 3.1 Shaking table test.

<u>Figure 3.2 Comparison of sinusoidal displacements</u> <u>by the LVDT and vision sen...</u> <u>Figure 3.3 Comparison of earthquake</u> <u>displacements by the LVDT and vision sen...</u>

<u>Figure 3.4 Shaking table test of a three-story frame</u> <u>structure: (a) shaking ...</u>

<u>Figure 3.5 Subpixel resolution evaluation using a</u> <u>UCC-based vision sensor: (...</u>

<u>Figure 3.6 Comparison of displacements by OCM</u> (artificial target), UCC (arti...

<u>Figure 3.7 Comparison of displacements by OCM</u> (natural target), UCC (natural...

<u>Figure 3.8 Evaluation of robustness in unfavorable</u> <u>conditions.</u>

<u>Figure 3.9 Case 1 comparison: (a) displacements by</u> <u>OCM and UCC; (b) UCC cros...</u>

<u>Figure 3.10 Case 2 comparison: (a) displacements</u> <u>by OCM and UCC; (b) UCC cro...</u>

<u>Figure 3.11 Case 3 comparison: (a) displacements</u> <u>by OCM and UCC; (b) UCC cro...</u>

<u>Figure 3.12 Case 4 comparison: (a) displacements</u> <u>by OCM and UCC; (b) UCC cro...</u>

<u>Figure 3.13 A steel building frame model on a</u> <u>seismic shaking table.</u>

Figure 3.14 Seismic shaking table setup.

<u>Figure 3.15 Experimental results of the seismic</u> <u>shaking table test: (a) meas...</u>

<u>Figure 3.16 Test setup for the simply supported</u> <u>beam.</u>

Figure 3.17 Schematic of sensor placement.

<u>Figure 3.18 Case of a non-perpendicular camera</u> <u>optical lens axis.</u>

<u>Figure 3.19 Images of a marker panel for different</u> <u>camera tilt angles: (a) 3...</u>

<u>Figure 3.20 Comparison of displacement</u> <u>measurement at point 16: (a) camera t...</u>

<u>Figure 3.21 Field test: (a) Streicker Bridge; (b)</u> <u>artificial target.</u>

<u>Figure 3.22 Randomly running pedestrians:</u> <u>displacement measurement by vision...</u>

<u>Figure 3.23 Randomly running pedestrians:</u> <u>acceleration measurement: (a) meas...</u>

<u>Figure 3.24 Jumping pedestrians: displacement</u> <u>measurement by vision sensor: ...</u>

<u>Figure 3.25 Jumping pedestrians: acceleration</u> <u>measurement: (a) measured acce...</u>

Figure 3.26 Field test on a highway bridge.

<u>Figure 3.27 Experimental results of field tests on a</u> <u>highway bridge: (a) v = ...</u>

Figure 3.28 View of the two testbed bridges.

<u>Figure 3.29 Field tests on the railway bridge: (a)</u> <u>setup of field tests; (b)...</u>

<u>Figure 3.30 Target panel and existing features on</u> <u>the railway bridges: (a) H...</u>

<u>Figure 3.31 Test H1: comparison of displacements</u> <u>by three sensors (day).</u>

<u>Figure 3.32 Test H2: comparison of displacements</u> <u>by three sensors (day).</u> <u>Figure 3.33 Test H3: comparison of displacements</u> <u>by three sensors (day).</u>

<u>Figure 3.34 Test H4: comparison of displacements</u> <u>by three sensors (day).</u>

<u>Figure 3.35 Test S1: comparison of displacements</u> <u>by two sensors (night).</u>

<u>Figure 3.36 Test S2: comparison of displacements</u> <u>by two sensors (night).</u>

<u>Figure 3.37 Test S3: comparison of displacements</u> (night).

<u>Figure 3.38 Test S4: comparison of displacements</u> (night).

<u>Figure 3.39 Schematic illustration of the</u> <u>displacement peak.</u>

<u>Figure 3.40 Errors between peak displacements of test H1–H4 of the HCB bridg...</u>

<u>Figure 3.41 Errors between peak displacements of</u> <u>the steel bridge in tests S...</u>

<u>Figure 3.42 Field test of the Vincent Thomas</u> <u>Bridge: (a) Vincent Thomas Brid...</u>

<u>Figure 3.43 Actual images captured by two</u> <u>cameras: (a) artificial target pan...</u>

<u>Figure 3.44 Displacement time histories: (a)</u> <u>measurement in the morning; (b)...</u>

<u>Figure 3.45 Power spectral distribution: (a)</u> <u>measurement in the morning; (b)...</u>

<u>Figure 3.46 Manhattan Bridge: (a) cross-section;</u> (b) test setup.

<u>Figure 3.47 Tracking target on the bridge: (a) one</u> <u>target; (b) simultaneous ...</u> <u>Figure 3.48 Displacement measurement of one</u> <u>target.</u>

<u>Figure 3.49 Simultaneous displacement</u> <u>measurements of three targets.</u>

<u>Figure 3.50 Tracking targets on the bridge and the background building.</u>

<u>Figure 3.51 The camera motion and the mid-span</u> <u>vertical displacement of the ...</u>

Chapter 4

<u>Figure 4.1 Typical modal testing and SHM systems</u> <u>using accelerometers: (a) m...</u>

<u>Figure 4.2 Comparison of identified mode shapes of the frame structure.</u>

<u>Figure 4.3 Displacement measurements at points 2–31 by the vision sensor.</u>

<u>Figure 4.4 Comparison of displacement</u> <u>measurements (a) at point 9; (b) at po...</u>

<u>Figure 4.5 Frequency results from (a)</u> <u>displacements at points 2–31 by the vi...</u>

<u>Figure 4.6 Comparison of mode shapes between the</u> <u>vision sensor and accelerom...</u>

<u>Figure 4.7 Stiffness optimization evolution using</u> <u>measurements taken by the ...</u>

<u>Figure 4.8 Test setup: (a) beam; (b) camera; (c)</u> <u>schematics of intact and da...</u>

<u>Figure 4.9 Displacement measurements at points 2–31.</u>

<u>Figure 4.10 Identified first two mode shapes of the</u> <u>intact and damaged beams...</u> <u>Figure 4.11 Damage indices of the damaged beam:</u> (a) MSC damage index; (b) MM...

Chapter 5

<u>Figure 5.1 Railway bridge for model updating: (a)</u> <u>side view; (b) plan view; ...</u>

Figure 5.2 Freight train configuration.

Figure 5.3 Displacement history with train speed 8.05 km/h.

<u>Figure 5.4 Schematic representation of the bridge-</u> <u>track-vehicle interaction ...</u>

<u>Figure 5.5 Measured vs. simulated displacement</u> <u>using the initial FE model.</u>

Figure 5.6 Sensitivity analysis procedure.

<u>Figure 5.7 Objective functions w.r.t. normalized</u> <u>bridge equivalent stiffness...</u>

<u>Figure 5.8 Objective functions w.r.t. normalized</u> <u>bridge damping \mathbf{R}_{α} : (a)...</u>

<u>Figure 5.9 Objective functions w.r.t. normalized rail</u> <u>bed stiffness</u> $K'_{rb:}$ (a) di...

<u>Figure 5.10 Objective functions w.r.t. normalized</u> <u>rail bed damping C'_{rb} (a) dis...</u>

<u>Figure 5.11 Objective functions w.r.t. normalized</u> <u>train suspension stiffness...</u>

<u>Figure 5.12 Objective functions w.r.t. normalized</u> <u>train suspension damping</u> $C'_{r:...}$

<u>Figure 5.13 Two-step FE model-updating</u> <u>procedure.</u>

Figure 5.14 After Step 1: train speed update.

<u>Figure 5.15 After Step 2: equivalent bridge stiffness</u> <u>update.</u>

Figure 5.16 Bridge under a moving train.

<u>Figure 5.17 Power spectral density (PSD) of</u> <u>measured displacement histories:...</u>

<u>Figure 5.18 Computed displacement and</u> <u>acceleration time histories and their ...</u>

<u>Figure 5.19 Computed displacement and</u> <u>acceleration time histories and their ...</u>

<u>Figure 5.20 Computed displacement and</u> <u>acceleration time histories and their ...</u>

<u>Figure 5.21 Mid-span maximum displacements and</u> <u>accelerations w.r.t. differen...</u>

Chapter 6

<u>Figure 6.1 Schematics of the output-only</u> <u>simultaneous identification problem...</u>

<u>Figure 6.2 Output-only time-domain identification</u> <u>procedure.</u>

Figure 6.3 Numerical example.

<u>Figure 6.4 Effect of the number of sensors and</u> <u>noise level on the evolution ...</u>

Figure 6.5 Identification errors for bridge stiffness.

<u>Figure 6.6 Comparison of identified and reference</u> <u>impact forces considering ...</u>

<u>Figure 6.7 Comparison of predicted and</u> <u>reference/measured displacement respo...</u>

<u>Figure 6.8 Effect of the initial stiffness value on the</u> <u>evolution of bridge ...</u> <u>Figure 6.9 Effect of the damping estimate on the</u> <u>evolution of bridge stiffne...</u>

<u>Figure 6.10 Comparison of identified and reference</u> <u>impact forces considering...</u>

Figure 6.11 Impact test setup.

Figure 6.12 Measurement points.

<u>Figure 6.13 Comparison of displacement</u> <u>measurements: (a) displacement at poi...</u>

<u>Figure 6.14 Beam stiffness identification from</u> <u>different initial stiffness v...</u>

Figure 6.15 Identified and measured hammer impact forces.

<u>Figure 6.16 Comparison of the predicted and</u> <u>measured beam displacement: (a) ...</u>

Chapter 7

<u>Figure 7.1 Outline of vision-based cable tension</u> <u>measurement.</u>

Figure 7.2 Hard Rock Stadium.

Figure 7.3 Typical cable assembly.

<u>Figure 7.4 Implementation of the computer vision</u> <u>sensor in Hard Rock Stadium...</u>

<u>Figure 7.5 Measured vibration and PSD function of</u> <u>TD_A cable at Quad A.</u>

<u>Figure 7.6 Measured vibration and PSD function of TD_B cable at Quad B.</u>

<u>Figure 7.7 Measured vibration and PSD function of TD_C cable at Quad C.</u>

<u>Figure 7.8 Measured vibration and PSD function of TD_D cable at Quad D.</u>

<u>Figure 7.9 Measured tension forces vs. reference</u> <u>forces for TD cables: (a) Q...</u>

<u>Figure 7.10 Measured vibration and PSD function</u> <u>of SLLB cable at Quad C.</u>

<u>Figure 7.11 Measured vibration and PSD function</u> of EZUB cable at Quad C.

<u>Figure 7.12 Measured vibration and PSD function</u> of EZF cable at Quad C.

Figure 7.13 Measured vibration and PSD function of SLF cable at Quad C.

<u>Figure 7.14 Measured tension forces for inclined</u> <u>cables using the vision sen...</u>

Figure 7.15 Bronx-Whitestone Bridge.

Figure 7.16 Suspender replacement locations.

<u>Figure 7.17 Field suspender replacement: (a)</u> <u>jacking apparatus; (b) new tens...</u>

<u>Figure 7.18 Vision sensor setup for measuring</u> <u>suspender tension.</u>

<u>Figure 7.19 Measured vibration time histories and</u> <u>PSD amplitudes for suspend...</u>

Chapter 8

<u>Figure 8.1 Bridge inspection: (a) conventional</u> <u>visual inspection; (b) UAV in...</u>

Figure 8.2 Examples of visible damage.

Appendix 1

<u>Figure A.1 Examples of image types: (a) binary</u> <u>image; (b) grayscale image; (...</u>

<u>Figure A.2 The 2D Cartesian coordinates of an M ×</u> <u>N grayscale image.</u> Figure A.3 Noise-removal example.

Figure A.4 Edge-detection example.

<u>Figure A.5 Discrete Fourier transform of a grayscale image.</u>

Wiley-ASME Press Series

Computer Vision for Structural Dynamics and Health Monitoring

Dongming Feng, Maria Q Feng

Theory of Solid-Propellant Nonsteady Combustion Vasily B. Novozhilov, Boris V. Novozhilov

Introduction to Plastics Engineering Vijay K. Stokes

Fundamentals of Heat Engines: Reciprocating and Gas Turbine Internal Combustion Engines Jamil Ghojel

Offshore Compliant Platforms: Analysis, Design, and Experimental Studies

Srinivasan Chandrasekaran, R. Nagavinothini

Computer Aided Design and Manufacturing Zhuming Bi, Xiaoqin Wang

Pumps and Compressors Marc Borremans

Corrosion and Materials in Hydrocarbon Production: A Compendium of Operational and Engineering Aspects Bijan Kermani and Don Harrop

Design and Analysis of Centrifugal Compressors Rene Van den Braembussche

Case Studies in Fluid Mechanics with Sensitivities to Governing Variables M. Kemal Atesmen

The Monte Carlo Ray-Trace Method in Radiation Heat Transfer and Applied Optics J. Robert Mahan

Dynamics of Particles and Rigid Bodies: A Self-Learning Approach

Mohammed F. Daqaq

Primer on Engineering Standards, Expanded Textbook Edition

Maan H. Jawad and Owen R. Greulich

Engineering Optimization: Applications, Methods and Analysis

R. Russell Rhinehart

Compact Heat Exchangers: Analysis, Design and Optimization using FEM and CFD Approach C. Ranganayakulu and Kankanhalli N. Seetharamu

Robust Adaptive Control for Fractional-Order Systems with Disturbance and Saturation Mou Chen, Shuyi Shao, and Peng Shi

Robot Manipulator Redundancy Resolution Yunong Zhang and Long Jin

Stress in ASME Pressure Vessels, Boilers, and Nuclear Components Maan H. Jawad

Combined Cooling, Heating, and Power Systems: Modeling, Optimization, and Operation Yang Shi, Mingxi Liu, and Fang Fang

Applications of Mathematical Heat Transfer and Fluid Flow Models in Engineering and Medicine Abram S. Dorfman

Bioprocessing Piping and Equipment Design: A Companion Guide for the ASME BPE Standard William M. (Bill) Huitt Nonlinear Regression Modeling for Engineering Applications: Modeling, Model Validation, and Enabling Design of Experiments R. Russell Rhinehart

Geothermal Heat Pump and Heat Engine Systems: Theory and Practice Andrew D. Chiasson

Fundamentals of Mechanical Vibrations Liang-Wu Cai

Introduction to Dynamics and Control in Mechanical Engineering Systems Cho W.S. To

Computer Vision for Structural Dynamics and Health Monitoring

Dongming Feng Ph.D., Professor Southeast University

Maria Q. Feng Renwick Professor, Columbia University NY, USA

This Work is a co-publication between John Wiley & Sons Ltd and ASME $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Press}}$



WILEY

This edition first published 2021 © 2021 John Wiley & Sons Ltd

This Work is a co-publication between John Wiley & Sons Ltd and ASME Press

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by law. Advice on how to obtain permission to reuse material from this title is available at <u>http://www.wiley.com/go/permissions</u>.

The right of Dongming Feng and Maria Q. Feng to be identified as the authors of this work has been asserted in accordance with law.

Registered Offices

John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, USA John Wiley & Sons Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

Editorial Office

The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

For details of our global editorial offices, customer services, and more information about Wiley products visit us at <u>www.wiley.com</u>.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats and by print-ondemand. Some content that appears in standard print versions of this book may not be available in other formats.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty

MATLAB® is a trademark of The MathWorks, Inc. and is used with permission. The MathWorks does not warrant the accuracy of the text or exercises in this book. This work's use or discussion of MATLAB® software or related products does not constitute endorsement or sponsorship by The MathWorks of a particular pedagogical approach or particular use of the MATLAB® software. In view of ongoing research, equipment modifications, changes in governmental regulations, and the constant flow of information relating to the use of experimental reagents, equipment, and devices, the reader is urged to review and evaluate the information provided in the package insert or instructions for each chemical, piece of equipment, reagent, or device for, among other things, any changes in the instructions or indication of usage and for added warnings and precautions. While the publisher and authors have used their best efforts in preparing this work, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this work and specifically disclaim all warranties, including without limitation any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. No warranty may be created or extended by sales representatives, written sales materials or promotional statements for this work. The fact that an organization, website, or product is referred to in this work as a citation and/or potential source of further information does not mean that the publisher and authors endorse the information or services the organization, website, or product may provide or recommendations it may make. This work is sold with

the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services. The advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for your situation. You should consult with a specialist where appropriate. Further, readers should be aware that websites listed in this work may have changed or disappeared between when this work was written and when it is read. Neither the publisher nor authors shall be liable for any loss of profit or any other commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Feng, Dongming, 1985– author. | Feng, Maria, 1961– author. Title: Computer vision for structural dynamics and health monitoring / Dongming Feng, Ph.D, Professor, Southeast University, Maria Feng, Ph.D, Renwick Professor, Columbia University.

Description: First edition. | Hoboken, NJ : John Wiley & Sons, Inc., [2021] | Series: Wiley-ASME press series | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2020017110 (print) | LCCN 2020017111 (ebook) | ISBN 9781119566588 (cloth) | ISBN 9781119566564 (adobe pdf) | ISBN 9781119566571 (epub)

Subjects: LCSH: Structural dynamics-Data processing. | Structural health monitoring-Data processing. | Computer vision-Industrial applications. Classification: LCC TA654 .F46 2020 (print) | LCC TA654 (ebook) | DDC 624.1/710285637-dc23

LC record available at <u>https://lccn.loc.gov/2020017110</u> LC ebook record available at <u>https://lccn.loc.gov/2020017111</u>

Cover Design: Wiley

Cover Images: Golden Gate Bridge, San Francisco

© ventdusud /Shutterstock, eye with visual effects

© SFIO CRACHO/Shutterstock

List of Figures

<u>1.1</u>	Common displacement sensors: (a) LVDT; (b) laser vibrometer; (c) GPS.
<u>1.2</u>	Vision-based remote displacement sensor.
<u>2.1</u>	Commercially available video cameras: (a) CMOS image sensor with optical lens; (b) Camcorder; (c) DSLR camera; (d) PTZ security camera.
<u>2.2</u>	Vision-based multi-camera measurement system.
<u>2.3</u>	Time synchronization.
<u>2.4</u>	Procedure for 2D vision sensor implementation.
<u>2.5</u>	Defining a template subset in a source image.
<u>2.6</u>	Surface plot of the NCC and template coordinates in image 1.
<u>2.7</u>	Surface plot of the NCC and template coordinates in image 2.
<u>2.8</u>	Schematic of stereo camera calibration.
<u>2.9</u>	Scaling factor determination: (a) optical axis perpendicular to the object surface; (b) optical axis non-perpendicular to the object surface.
<u>2.10</u>	Error resulting from camera non-perpendicularity: (a) effect of optical axis tilt angle (f = 50 mm); (b) effect of the focal length of the lens (θ = 3°).
<u>2.11</u>	Flowchart of the UCC implementation.
<u>2.12</u>	Orientation code ($N = 16$).
<u>2.13</u>	Matching results for images in ill conditions: (a) searching for a partially occluded toy, (b) highlighted CD jacket.
<u>2.14</u>	Bilinear interpolation for sub-pixel analysis.

2.15	Flowchart of vision sensor based on OCM.
<u>2.16</u>	User interface of the OCM-based displacement measurement software.
<u>3.1</u>	Shaking table test.
<u>3.2</u>	Comparison of sinusoidal displacements by the LVDT and vision sensor with an artificial target panel: (a) 1Hz sinusoidal signal; (b) 5Hz sinusoidal signal; (c) 10Hz sinusoidal signal; (d) 20Hz sinusoidal signal.
<u>3.3</u>	Comparison of earthquake displacements by the LVDT and vision sensor with a natural target.
<u>3.4</u>	Shaking table test of a three-story frame structure: (a) shaking table and frame structure; (b) vision sensor system.
<u>3.5</u>	Subpixel resolution evaluation using a UCC-based vision sensor: (a) resolution: ± 1.338 mm; (b) resolution: ± 0.669 mm; (c) resolution: ± 0.268 mm; (d) resolution: ± 0.067 mm.
<u>3.6</u>	Comparison of displacements by OCM (artificial target), UCC (artificial target) and LDS: (a) base displacement; (b) first-floor relative displacement; (c) second-floor relative displacement; (d) third-floor relative displacement.
<u>3.7</u>	Comparison of displacements by OCM (natural target), UCC (natural target), and LDS: (a) base displacement; (b) first-floor relative displacement; (c) second-floor relative displacement; (d) third-floor relative displacement.
<u>3.8</u>	Evaluation of robustness in unfavorable conditions.
<u>3.9</u>	Case 1 comparison: (a) displacements by OCM and UCC; (b) UCC cross-correlation function contour.
<u>3.10</u>	Case 2 comparison: (a) displacements by OCM and

<u>3.11</u>	Case 3 comparison: (a) displacements by OCM and UCC; (b) UCC cross-correlation function contour.
<u>3.12</u>	Case 4 comparison: (a) displacements by OCM and UCC; (b) UCC cross-correlation function contour.
<u>3.13</u>	A steel building frame model on a seismic shaking table.
<u>3.14</u>	Seismic shaking table setup.
<u>3.15</u>	Experimental results of the seismic shaking table test: (a) measured displacement by the vision sensor; (b) power spectral distribution.
<u>3.16</u>	Test setup for the simply supported beam.
<u>3.17</u>	Schematic of sensor placement.
<u>3.18</u>	Case of a non-perpendicular camera optical lens axis.
<u>3.19</u>	Images of a marker panel for different camera tilt angles: (a) 3°; (b) 5°; (c) 9°.
<u>3.20</u>	Comparison of displacement measurement at point 16: (a) camera tilt angle 3°; (b) camera tilt angle 5°; (c) camera tilt angle 9°.
<u>3.21</u>	Field test: (a) Streicker Bridge; (b) artificial target.
<u>3.22</u>	Randomly running pedestrians: displacement measurement by vision sensor: (a) measured displacement time history; (b) power spectral distribution.
<u>3.23</u>	Randomly running pedestrians: acceleration measurement: (a) measured acceleration time history; (b) power spectral distribution.
<u>3.24</u>	Jumping pedestrians: displacement measurement by vision sensor: (a) measured displacement time history; (b) power spectral distribution.
<u>3.25</u>	Jumping pedestrians: acceleration measurement: (a) measured acceleration time history; (b) power

	spectral distribution.
<u>3.26</u>	Field test on a highway bridge.
<u>3.27</u>	Experimental results of field tests on a highway bridge: (a) $v = 3 \text{ km/h}$; (b) $v = 50 \text{ km/h}$.
<u>3.28</u>	View of the two testbed bridges.
<u>3.29</u>	Field tests on the railway bridge: (a) setup of field tests; (b) schematic representation of the position between the camera and the bridge girders (c) remote measurement of bridge displacement under moving trainloads.
<u>3.30</u>	Target panel and existing features on the railway bridges: (a) HCB bridge; (b) steel bridge; (c) LED lights for night tests.
<u>3.31</u>	Test H1: comparison of displacements by three sensors (day).
<u>3.32</u>	Test H2: comparison of displacements by three sensors (day).
<u>3.33</u>	Test H3: comparison of displacements by three sensors (day).
<u>3.34</u>	Test H4: comparison of displacements by three sensors (day).
<u>3.35</u>	Test S1: comparison of displacements by two sensors (night).
<u>3.36</u>	Test S2: comparison of displacements by two sensors (night).
<u>3.37</u>	Test S3: comparison of displacements (night).
<u>3.38</u>	Test S4: comparison of displacements (night).
<u>3.39</u>	Schematic illustration of the displacement peak.
<u>3.40</u>	Errors between peak displacements of test H1-H4 of the HCB bridge.
<u>3.41</u>	Errors between peak displacements of the steel

	bridge in tests S1–S4.
<u>3.42</u>	Field test of the Vincent Thomas Bridge: (a) Vincent Thomas Bridge (Los Angeles, CA); (b) test setup.
<u>3.43</u>	Actual images captured by two cameras: (a) artificial target panel; (b) natural rivet pattern.
<u>3.44</u>	Displacement time histories: (a) measurement in the morning; (b) measurement in the evening.
<u>3.45</u>	Power spectral distribution: (a) measurement in the morning; (b) measurement in the evening.
<u>3.46</u>	Manhattan Bridge: (a) cross-section; (b) test setup.
<u>3.47</u>	Tracking target on the bridge: (a) one target; (b) simultaneous measurements of three targets.
<u>3.48</u>	Displacement measurement of one target.
<u>3.49</u>	Simultaneous displacement measurements of three targets.
<u>3.50</u>	Tracking targets on the bridge and the background building.
<u>3.51</u>	The camera motion and the mid-span vertical displacement of the bridge.
<u>4.1</u>	Typical modal testing and SHM systems using accelerometers: (a) modal testing of a beam in the lab; (b) long-term SHM of the Jamboree bridge.
<u>4.2</u>	Comparison of identified mode shapes of the frame structure.
<u>4.3</u>	Displacement measurements at points 2–31 by the vision sensor.
<u>4.4</u>	Comparison of displacement measurements (a) at point 9; (b) at point 16.
<u>4.5</u>	Frequency results from (a) displacements at points 2– 31 by the vision sensor; (b) displacements at points 9

	and 16 by LDS; (c) accelerations at six points by accelerometers.
<u>4.6</u>	Comparison of mode shapes between the vision sensor and accelerometer: (a) first mode shape; (b) second mode shape.
<u>4.7</u>	Stiffness optimization evolution using measurements taken by the vision sensor (natural target).
<u>4.8</u>	Test setup: (a) beam; (b) camera; (c) schematics of intact and damaged beams.
<u>4.9</u>	Displacement measurements at points 2–31.
<u>4.10</u>	Identified first two mode shapes of the intact and damaged beams: (a) first mode shape; (b) second mode shape.
<u>4.11</u>	Damage indices of the damaged beam: (a) MSC damage index; (b) MMSC damage index.
<u>5.1</u>	Railway bridge for model updating: (a) side view; (b) plan view; (c) front view.
<u>5.2</u>	Freight train configuration.
<u>5.3</u>	Displacement history with train speed 8.05 km/h.
<u>5.4</u>	Schematic representation of the bridge-track-vehicle interaction system.
<u>5.5</u>	Measured vs. simulated displacement using the initial FE model.
<u>5.6</u>	Sensitivity analysis procedure.
<u>5.7</u>	Objective functions w.r.t. normalized bridge equivalent stiffness REI: (a) displacement; (b) acceleration.
<u>5.8</u>	Objective functions w.r.t. normalized bridge damping $R\alpha$: (a) displacement; (b) acceleration.
<u>5.9</u>	Objective functions w.r.t. normalized rail bed stiffness Rkrb: (a) displacement; (b) acceleration.

<u>5.10</u>	Objective functions w.r.t. normalized rail bed damping Rcrb: (a) displacement; (b) acceleration.
<u>5.11</u>	Objective functions w.r.t. normalized train suspension stiffness Rkt: (a) displacement; (b) acceleration.
<u>5.12</u>	Objective functions w.r.t. normalized train suspension damping Rct: (a) displacement; (b) acceleration.
<u>5.13</u>	Two-step FE model-updating procedure.
<u>5.14</u>	After Step 1: train speed update.
<u>5.15</u>	After Step 2: equivalent bridge stiffness update.
<u>5.16</u>	Bridge under a moving train.
<u>5.17</u>	Power spectral density (PSD) of measured displacement histories: (a) train speed = 7.93 km/h ; (b) train speed = 36.80 km/h ; (c) train speed = 70.22 km/h .
<u>5.18</u>	Computed displacement and acceleration time histories and their PSDs with train speed 7.93 km/h.
<u>5.19</u>	Computed displacement and acceleration time histories and their PSDs with train speed 36.80 km/h.
<u>5.20</u>	Computed displacement and acceleration time histories and their PSD with train speed 70.22 km/h.
<u>5.21</u>	Mid-span maximum displacements and accelerations w.r.t. different train speeds.
<u>6.1</u>	Schematics of the output-only simultaneous identification problem.
<u>6.2</u>	Output-only time-domain identification procedure.
<u>6.3</u>	Numerical example.
<u>6.4</u>	Effect of the number of sensors and noise level on the evolution of bridge stiffness identification: (a) two sensors; (b) three sensors; (c) seven sensors.
<u>6.5</u>	Identification errors for bridge stiffness.
<u>6.6</u>	Comparison of identified and reference impact forces