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# 2 Revision History

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Author** | **Revisions Made** |
| 9/27/2012 | Jingye Liu | 0 |

# 3 Design Status Summary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Phase 6: Service / Maintenance** | **Status:** **Not Completed** |
| ***Gate 6: Project Partner and Advisor approve continued fielding of project. If not, retire or redesign.*** | |
| Date of Advisor approval: |  |
|  |  |
| **Phase 5: Delivery** | **Status:** **Not Completed** |
| ***Gate 5: Continue if Project Partner, Advisor and EPICS Admin agree that project is ready for delivery!*** | |
| Date of Advisor approval: |  |
|  |  |
| **Phase 4: Detailed Design** | **Status:**  **In Progress** |
| ***Gate 4: Continue if can demonstrate feasibility of solution (is there a working prototype?). Project Partner and advisor approval required.*** | |
| Date of Advisor approval: |  |
|  |  |
| **Phase 3: Conceptual Design** | **Status:**  **Completed** |
| ***Gate 3: Continue if project partner and advisor agree that solution space has been appropriately explored and the best solution has been chosen.*** | |
| Date of Advisor approval: | September 15, 2012 |
|  |  |
| **Phase 2: Specification Development** | **Status: Completed** |
| ***Gate 2: Continue if project partner and advisor agree that you have identified the “right” need, specification document is completed and no existing commercial products meet design specifications.*** | |
| Date of Advisor approval: | September 8,2012 |
|  |  |
| **Phase 1: Project Identification** | **Status:**  **Completed** |
| ***Gate 1: Continue if have identified appropriate EPICS project that meets a compelling need for the project partner.*** | |
| Date of Advisor approval: |  |

# 4 Project Charter

## 4.1 Description of the Community Partner

Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation (NEES) is the organization working with EPICS on this project. NEES’ mission is to give researchers the tools necessary to research how earthquakes impact buildings and other structures. The project partner for NEES is Dr. Pamela McClure.

The mission is to design and create a simple and easy to use shake table and interface for teachers and students to learn about the simple dynamics of earthquakes by simulating simple earthquake properties. School teachers, NEES and the EPICS team will be those that benefit the most from the project. Institutions/organizations wishing to use the shake table will have access to it through purchase or a form of rental program.

## 4.2 Stakeholders

## Due to the potential widespread impact of this project there are several different stakeholders for this project. The primary stakeholders are school teachers, students, NEES, EPICS students, Dr. Pamela McClure, Dr. Sean Brophy and educational institutions etc.

## Students and teachers will benefit the most from this product as they will have access to an interactive easy to use learning tool. NEES on the other hand will benefit as the primary client and sponsor of this project. Moreover, EPICS students will benefit from the design experience gained while working on the project. Also, the educational institutions who are interested in purchasing interactive learning tools will benefit from the availability of this product in the market.

## The main driving forces behind this project are Dr. Sean Brophy and Dr. Pamela McClure who are there to make sure that the project is completed and delivered to the client (i.e. NEES) in a timely manner.

## 4.3 Project Objectives

The motivation of the project was to provide an affordable, fun, safe, interactive and portable shake table to schools for educators to use as a teaching aid for understanding the basic effects of earthquakes. The project consists of two teams. One team will design a functional shake table and the other team will design an interface. The interface will be a mat on the floor that students can jump on top of. A sensor in the matt will send signals to a computer and motor in the shake table. Here the signals can be used to drive the shake table so students can make their own earthquake. The shake table needs to be such that it is safe to use, easy to use and is durable. NEES’ mission is to provide a shake table that fits these criteria and the project currently being worked on by the assigned EPICS team aims to accomplish this task.does your project fit within the mission of the project partner and your team?

## 4.4 Outcomes/Deliverables

## The project results will be a functional prototype that will be used to further modify and adjust to a final product that will work with the highest efficiency. When finished, the prototype will be left behind with notes on specifications and other details about the process to which the team reached the goal for others and future teams to work on. This will help future teams to replicate and improve the work done by the current team.

## 4.5 Overall Project Timeline

# The project will be finished at the end of this semester, when the interface which is using ARDUINO board to control stepper motor as generating output, get acceleration from Quake Catcher Network sensor(accelerometer) as input. And a specific algorithm from acceleration to motor shaking should be done mostly.

# 

# 5 Overall Project Design

## 5.1 Phase Four

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Phase 4: Detailed Design** | **Status:** | **Evidence can be found:** |
| Goal is to design working prototype which meets functional specifications. | | |
| * Bottom-Up Development of component designs | In Progress | Notebook |
| * Develop Design Specification for components | In Progress | Notebook |
| * Design/analysis/evaluation of project, sub-modules and/or components (freeze interfaces) | In Progress | Notebook |
| * Design for Failure Mode Analysis (DFMEA) | In Progress |  |
| * Prototyping of project, sub-modules and/or components | In Progress | Notebook |
| * Field test prototype/usability testing | In Progress |  |
| ***Gate 4: Continue if can demonstrate feasibility of solution (is there a working prototype?). Project Partner and advisor approval required.*** | Decision: | Rationale summary: |
| Advisor approval: | Yes / No | Date: |

The majority parts of model are decided and settled, but there are still something detailed left undecided, like power supply, some port conversion, but we can already start working on program from the parts we have.

The shield kit for ARDUINO include the most parts, like power port and motor driver, to run stepper motor. It is chosen from several candidates, and we choose it because is most developed and the price of is acceptable, which can save lots of work compared with manpower.

QCN should have a port conversion from USB to the port suits ARDUINO.

Additional power supply for ARDUINO and motor driver kit is also needed if it’s delivered, hopefully only one adapt can run both of them.

## 5.2 Phase Three

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Phase 3: Conceptual Design** | **Status:** | **Evidence can be found:** |
| Goal is to expand the design space to include as many solutions as possible. Evaluate different approaches and selecting “best” one to move forward. Exploring “how”. | | |
| * Complete functional decomposition | Complete | Sharepoint, Previous Doucument and Power Point presentation |
| * Brainstorm several possible solutions | Complete | Notebook |
| * Prior Artifacts Research | Complete | Sharepoint and Previous Doucument |
| * Create prototypes of multiple concepts, get feedback from users, refine specifications | Complete | Sharepoint, Previous Doucument and Power Point presentation |
| * Evaluate feasibility of potential solutions (proof-of-concept prototypes) | Complete | Sharepoint, Previous Doucument and Power Point presentation |
| * Choose "best" solution | Complete | ARDUINO board and Shield |
| ***Gate 3: Continue if project partner and advisor agree that solution space has been appropriately explored and the best solution has been chosen.*** | Decision: | Rationale summary: |
| Advisor approval: | Yes / No | Date: |

## Considering about the materials from last semester, QCN accelerometer will be used as our input, a sensor can get date from jumping. Based on the size and weight of the plate we determined the necessary stepper motor (a motor that rotates in both directions, clockwise and counterclockwise) to drive the machine and the motor should be powerful enough to shake the table.

## However, there are several choose in control unit, such DIY board, or the control unit from Digi Key, but ARDUINO board is our final decision, because it’s easy to program, compared with the micro-processor which using low level language, and it has strong extension ability can easily compatible with different kinds of motor driver and input pattern.

## 5.3 Phase Two

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Phase 2: Specification Development** | **Status:** | **Evidence can be found:** |
| Goal is to understand “what” is needed by understanding the context, stakeholders, requirements of the project, and why current solutions don’t meet need, and to develop measurable criteria in which design concepts can be evaluated. | | |
| * Understand and describe context (current situation and environment) | Complete | Notebook and Power Point presentation |
| * Create stakeholder profiles | Complete | Power Point presentation |
| * Create mock-ups and simple prototypes: quick, low-cost, multiple cycles incorporating feedback | Complete | Power Point presentation |
| * Develop a task analysis and define how users will interact with project (user scenarios) | Complete | Power Point presentation and Plan document |
| * Identify other solutions to similar needs and identify benchmark products (prior art) | Complete | Power Point presentation |
| * Define customer requirements in more detail; get project partner approval | Complete | Power Point presentation and Plan document |
| * Develop specifications document | Complete | Notebook and Plan document |
| * Establish evaluation criteria | Complete | Plan document |
| ***Gate 2: Continue if project partner and advisor agree that you have identified the “right” need, specification document is completed and no existing commercial products meet design specifications. [This includes their agreeing that you have captured and documented the critical requirements and specifications for this project]*** | Decision:  Continue | Rationale summary:  Specification document is completed and no existing commercial products meet design specifications at same price. |
| Advisor approval: | Yes / No | Date: |

A general concept of what the final product will be was conceived and from there ideas were presented on what was needed to meet these criteria. The obvious specification was that the project required a control unit, which part will control from generating input to output. QCN accelerometer is used as sensor to get input from jumping. Based on the size and weight of the plate we determined the necessary stepper motor (a motor that rotates in both directions, clockwise and counterclockwise) to drive the machine and the motor should be powerful enough to shake the table. With safety being an important concern, it must be taken into consideration in every decision made. The program will stop automatically if something unexpected happened, such as motor move beyond limit, program crash, some parts of shake table not working. Considering about mobility, the control unit and motor control unit may be embedded and housed into shake table, which also can be thought as one way to protect the control unit.

## 5.6 Phase One

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Phase 1: Project Identification** | **Status:** | **Evidence can be found:** |
| Goal is to identify a specific, compelling need to be addressed | | |
| * Conduct needs assessment (if need not already defined) | Complete | Power Point presentation |
| * Identify stakeholders (customer, users, person maintaining project, etc.) | Complete | Power Point presentation |
| * Understand the Social Context | Complete | Power Point presentation |
| * Define basic stakeholder requirements (objectives or goals of projects and constraints) | Complete | Power Point presentation |
| * Determine time constraints of the project | Complete | Power Point presentation |
| ***Gate 1: Continue if have identified appropriate EPICS project that meets a compelling need for the project partner [This includes a Project Charter]*** | Decision:  Continue | Rationale summary:  Product meets stakeholders’ need, and concept of design is rational. |
| Advisor approval: | Yes / No | Date: |

# The main objective of this project will be to provide a fun and interactive way for K-12 students to learn about the effects of earthquakes on structures and buildings. The current focus is for demonstrations used in outreach programs and for teachers to use in science instruction.

# The project identification is to create a shake table that makes the learning process of the effects of earthquakes on structures and buildings fun and interactive. This shake table will be able to simulate an earthquake based on jumping motions created by the K-12 students. The students will jump on a platform that contains an accelerometer to detect the jumping motion of the students. This jumping motion will be translated to the shaking motion of the shake-table. The table has to be such that it is safe and easy to use for K12 students.

There exist an similar model can do the same as our shake table, but the advantage of our model is 50 times cheaper, so the school can afford as a teaching equipment, who will be our biggest coms we consider.

Future goals for this project include figuring out a way to produce these tables in a cost effective manner.

Future goals for this project include figuring out a way to produce these tables in a cost effective manner.

# 6 Semester Documentation (current semester)

## 6.1 Team Member

Jingye Liu

Dongyang Fu

Zachary Golden

Andrew Grosinger

Nikhilgandhi Manojkumar

## 6.2 Current Status and Location on Overall Project Timeline

This is week 6, and our team started development process from week 5, the concept for interface model was decided, and some detailed parts, like adapt choosing, port choosing will be considered concurrently with developing, and we hope can get something out, using ADRUINO control unit to run motor and generate data form QCN sensor before week 7’s design review.

## 6.3 Goals for the Semester

The goal of this semester is to have basic interface prototype can working on shake table, which can be showed to stakeholder.

## 6.4 Semester Timeline

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Task** | **Start By** | **Complete By** |
| Review/Understand Previous Semester’s Documents | Week 1 | Week 3 |
| Design the new concept model and specification from previous work and Plan Document | Week 3 | Week 5 |
| Design Document | Week 6 | Week 6 |
| QCN based programing | Week 5 | Week 9 |
| Stepper Motor controlling | Week 5 | Week 9 |
| QCN and Stepper Motor work together | Week 9 | Week 14 |
| Final Design Presentation | Week 15 | Week 15 |

## 6.5 Semester Budget

Insert the expected budget for the current semester.

## 6.6 Transition Report

### 6.6.1 Summary of Semester Progress / Comparison of Actual Semester Timeline to Proposed Semester Timeline

Compare actual semester timeline to proposed semester timeline (if different). What aspects varied the most from proposed to actual?

Discuss the progress made during the current semester, including any pitfalls that you encountered that would be helpful for future teams to avoid as well as any best practices you found that helped you to advance the status of the project or work well as a team.

### 6.6.2 Draft Timeline for (next semester) and Relationship to Overall Project Timeline

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Task** | **Start By** | **Complete By** |
| Review/Understand Previous Semester’s Documents | Week 1 | Week 3 |
| Modify design if needed for more features for the interface | Week 3 | Week 10 |
| Build working prototype(s) | Week 10 | Week 14 |

# 7 Past Semester Archive

## 7.1 Past Semester 1

Spring 2011

The calculations and CAD model of shake table were completed on time. With the delays, the ordering and delivery of the parts took more time than anticipated. These delays also set back the progress of constructing the prototype. The previous team for the most part stuck to the original timeline however some unforeseen circumstances caused delays and changes to the timeline. They were not able to get a complete working prototype constructed by the end of the semester. However, a partially constructed shake table is finished and available.

### 7.1.1 Past Team Members

### Mohammad Faizan Azam

### Benjamin Eng

### Bilal Khan

### Amit Soni

### 7.1.2 Past Timeline

