Robotic Pole Inspection Collar

Team 505 "Team Southern Pine" FPL

FAMU-FSU Engineering

ME Team Introductions



Mathew Crespo Mechanical Systems Engineer



John Flournoy Design & Material Engineer



Carey Tarkinson Mechatronics & Programming Engineer



Angelo Mainolfi Project Engineer

Carey Tarkinson

Department of Computer & Electrical Engineering Department of Mechanical Engineering



EE Team Introductions



Corie Cates Project Engineer



Alonzo Russell Hardware Engineer



Leonardo Vazquez Software Engineer



Thomas Williams Hardware Engineer

Carey Tarkinson



Sponsors and Advisors





Engineering Sponsor Troy Lewis Engineer II Smart Grid & Innovation Florida Power & Light



Academic Advisor Jonathan Clark, Ph.D. Associate Professor



Shayne McConomy, Ph.D. Teaching Faculty

John Flournoy





The objective is to design a mechanism that can climb a wooden

utility pole and check its structural integrity

John Flournoy



Project Background

- FPL is Florida's largest utility company serving over 5 million customer accounts
- FPL's linemen interact with wooden utility poles daily to serve their customers
- Checking the structural integrity is crucial to keeping linemen safe
- We are motivated by a safety incident

John Flournoy



Developed Guidelines

Key Goals

O Ascend and descend a wooden utility pole

- O Detect rot within the pole
- Interface the readings to the linemen

Targets & Metrics

- Olimb a minimum of 15 feet
- Scan a minimum depth of 8 inches
- Interface readings within 60 seconds



Carey Tarkinson



Prototype One



Using a bicycle-climber frame structure

Large frame when built to suit a utility pole diameter

A heavier load is beneficial to the design

Carey Tarkinson



Prototype Two



Triangular frame helps keep complexity down

Easily opens and closes around utility poles of varying diameters

Provides area to mount sensors and motors

John Flournoy



Concept Generation

- Crapshoot
 Scamper
 Biomimicry
 Mor
 - Morphological Chart



John Flournoy

10



High Fidelity Concepts



John Flournoy



Binary Pairwise Comparison

Evaluation Criteria Hierarchy

- 1) Rot Detection
- 2) Ability to Climb
- 2) OSHA Test Standards
- 3) Data Interface
- 4) Portability
- 5) Modularity



Carey Tarkinson



House of Quality

Impactful Engineering Characteristics

Stability
Safety
Maneuverability
Speed



13



Winning Concept



John Flournoy



Testing Prototype Three

Motorized Triangle Climber Prototype

Revelations:

Finching caused by poor wheel mounting
Motors were grossly underpowered
Wheels struggled to maintain contact to pole



John Flournoy

Department of Computer & Electrical Engineering Department of Mechanical Engineering



Prototype Four Progress

- 3D printed hourglass wheels to increase contact area
- 3D printed bearing mounts that attach to the inside of the frame
- Skateboard bearings allow smooth rotation of acetal wheel shafts
- Long passive wheel shaft for diameter compliance



Carey Tarkinson



Augmented Triangle Design

Triangular prism climber

- Designed to combat potential stability and pinch issues
- Wrap around elastic band to allow variable tension



Carey Tarkinson



Prototype Testing Method

FPL provided pole samples for safe testing
Samples included healthy and rotten power pole segments
Mathematical Mathematical Structure Sensor Content Segments

John Flournoy



Future Work









Begin testing on pole samples

Purchase final components

Develop sensor housing Test automated climbing ability

Carey Tarkinson

Department of Computer & Electrical Engineering Department of Mechanical Engineering



Sources

- <u>https://www.slunglow.org/event/new-show-cap-pie/</u>
- <u>https://journalnow.com/archive/so-metal-the-world-of-metal-detecting-is-changing-and-north-carolina-is-home-to/article_7bb241c8-ecac-11e6-a1f4-7f1a74729de1.html</u>
- <u>https://www.onlinewebfonts.com/icon/546768</u>
- https://www.flaticon.com



Appendix

• The following slides have supporting information



Analytical Hierarchy Process - AHP

- Pairwise Matrix
- Normalized Pairwise Matrix
- Criteria Weights
- Weighed Sum Vector
- Consistency Vector





AHP Chart

| Pairwise Comparison | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------|------------------------|------------|-------|--|
| Customer Needs | Ability to Climb | Rot Detection | Data Interface | Portability | OSHA Test Standards | Modularity | Total | |
| Ability to Climb | - | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | |
| Rot Detection | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | |
| Data Interface | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | |
| Portability | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 1 | |
| OSHA Test Standards | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 3 | |
| Modularity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | |
| Total | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 5 | | |

Table 1: Analytical Hierarchy Process

Department of Computer & Electrical Engineering Department of Mechanical Engineering



AHP 2

| Normalized Pairwise Comparison | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------|------------------------|------------|--------|--|--|
| Customer Needs | Ability to Climb | Rot Detection | Data Interface | Portability | OSHA Test Standards | Modularity | Weight | | |
| Ability to Climb | - | 0 | 0.33 | 0.25 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 1.28 | | |
| Rot Detection | 1 | - | 0.33 | 0.25 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 2.28 | | |
| Data Interface | 0 | 0 | - | 0.25 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.45 | | |
| Portability | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0.2 | 0.20 | | |
| OSHA Test Standards | 0 | 0 | 0.33 | 0.25 | - | 0.2 | 0.78 | | |
| Modularity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | | |
| Total | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |



HOC

Table 3: House of Quality Relationship Matrix

| Relationship Matrix between Engineering Characteristics and Customer Needs | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|
| | | Engineering Characteristics | | | | | | | | |
| Improveme | nt Direction | Ļ | 1 | 1 | 1 | Ļ | ↑ (| | | |
| Un | lits | lb. | ft/s | N/A | N/A | s | N/A | | | |
| Customer Needs | Importance Weight Factor | Weight | Speed | Stability | Safety | Ease of Mounting | Maneuverability | | | |
| Ability to climb | 5 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 7 | | | |
| Rot Detection | 5 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 4 | 8 | | | |
| Data Interface | 4 | 2 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 3 | 5 | | | |
| Portability | 3 | 9 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 8 | | | |
| OSHA Test Standards | 5 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 5 | | | |
| Modularity | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4 | | | |
| Raw Sco | ore (887) | 123 | 142 | 175 | 174 | 121 | 152 | | | |
| Relative | Weight % | 13.9 | 16.0 | 19.7 | 19.6 | 13.6 | 17.1 | | | |
| Rank Order | | 5 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 3 | | | |





Table 4: Initial Pugh Chart

| Selection Criteria | Datum | Variable Arm Climber | Rollercoaster Gripper | Counter- Weight Triangle Hybrid | Serpent Robot | Hybrid Bike Design | Triangle Climber | Batmobile Climber |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--|------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Vertical Traversal Speed | | - | + | - | - | - | - | + |
| Stability | Bike Climber | S | + | S | + | + | + | - |

| Weight | | - | - | - | - | - | + | + |
|---------------------|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ease of Mounting | | - | - | - | - | - | - | + |
| Portability | | s | - | - | - | - | + | + |
| Modularity | | S | + | + | - | S | + | - |
| Simplicity | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Number of Pluses | | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| Number Minuses | | 4 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| Number of S's | | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |



Pugh Chart 2

| Selection Criteria | Datum | Triangle Climber | Batmobile Climber | Variable Arm Climber |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| Vertical Traversal Speed | | + | + | - |
| Stability | | + | - | S |
| Weight | | + | | + |
| Ease of Mounting | Roller Coaster Gripper | + | + | + |
| Portability | | S | + | - |
| Modularity | | + - | | S |
| Simplicity | | + | + | - |
| Number of Pluses | | 6 | 5 | 2 |
| Number Minuses | | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Number of S's | | 1 | 0 | 2 |

Table 5: Second Pugh Chart



Project Management

Department of Computer & Electrical Engineering Department of Mechanical Engineering



Most Important Points

- 1. The quick brown fox jumps over the lazy dog.
- 2. The quick brown fox jumps over the lazy dog.
- 3. The quick brown fox jumps over the lazy dog.
- 4. The quick brown fox jumps over the lazy dog.
- 5. The quick brown fox jumps over the lazy dog.
- 6. The quick brown fox jumps over the lazy dog.



Lessons Learned



Department of Computer & Electrical Engineering Department of Mechanical Engineering



Reference

Department of Computer & Electrical Engineering Department of Mechanical Engineering



Questions (be sure to design your own)

Department of Computer & Electrical Engineering Department of Mechanical Engineering



Backup Slides

Department of Computer & Electrical Engineering Department of Mechanical Engineering

