



# Assessment of Steel Structure Deconstructability using BIM-based Approach

By

# Andrew Magdy Samy Basta

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of **MASTER OF SCIENCE** in

**Integrated Engineering Design In Construction Projects** 

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY GIZA, EGYPT 2018

### Assessment of Steel Structure Deconstructability using BIM-based Approach

By Andrew Magdy Samy Basta

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

#### **Integrated Engineering Design In Construction Projects**

Under the Supervision of

#### **Prof. Mohamed Mahdy Marzouk**

**Prof. Mohammed Hassanien Serror** 

Professor of Construction Engineering and Management Structural Engineering Department Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University Professor of Steel Structures Structural Engineering Department Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY GIZA, EGYPT 2018

### Assessment of Steel Structure Deconstructability using BIM-based Approach

# By Andrew Magdy Samy Basta

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of MASTER OF SCIENCE in Integrated Engineering Design In Construction Projects

Approved by the Examining Committee

**Prof. Mohamed Mahdy Marzouk** ...... Thesis Main Advisor Professor of Construction Engineering and Management - Structural Engineering Department, Cairo University

**Prof. Mohammed Hassanien Serror** ...... Advisor Professor of Steel Structures - Structural Engineering Department, Cairo University

**Prof. Sherif Ahmed Mourad** ...... Internal Examiner Professor of Steel Structures - Structural Engineering Department, Cairo University

**Prof. Ayman Ezzat Othman** ......External Examiner Professor of Construction Engineering and Management - British University in Egypt

#### FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY GIZA, EGYPT 2018

Name:	Andrew Magdy Samy Basta
Date of Birth:	06/06/1992
Nationality:	Egyptian
Registration Date:	01/10/2016
Awarding Date:	/2018
Degree:	Master of Science
Department:	Integrated Engineering Design In Construction Projects
Supervisors:	Prof. Mohamed Mahdy Marzouk Prof. Mohammed Hassanien Serror

#### **Examiners:**

Prof. Mohamed Mahdy Marzouk – Cairo University (Thesis main advisor)
Prof. Mohammed Hassanien Serror – Cairo University (advisor)
Prof. Sherif Ahmed Mourad – Cairo University (Internal examiner)
Prof. Ayman Ezzat Othman – British University in Egypt (External examiner)
Professor of Construction Engineering and Management - BUE

#### **Title of Thesis:**

#### Assessment of Steel Structure Deconstructability using BIM-based Approach

#### **Key Words:**

Building Information Modeling; Steel structure; Design for Deconstruction (DfD); Deconstructability Assessment Score (DAS); Dynamo; Revit.

#### **Summary:**

Recently, attention is being focused on Design for Deconstruction (DfD) as one of the most effective structure end-of-life design scenarios. Although several research efforts have dealt with the DfD and reversible buildings design theories for the past few years, the lack of technological support for developing tools to improve DfD to be BIM compliant has been clearly noticed. This research presents a Deconstructability Assessment Scoring (DAS) methodology for quantitative assessment of Steel Structures deconstructability. The proposed methodology takes into consideration a number of steel parameters and their deconstructability Seven innovative solutions contributing to steel connections deconstructability are considered in the proposed research. Furthermore, steel elements reusable fire-proofing systems are introduced to provide the required fire resistance and deconstructability. The detailed analyses for the selected parameters are adopted and implemented to form the Steel Structure Deconstructability Assessment Scoring (SS-DAS). The proposed methodology is implemented in Autodesk Revit using Dynamo. The proposed innovative solutions are modeled as families to automate the scoring process.



## Disclaimer

I hereby declare that this thesis is my own original work and that no part of it has been submitted for a degree qualification at any other university or institute.

I further declare that I have appropriately acknowledged all sources used and have cited them in the reference section.

Name: Andrew Magdy Samy Basta

Date:

Signature:

# Acknowledgments

First of all, I would like to express my full gratitude to my advisors **Prof. Mohamed Mahdy Marzouk** and **Prof. Mohammed Hassanien Serror** for their continuous support, patience, motivation through all steps of this research.

Secondly, I would like to express my full appreciation to COSMOS-E Engineers and Consultants company in addition to the visited steel fabrication workshop crew for the precious information obtained regarding steel structure components.

Last but not the least, I should say to my family:

"Many thanks for supporting and loving me through writing this thesis and through my whole life. Father, mother and brother, I appreciate your existence in my life!"

Andrew Magdy

September 9th, 2018

# **Table of Contents**

ACKNOWL	EDGMENTS	II
TABLE OF	CONTENTS	III
LIST OF TA	BLES	V
LIST OF FIG	GURES	VI
ABSTRACT		VIII
CHAPTER 1	: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1.	General	1
1.2.	PROBLEM STATEMENT	1
1.3.	RESEARCH OBJECTIVES	2
1.4.	RESEARCH SCOPE	2
1.5.	Research Methodology	2
1.6.	ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS	3
CHAPTER 2	2 : LITERATURE REVIEW	4
2.1.	General	4
2.2.	DESIGN FOR DECONSTRUCTION (DFD)	4
2.2.1.	DfD and Sustainability	5
2.2.2.	DfD Strategies, Challenges, and Critical Success Factors	6
2.2.3.	Closed Material Loop	7
2.3.	STEEL STRUCTURES DECONSTRUCTABILITY	8
2.3.1.	Steel Structure DfD Principles	8
2.4.	STEEL STRUCTURE COMPONENTS	12
2.4.1.	Steel Connections	
2.4.2.	Steel Member Profile	17
2.4.3.	Fire-proofing Systems	
2.5.	DESIGN FOR DECONSTRUCTION PLAN	20
2.5.1.	Building Layers	
2.5.2.	Deconstruction Principles	
2.5.3.	Structure Similarity and Members Repetition	
2.5.4.	Utilizing Building Information Modeling (BIM)	
2.6.	SUMMARY	25
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>	: PROPOSED FRAMEWORK	
3.1.	General	26
3.2.	FRAMEWORK PROCEDURE	
3.3.	ANALYZING STEEL MAIN ELEMENTS: WORKSHOP VISITS	
3.3.1.	Steel Connections	27
3.3.2.	Member profile	
3.4.	INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS IN STEEL STRUCTURE	

3.4.1.	Innovative Connections	31
3.4.2.	Innovative Steel-Concrete Composite Systems	36
3.4.3.	Reusable Fireproofing Systems	39
3.5.	SS-DAS EQUATION MODEL	41
3.6.	INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS FAMILIES	42
3.7.	INTEGRATING SS-DAS PARAMETERS INTO THE 3D MODEL	42
3.8.	SS-DAS DYNAMO PROTOTYPING	42
3.9.	SELECTING ALTERNATIVES USING SS-DAS	42
3.10.	SUMMARY	42
CHAPTER 4 : E	SIM-BASED FRAMEWORK	43
4.1.	INTRODUCTION	43
4.2.	DECONSTRUCTABILITY ASSESSMENT SCORING SYSTEM (DAS)	43
4.2.1.	BIM-DAS Equation Development	44
4.3.	SS-DAS EQUATION MODEL FORMATION	47
4.4.	SS-DAS CALCULATIONS AUTOMATION	48
4.4.1.	Innovative Solutions Revit Families Creation	48
4.4.2.	Adding SS-DAS Shared Parameters	53
4.4.3.	Importing SS-DAS Index into Revit Project Parameters	54
4.4.4.	Dynamo Prototype Formation	56
4.5.	SUMMARY	61
CHAPTER 5 : C	CASE STUDY	62
5.1.	INTRODUCTION	62
5.1. 5.2.	INTRODUCTION Design Alternatives	62 62
5.1. 5.2. 5.2.1.	INTRODUCTION DESIGN ALTERNATIVES Base Case	62 62 62
5.1. 5.2. 5.2.1. 5.2.2.	INTRODUCTION DESIGN ALTERNATIVES Base Case Quicon Alternative	62 62 62 64
5.1. 5.2. 5.2.1. 5.2.2. 5.2.3.	INTRODUCTION DESIGN ALTERNATIVES Base Case Quicon Alternative Lindapter Alternative	62 62 62 64 64
5.1. 5.2. 5.2.1. 5.2.2. 5.2.3. 5.2.4.	INTRODUCTION DESIGN ALTERNATIVES Base Case Quicon Alternative Lindapter Alternative ConXtech Alternative	62 62 62 64 64 65
5.1. 5.2. 5.2.1. 5.2.2. 5.2.3. 5.2.4. 5.2.5.	INTRODUCTION DESIGN ALTERNATIVES Base Case Quicon Alternative Lindapter Alternative ConXtech Alternative Post-tension Alternative	62 62 64 64 65 65
5.1. 5.2. 5.2.1. 5.2.2. 5.2.3. 5.2.4. 5.2.5. 5.2.6.	INTRODUCTION DESIGN ALTERNATIVES Base Case Quicon Alternative Lindapter Alternative ConXtech Alternative Post-tension Alternative Friction-grip Alternative	62 62 64 64 65 65 65
5.1. 5.2. 5.2.1. 5.2.2. 5.2.3. 5.2.4. 5.2.5. 5.2.6. 5.2.7.	INTRODUCTION DESIGN ALTERNATIVES Base Case Quicon Alternative Lindapter Alternative ConXtech Alternative Post-tension Alternative Friction-grip Alternative	62 62 64 64 65 65 66 67
5.1. 5.2. 5.2.1. 5.2.2. 5.2.3. 5.2.4. 5.2.5. 5.2.6. 5.2.7. 5.2.8.	INTRODUCTION DESIGN ALTERNATIVES Base Case Quicon Alternative Lindapter Alternative ConXtech Alternative Post-tension Alternative Friction-grip Alternative Clamped Alternative Reusable fireproofed Alternative	62 62 64 64 65 65 66 67 67
5.1. 5.2. 5.2.1. 5.2.2. 5.2.3. 5.2.4. 5.2.5. 5.2.6. 5.2.7. 5.2.8. 5.2.9.	INTRODUCTION DESIGN ALTERNATIVES Base Case Quicon Alternative Lindapter Alternative ConXtech Alternative Post-tension Alternative Friction-grip Alternative Clamped Alternative Reusable fireproofed Alternative Alternative (1)	62 62 64 65 65 65 67 67 67
5.1. $5.2.$ $5.2.1.$ $5.2.2.$ $5.2.3.$ $5.2.4.$ $5.2.5.$ $5.2.6.$ $5.2.7.$ $5.2.8.$ $5.2.9.$ $5.2.10.$	INTRODUCTION DESIGN ALTERNATIVES Base Case Quicon Alternative Lindapter Alternative ConXtech Alternative Post-tension Alternative Friction-grip Alternative Clamped Alternative Reusable fireproofed Alternative Alternative (1) Alternative (2)	62 62 64 64 65 65 65 66 67 68 68
5.1. 5.2. 5.2.1. 5.2.2. 5.2.3. 5.2.4. 5.2.5. 5.2.6. 5.2.7. 5.2.8. 5.2.9. 5.2.10. 5.3.	INTRODUCTION DESIGN ALTERNATIVES Base Case Quicon Alternative Lindapter Alternative ConXtech Alternative Post-tension Alternative Friction-grip Alternative Clamped Alternative Reusable fireproofed Alternative Alternative (1) Alternative (2)	62 62 64 65 65 65 66 67 67 68 68 68
5.1. 5.2. 5.2.1. 5.2.2. 5.2.3. 5.2.4. 5.2.5. 5.2.6. 5.2.7. 5.2.8. 5.2.9. 5.2.10. 5.3. 5.4.	INTRODUCTION DESIGN ALTERNATIVES Base Case Quicon Alternative ConXtech Alternative Post-tension Alternative Friction-grip Alternative Clamped Alternative Reusable fireproofed Alternative Alternative (1) Alternative (2) INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS IMPACT ANALYSIS DESIGN ALTERNATIVES RESULTS ANALYSIS	62 62 64 65 65 65 65 67 67 68 68 70 71
5.1. $5.2.$ $5.2.1.$ $5.2.2.$ $5.2.3.$ $5.2.4.$ $5.2.5.$ $5.2.6.$ $5.2.7.$ $5.2.8.$ $5.2.9.$ $5.2.10.$ $5.3.$ $5.4.$ $5.5.$	INTRODUCTION DESIGN ALTERNATIVES Base Case Quicon Alternative Lindapter Alternative ConXtech Alternative Post-tension Alternative Friction-grip Alternative Clamped Alternative Reusable fireproofed Alternative Alternative (1) Alternative (2) INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS IMPACT ANALYSIS DESIGN ALTERNATIVES RESULTS ANALYSIS	62 62 64 65 65 65 67 67 67 68 70 71 72
5.1. 5.2. 5.2.1. 5.2.2. 5.2.3. 5.2.4. 5.2.5. 5.2.6. 5.2.7. 5.2.8. 5.2.9. 5.2.10. 5.3. 5.4. 5.5. CHAPTER 6 : C	INTRODUCTION DESIGN ALTERNATIVES Base Case Quicon Alternative Lindapter Alternative ConXtech Alternative Post-tension Alternative Friction-grip Alternative Clamped Alternative Reusable fireproofed Alternative Alternative (1) Alternative (2) INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS IMPACT ANALYSIS DESIGN ALTERNATIVES RESULTS ANALYSIS SUMMARY	
5.1. 5.2. 5.2.1. 5.2.2. 5.2.3. 5.2.4. 5.2.5. 5.2.6. 5.2.7. 5.2.8. 5.2.9. 5.2.10. 5.3. 5.4. 5.5. <b>CHAPTER 6 : C</b> 6.1.	INTRODUCTION DESIGN ALTERNATIVES Base Case Quicon Alternative Lindapter Alternative ConXtech Alternative Post-tension Alternative Post-tension Alternative Friction-grip Alternative Clamped Alternative Reusable fireproofed Alternative Alternative (1) Alternative (2) INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS IMPACT ANALYSIS DESIGN ALTERNATIVES RESULTS ANALYSIS SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
5.1. 5.2. 5.2.1. 5.2.2. 5.2.3. 5.2.4. 5.2.5. 5.2.6. 5.2.7. 5.2.8. 5.2.9. 5.2.10. 5.3. 5.4. 5.5. <b>CHAPTER 6 : C</b> 6.1. 6.2.	INTRODUCTION DESIGN ALTERNATIVES Base Case Quicon Alternative Lindapter Alternative ConXtech Alternative Post-tension Alternative Friction-grip Alternative Clamped Alternative Reusable fireproofed Alternative Alternative (1) Alternative (2) INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS IMPACT ANALYSIS DESIGN ALTERNATIVES RESULTS ANALYSIS SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONCLUSION RESEARCH CONTRIBUTIONS	
5.1. 5.2. 5.2.1. 5.2.2. 5.2.3. 5.2.4. 5.2.5. 5.2.6. 5.2.7. 5.2.8. 5.2.9. 5.2.10. 5.3. 5.4. 5.5. <b>CHAPTER 6 : C</b> 6.1. 6.2. 6.3.	INTRODUCTION DESIGN ALTERNATIVES Base Case Quicon Alternative ConXtech Alternative Post-tension Alternative Friction-grip Alternative Clamped Alternative Reusable fireproofed Alternative Alternative (1) Alternative (2) INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS IMPACT ANALYSIS DESIGN ALTERNATIVES RESULTS ANALYSIS SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONCLUSION RESEARCH CONTRIBUTIONS FUTURE WORK AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
5.1. 5.2. 5.2.1. 5.2.2. 5.2.3. 5.2.4. 5.2.5. 5.2.6. 5.2.7. 5.2.8. 5.2.9. 5.2.10. 5.3. 5.4. 5.5. CHAPTER 6 : C 6.1. 6.2. 6.3. REFERENCES	INTRODUCTION DESIGN ALTERNATIVES	

# **List of Tables**

## Chapter 2

Table 2.1: Steel structure DfD principles	9
Table 2.2: Evaluation of connection alternatives in steel structure DfD [8]	12
Table 2.3: Building layer's example [3]	21
Table 2.4: Key project players' matrix [50]	23
Table 2.5: Project phases accompanied with design principles matrix [50]	23

## Chapter 5

Table 5.1: Innovative alternatives results	70
Table 5.2: Design alternatives Dynamo graph results	71

# **List of Figures**

## Chapter 2

Figure 2.1: Crystal Palace exhibition hall, London [11]	5
Figure 2.2: Building's end-of-life for closed material loop condition [2]	7
Figure 2.3: Connections types according to its relation to parts' edges [8]	11
Figure 2.4: Bearing type and slip-critical type bolts [52]	13
Figure 2.5: Equipped snug-tightening of bolted connection [26]	14
Figure 2.6: Manual snug-tightening of bolted connection [26]	14
Figure 2.7: Torque wrench bolt [52]	15
Figure 2.8: Different types of full penetration butt weld [31]	16
Figure 2.9: Different types of partial penetration butt weld [31]	16
Figure 2.10: Standard rolled (left) and built-up (right) I-sections [41]	17
Figure 2.11: Masonry fire protection [52]	20

# Chapter 3

Figure 3.1: Proposed SS-DAS evaluation framework (Developed by the author)	26
Figure 3.2: Bearing type bolted connection in preheater [54]	27
Figure 3.3: Friction type bolted connection in Grand Egyptian Museum [54]	27
Figure 3.4: Fillet welded stiffeners and beam plates before weld removal at steel	
fabrication workshop [54]	29
Figure 3.5: Heat affected zone (HAZ) welded stiffeners after weld removal at steel	
fabrication workshop [54]	29
Figure 3.6: Built-up section for a CTG of a rolling mill [54]	30
Figure 3.7: Quicon schematic connection [33]	32
Figure 3.8: Lindapter components [35]	33
Figure 3.9: Post-tensioned moment connections [33]	34
Figure 3.10: ConXtech 3D moment connection [37]	35
Figure 3.11: ConXtech XR and XL [40]	36
Figure 3.12: Different steel-concrete composite section bolting types [42]	37
Figure 3.13: PFBSC scheme assembly model [44]	38
Figure 3.14: Clamped steel-concrete shear connection prototype [5]	38
Figure 3.15: Clamped specimen setup for testing [5]	39
Figure 3.16: Flexible wrap fire protection [51]	40
Figure 3.17: Flexible blanket fire protection [48]	41

# Chapter 4

Figure 4.1: Building's end-of-life strategies [3]	44
Figure 4.2: D <sub>score</sub> and R <sub>score</sub> parameters for calculating DAS [3]	45
Figure 4.3: Quicon connection family	49
Figure 4.4: Lindapter connection family	49
Figure 4.5: ConXtech connection family	50
Figure 4.6: Post-tension Moment connection family	50
Figure 4.7: Friction-grip Bolted Shear connection family	51
Figure 4.8: Clamped connection family	51

Figure 4.10: Flexible Wrap family
Figure 4.11: Adding shared parameters in Revit
Figure 4.12: Add SS-DAS shared parameter55
Figure 4.13: Adding SS-DAS into project information
Figure 4.14: SS-DAS as a Green Building property of the Steel Structure55
Figure 4.15: SS-DAS Dynamo Prototype full graph
Figure 4.16: SS-DAS Dynamo graph for Part 1
Figure 4.17: SS-DAS Dynamo graph for Part 257
Figure 4.18: SS-DAS Dynamo graph for Part 3
Figure 4.19: SS-DAS Dynamo graph for Part 4
Figure 4.20: SS-DAS Dynamo graph for Part 5
Figure 4.21: SS-DAS Dynamo graph for Part 6
Figure 4.22: SS-DAS Dynamo graph for Part 7
Figure 4.23: SS-DAS Dynamo graph for Part 8

## Chapter 5

Figure 5.1: Base case full 3D model	62
Figure 5.2 (a): Apex haunch connection	63
Figure 5.2 (b): Purlin connection	63
Figure 5.2 (c): Case base connections	63
Figure 5.3: Beam-column connection- Quicon alternative	64
Figure 5.4: Roof purlin connection- Lindapter alternative	65
Figure 5.5: Beam-column connection- ConXtech alternative	65
Figure 5.6: Beam-column connection- Post tension alternative	66
Figure 5.7: Slab-beam connection- Friction grip alternative	66
Figure 5.8: Slab-beam connection- Clamped alternative	67
Figure 5.9: Fireproofing systems- Reusable fireproofing alternative	67
Figure 5.10: Innovative solutions combination- Alternative 1	68
Figure 5.11: Innovative solutions combination- Alternative 2	69
Figure 5.12: Shared parameters values for an I-column	69
Figure 5.13: SS-DAS index improvement %	70
Figure 5.14: SS-DAS values for case study alternatives	71

#### Abstract

Recently, attention is being focused on Design for Deconstruction (DfD) as one of the most effective structure end-of-life design scenarios. Although several research efforts have dealt with the DfD and reversible buildings design theories for the past few years, the lack of technological support for developing tools to improve DfD to be BIM compliant has been clearly noticed. This research presents a Deconstructability Assessment Scoring (DAS) methodology for quantitative assessment of Steel Structures deconstructability. The proposed methodology takes into consideration a number of steel parameters such as connection type, member type, and steel-concrete composite action solutions. Deconstructability of the steel member types (including built-up and hot-rolled) as well as steel connection types (including bolted and welded) are investigated. Seven innovative solutions contributing to steel connections deconstructability are considered in the proposed research including; Quicon, Lindapter, ConXtech, post-tensioned moment connection, post-installed friction-grip bolted shear connection and clamped steel-concrete connection. Furthermore, steel elements reusable fire-proofing systems such as endothermic wraps and flexible fire blankets are introduced to provide the required fire resistance and deconstructability. The detailed analyses for the selected parameters are adopted and implemented to form the Steel Structure Deconstructability Assessment Scoring (SS-DAS). Accordingly, the SS-DAS provides a vastly index that expresses the steel structure deconstructability. The proposed methodology is implemented in Autodesk Revit using Dynamo. The proposed innovative solutions are modeled as families to automate the scoring process by extracting the model bill of quantity, calculating the structure parameters ratios and incorporating these ratios providing each design alternative model with its unique SS-DAS index. It should be noted that SS-DAS index is used to reflect its sustainability aspect with respect to different design alternatives for the steel structure with a high Level of Detailing (LOD). A case study of steel structure utility building is worked out to illustrate the use of the developed methodology. The framework is expected to assist project owners in making efficient decisions with respect to selecting the most deconstructable steel structure design alternative.

### **Chapter 1 : Introduction**

#### 1.1. General

For many years, the conventional construction industry encountered a technological revolution due to the need for non-conventional processes with mitigated errors, less construction time, more effective design quality, and high conflict resolution. Accordingly, Building Information Modeling (BIM) showed up to provide this needed features. BIM has been used widely in the construction industry as a result of the awareness of its implementation importance.

In addition to BIM main benefits for conceptual design, feasibility studies, clash detection, etc., it contributed strongly to various construction sectors; safety, facility management, rehabilitation of heritage buildings, etc. [1]. In spite of the beneficial contribution of BIM in Architecture, Engineering Construction (AEC) industry, the main contribution has been often in phases of design, bidding, construction, and facility management, only few works have been considering the end-of-life phase issues [2].

Due to the rapidly increased population, a huge number of building and construction demand is created. As a resource-intensive industry, the AEC industry considered as a main contributor to the main environmental impacts such as: global warming, natural resources depletion, waste generation, and pollution, which in return have a bad influence on natural health and human survival [2].

#### **1.2.** Problem Statement

The construction industry has been facing difficulties due to the call for facilities design for end-of-life activities such as: relocation, renovation, disassembly, and disposal. From the ecosystem and sustainability perspectives, these activities have many side effects:

- Large volume of demolition and land-filling wastes, since most of construction materials are unrecoverable, unrecyclable, or undeconstructable.
- High amount of energy consumption, increasing the Carbon gas emissions with environmental impact.
- High amount of facility's capital investment loss.

Landfills are no more capable to receive that massive demolition and end-of-life waste, environment can no longer suffer from toxic gases and CO2 emissions and Earth has no additional material and energy sources for the upcoming life-time. Sequentially, waste produced, energy consumed, and CO2 gas emissions released by reason of AEC industry practices began to be observed significantly. Since the current AEC industry is highly directed towards building renovation and demolition therefore, ensuring adequate Construction, Demolition, and Excavation Waste (CDEW) management at the end-of-life of building is crucial. The need to adequately manage and reduce CDEW at the end-of-life therefore requires replacing the traditional demolition scenario with a more sustainable scenario such as: deconstruction [2]. Although many researches considered CDEW management, only few studies handled the mitigation of end of life waste right from early design stages [3]. Through the last decade, the deconstruction theory showed up to upgrade and improve the design for end-of-life activities of facilities. Subsequently, Design for Deconstruction (DfD) took place to enhance the engineering design process to avoid the end-of-life activities problems.

The main research gap is the lack of technological support for developing tools to improve DfD to be BIM compliant, in addition to infancy of the assessment of structures deconstructability. Accordingly, there is a necessity to develop a BIM compliant framework to assess structures deconstructability which in return would contribute to structures design satisfaction.

#### **1.3. Research Objectives**

The main objective of this research is developing a framework to enhance the assessment of the deconstructability of steel structures. Creating the framework, it will efficiently help the engineers to assess their designs' deconstructability through a BIM-based process that can be linked to the Engineering Design Process reducing time, effort, and human errors. As a result, the most deconstructable design of the steel structure would be evaluated using this framework.

#### **1.4. Research Scope**

The proposed framework has been established using BIM-based software tools. A steel structure 3D modeling software (Autodesk Revit) has been employed with high capability to model both the steel structure members and connections. Hence, a compliant tool has been developed (Dynamo tool) to capture a set of deconstructability parameters and give the structure its deconstructability score. The parameters in question are related to members' profile (built-up or hot-rolled), deconstructable connections (friction-grip bolted [4] and clamped connections [5]) ratio, connection bolting type, connection welding type, reusable-fireproofed members' ratio (e.g. flexible blanket systems [6]), members' repetition and structure similarity, and existence of qualified deconstruction manager and a deconstruction aware crew. Hence, Deconstructability Assessment Scoring System (DAS) criteria has been modified and applied to case- study of a steel structure to obtain the DAS score.

#### 1.5. Research Methodology

To achieve the previously stated objectives, the following methodology is to be followed:

- 1) Analyze steel structure components by conducting workshop visits.
- 2) Introduce innovative solutions.
- 3) Modify the former DAS equation to adopt the chosen parameters.
- 4) Prepare the steel structure model with a high Level of Detailing (LOD).

- 5) Enrich all model elements with the needed deconstructability information.
- 6) Utilize Dynamo tool for Autodesk Revit to develop a prototype and link it to the steel structure Revit model.
- 7) Calculate the DAS score for the model and import it to Revit database.
- 8) Apply the BIM-based framework to a real steel structure.

The output of the above listed steps as DAS score is ready to be utilized by any further add-in tools for further functions.

### **1.6.** Organization of the Thesis

Following the introductory chapter, the thesis is organized as follows:

- Chapter 2 presents a literature review of design for deconstruction and effective deconstructability principles. Moreover, an analysis for steel structure components is taking place. At last, it mentions the importance of DfD plan and experienced team existence in addition to the significance of adopting BIM for DfD and deconstruction processes.
- Chapter 3 shows the proposed framework. The proposed framework consists of seven main steps utilizing two main BIM tools; Autodesk Revit and Dynamo tool. A workshop visit takes place to analyze steel structure's main parameters. Moreover, this chapter introduces a group of eight innovative solutions.
- Chapter 4 describes a BIM-based framework starting with a modification for the BIM-DAS model equation. Then, it introduces a steel structure deconstructability assessment score system (SS-DAS). The developed framework considers enriching the steel structure 3D model with shared parameters. The chapter also shows the creation of an SS-DAS Dynamo prototype to automate calculations of different design alternatives.
- Chapter 5 presents the application of the BIM-based framework on a real case study. It introduces a number of design alternatives for the case study. Afterwards, SS-DAS Dynamo graph is used to calculate SS-DAS index for each alternative. This chapter then illustrates a clear comparison of the different SS-DAS values showing the effect of utilizing each of the innovative solutions.
- Finally, conclusion, research contributions, future work and recommendations are presented in Chapter 6.