Düzce University Faculty of Forestry Journal of Forestry

(DUJOF)

Journal of Forestry Volume 20, Number 2, pp. 1-14 Category: Research Article

> https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/duzceod ISSN 2148-7855 (online), ISSN 2148-7871 Düzce University Faculty of Forestry DOI: 10.58816/duzceod.1582454

Determination of Material Volume Using UAVs in Land Surface Change: The Case of Konuralp Campus (Düzce)*

Arazi Yüzey Değişiminde İHA Kullanılarak Materyal Hacminin Belirlenmesi: Konuralp Yerleşkesi (Düzce) Örneği

^DNuri TÖREYEN¹, ^DYılmaz TÜRK¹, ^DTunahan ÇINAR¹

Abstract

In this study examined the availability of UAV in determining material volume in excavation and fill works. The study aims to calculating the volume of an excavation work areas 1841 m² at the parking lot of the Faculty of Sports Sciences at Düzce University Konuralp Campus and a filling work areas 2759 m² on the access road to the Environmental and Health Specialization Laboratory. Autonomous UAV flights were performed before and after the excavation and filling works in the study areas. Besides, following these UAV flights, terrestrial measurements were made in the same way. The study found that UAV data analysis results an excavation volume of 7121 m³ in the parking area and a filling volume of 5752 m³ on the road. According to calculations used terrestrial measurement methods, the excavation volume in the parking area was 7007 m³ and the filling volume on the road was 5683 m³. An average difference of 1.42% was found between UAV data and terrestrial measurement methods. The results were showed the usability of UAV systems in detected material volume.

Keywords: UAVs, Total station, cut and fill volumes, digital elevation model.

Özet

Bu calısmada, İHA teknolojisinin kazı ve dolgu çalışmaları materyal hacminin belirlenmesinde kullanılabilirliği incelenmiştir. Düzce Üniversitesi Konuralp Yerleşkesi Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi otoparkında 1841 m² büyüklüğünde yapılan kazı çalışması ile Çevre ve Sağlık İhtisaslaşma bağlantı yolunda 2759 Laboratuvarı m^2 büyüklüğünde yapılan dolgu çalışması hacminin hesaplanması çalışamaya konu edilmiştir. Kazı ve dolgu çalışmalarından önce ve sonra İHA ile uçuşlar otonom olarak gerçekleşmiştir. Ayrıca bu İHA uçuşlarını takiben yersel ölçümler de aynı şekilde yapılmıştır. Çalışmada, İHA verileri ile otopark alanında 7121 m3 kazı hacmi, yolda 5752 m3 dolgu hacmi bulunmuştur. Yersel ölçüm yöntemlerine göre yapılan hesaplamada ise otopark alanında kazı miktarı 7007 m³, yolda dolgu miktarı 5683 m³ bulunmuştur. İHA verileri ile yersel ölçüm yöntemleri arasında ortalama %1,42'lik bir fark bulunmuştur. Elde edilen sonuçlar materyal hacminin belirlenmesinde İΗΑ sistemlerinin kullanılabilirliğini ortaya koymaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İHA, Total station, Kazı ve dolgu hacimleri, Sayısal yükseklik modeli.

1. Introduction

In recent years, the development of technologies and image processing algorithms has further increased the importance of photogrammetry studies. Photogrammetry has been a long history, included mathematical calculations on three-dimensional (3D) images produced from superposition pairs of two-dimensional photographs (Erdin, 1992; Yilmaz, 2010). The developed UAV platforms have been significantly influenced by new generation image processed techniques. The increased use of the Structure-from-Motion (SfM) algorithm considered a development in photogrammetry, was of importance in the improvement of UAVs and their systems (Gülci et al., 2021). High-resolution digital elevation models (DEMs) and orthophotos have been easily creating with many commercial or open-source software operating with the SfM algorithm (Shervais, 2015; Wallace et al., 2016). SfM algorithm, which produces successful and accurate results even in complex topography, has accuracy within an accepted range when compared to laser scanning systems (Westboy et al., 2012; Seki et al., 2017). Programs with interfaces that make easier the processing of high resolution images in the digital media allow researchers to easily create 3D models. Consequently, the use of digital photogrammetry in different studies including natural sciences such as forest engineering was expanded and increased daily (Akgul et al., 2016; Osborn et al., 2017; Tercan, 2018).

Additionally, in photogrammetry studies that have been increased used digital cameras available to researchers, the location, size and shape of objects are determined from vertical and oblique have high resolution aerial photographs (Erdin, 1992). In recent studies, the merge of low-cost UAV imagery with the SfM technique was increasingly viewed as fast, affordable, accessible and innovative compared to terrestrial measurement and terrestrial LIDAR (Laser Imaging Detection and Ranging) (İnan and Öztürk, 2016; Gülci et al., 2017; Akgul et al., 2018).

UAVs have been typically equipped with cameras or sensors and can provided highresolution images. These high-resolution images could be used to detected changes in the land surface. UAV systems enable the rapid collection of terrain data in a study area. To detect terrestrial changes with UAVs, it is necessary to plan and conduct multiple flights. Compared to aerial vehicles such as airplanes or helicopters, UAV systems all the time have been lower operating costs, make possible for more frequent data collection (Liang et al., 2023). Total Stations was land surveying devices capabled of delicate point-based measurements on terrain. This allows the detected of changes in the land surface with millimeter sensitive. Total Stations was could create three-dimensional maps used measurements from the land, enabling detailed analysis of surface changes. They allow direct terrestrial measurement, making it was possible to detected land changes directly in the study area. However, the lengthy data acquisition process is a disadvantage. UAV systems are often used to cover big size study areas and collected data quickly, while Total Stations was preferred for more detailed and sensitive measurements. The combined use of these products have help in more comprehensively and accurately determined changes in the land surface (Anonymous, 2024).

In this study examined the determination of excavation and fill volumes used UAV and total Stations systems for works conducted at the Düzce University Konuralp Campus. The aim of this study is to assess the usability of UAV systems in calculating material volumes and to compared the results of UAV and terrestrial measurement.

1.1. Methods Used for Determining Material Volume

The methods used to determine the volume of excavation material can vary depending on the size of the excavation site, the type of material, and precision requirements. Various material volume calculation methods have been used from past to present.

1.1.1. UAV Systems

Satellites and manned aerial vehicles are important systems currently used to obtain remote sensing images. However, these systems have several disadvantages. UAVs, on the other hand, offer various advantages, such as lower cost, lighter weight, and the ability to capture images at low flight speeds. Unlike aircraft and satellite systems that capture images from high altitudes, UAVs can be used in cloudy weather for the same purpose (Xiang and Tian, 2011). Additionally, UAVs are safer as they pose less risk compared to piloted aircraft, and they offer flexibility in terms of desired flight altitude and timing. UAVs are classified for scientific or civilian use based on features such as platform size, flight tolerance, and capacity, often aligning with existing military categories (Watts et al., 2012).

Today, UAV systems are widely used in military applications for documentation, monitoring, and increasingly in civilian applications (Eisenbeiss and Sauerbier, 2011). Following the development in the design, research, and production of aerial platforms, the demand for UAVs in aerial photogrammetry has increased (Tahar et al., 2011). UAVs are

used in agriculture for spraying, surveillance, road deformation detection, and documentation of cultural heritage (Mitch and Salah, 2009).

1.1.2. Total Station (Electronic Distance Measurement)

A Total Station is a highly precise and versatile measurement device used in topographic surveys. It is commonly used in construction, mining, mapping, and land surveying (GH, 2024). Total Station devices provide accurate location data by measuring both horizontal and vertical angles and distances. The Total Station sends laser or infrared beams to the points to be measured. These beams reflect off prisms or directly off target surfaces and return. The device determines the distance and position by measuring the return time and angle of the beams. The advantages of a Total Station include millimeter-level accuracy, the ability to perform both angular and distance measurements, data recording capability, and immediate calculations, along with user-friendly interfaces and software that provide ease of use. The Total Station is an indispensable tool in modern surveying techniques. It provides precise and reliable results, making it widely applicable. When used correctly and maintained regularly, it offers a significant advantage in topographic and engineering studies. However, the lengthy data acquisition process is a disadvantage (Pehlivan, 2019).

Total Station has been used in many scientific studies (Scherer and Lerma, 2009: Luo et al., 2016; Ulvi, 2018; Gülci and Kılınç, 2018) and in volume calculations in practice. The use of devices such as Total Station, which obtain data by terrestrial measurements, is less common than the use of UAVs in today's volume calculation studies. UAVs can scan more areas with high precision and in a shorter time and data can be generated (Özdemir, 2023).

2. Material and Method

2.1. Study area

The study area was located approximately 10 km from Düzce Province, specifically at the Düzce University Konuralp Campus in the northern part of the province. The research focuses on the excavation area at the parking lot of the Faculty of Sports Sciences (Area A) and the fill area along the access road to the Health and Environment Specialization Laboratory (Area B). The two areas are approximately 1 km apart. The parking lot excavation area covers 1841 m², while the road fill area measures 2759 m². Düzce Province is situated between the latitudes of 40°43' and 41°07' north and the longitudes of 30°49' and 31°50" east, encompassing an area of 2593 km² in the Western Black Sea Region

(Anonymous, 2002). To the east and south of the province lies Bolu, to the west is Sakarya and to the north is the Black Sea (Figure 1). The average elevation of Düzce city center is 120 m, with elevations reaching up to 1850 m in mountainous regions (Anonymous, 1999).



Figure 1. Study areas and their surroundings.

2.2. UAV System and Terrestrial Photogrammetric Methods for Acquiring Digital Images

2.2.1. Acquiring Digital Images with UAVs

In this study, the volume of material in the designated areas was calculated. A total of two flights were conducted using UAVs as part of the research. The image acquisition process with the UAV followed these steps: i) pre-field preparation, ii) field work, iii) execution of the flight, and iv) post-flight processing.

Autonomous flights were carried out in the study area, with front and side overlap rates set at 70% and 80%, respectively. The flight path was designed to cover the study area, with a camera angle of 90° and flying at an altitude of 100 m.

The flights were conducted autonomously using the DJI Phantom 4 RTK model UAV platform (Figure 2). The DJI Phantom 4 RTK system features a 1-inch 20-megapixel resolution CMOS sensor. It is equipped with a global navigation satellite system (GNSS) receiver that allows for high positional accuracy through multi-frequency RTK/PPK data acquisition. The flight planning process was created using the DJI GS RTK application from the controller of the DJI Phantom 4 RTK system.



Figure 2. DJI Phantom 4 RTK model UAV and remote controller.

2.2.2. Field Surveys

After the acquisition of UAV images, terrestrial measurements were initiated. In the terrestrial measurement method, three separate polygon points that are geologically difficult to change were established using a TOPCON GR5 RTK-GNSS (Global Navigation Satellite System) receiver, with 30-minute sessions conducted to set up these points. Two of the polygon points were used for connections, while the third was for control purposes. Subsequently, the established polygon points were connected using an electronic distance measurement device (Total Station: TOPCON OS200) (Figure 3), and elevation coordinate information of the surface was obtained through backsights and prisms. Taking into account the slope changes on the surface, measurements were conducted with a maximum distance of 5 meters. These procedures were carried out twice in the study areas, once before the excavation and fill work and once after. In the study, the terrestrial measurement was used as a reference for evaluating the accuracy of the volumes calculated with the UAV.



Figure 3. Field Surveys.

2.3. Determination of Excavation and Filling Volume in the Study Area

The images obtained using UAVs were processed to produce a high-resolution and accurate point cloud using Agisoft Metashape Professional Version 1.7.6 software (Figure 4). The software was run on Windows 10 64-bit operating system, Inter ® Xeon ® CPU E5-1650 v3 @ 3.50GHz 48 GB processor model and a workstation with 4 GB AMD FirePro W5100 graphics card technical specifications were used. During the image alignment

process, the accuracy level was set to medium, while high quality settings were chosen for the production of depth maps and dense cloud generation. Since the images were acquired through flights conducted in RTK mode, YKN (Ground Control Points) were not defined in the image optimization process. The photogrammetric analysis of the images involved the steps of Align and Build Dense Cloud. The resulting point cloud was then exported in ".xyz" format. Similarly, the coordinates recorded by the electronic distance measurement device were exported to create ".xyz" format.



Figure 4. Dense Cloud Processing in Agisoft Metashape Professional Version 1.7.6.

The ".xyz" format data obtained from the UAV and field surveys were imported into NetCAD software to create a triangular model (digital elevation model) and obtain terrain surfaces (Figure 5). Subsequently, using the Netpro module, routes were created on the surfaces obtained before and after excavation and filling for both methods, with crosssections defined every two meters. The resulting cross-sections were compared with those in the Netsurf module, and the volume was calculated using the TCK method (Figure 6). In TCK method; the application distance (AD) is calculated by the formula AD = [E/(E+F)] xL for excavation (E) and AD = [E/(E+F)] x L for filling (F). L is the distance between two sections. Area is the excavation and backfill areas per section. If both sections are in excavation or filling in the volume, the formula (A1+A2)*L/2 is applied (Netcad, 2024).



Figure 5. Data Processing in NetCAD Software.

TSI JEA		X	44 N C	× 7 r 1	12 15	aretleyici çizir	n alanı dışında	Olcek=
		Eat	ا مدادها فأعد	Jacim Lines				,
		Enk	esitierden F	nacim Hesat	28	_		
		So	Sonraki Alm Enkesitleri C:\Users\YilmazT\Desktop\proje_6_kiibai_hes Önceki Alm Enkesitleri					
			VU sers \ Y im					
			Yontem					
			TCK Yöntemi (A1+A2+Karekök(A1*A2))*L/3 (A1+A2)*L/2 D01/2/2					
	C DSI Yontemi							
			Grafik					
				¥ H	lesapla	X Iptal		
		Araçlar Baster	Netsurf Hesap	3D + Netmap Kam	u <u>Ç</u> ap <u>P</u> lanet <u>N</u> e	tPro Nettop (çmesu	uyu <u>G</u> enel Yardım	
Di⊕ i≡ Qid 0+062.00	2.00	Araçlar Baster	Netsurf Hesap	3D + Netmap Kam m alanı dışında Ölçek::4	u <u>Cap Planet Ne</u> 73 <u>267.042</u>	tPro Nettop (çmesu 6, 120	uyu Genel Yardım 3769.383	-3)
0+062.00 0+064.00	2.00 2.00	Araçlar Baster ∼ ? ┌╯ 戀 ₽	Netsurf Hesap 1 Işaretleyici çizir 129.690 126.111	3D + Netmap Kam m alanı dışında Ölçekı:4 -	u <u>Çap Planet Ne</u> 73 267.042 255.801	1Pro Nettop Içmesa 6,120 6,120	uyu <u>G</u> enel Yardim 3769.383 4025.184	-31
DI	2.00 2.00 2.00	Araçlar Baster Cv ? r 📆 P - -	Netsurf Hesap Işaretleyici çizir 129.690 126.111 121.625	3D + Netmap Kam m alanı dışında Ölçeke 4 - -	u Çap <u>Planet Ne</u> 73 267.042 255.801 247.736	6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120	2yu <u>G</u> enel Yardım 3769.383 4025.184 4272.920	-31 -4(-42
➡ I ■ QtS 0+062.00 0+064.00 0+066.00 0+068.00	2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00	Araçler Baster Ca ? (*) (*)	Netsurf Hesap 129.690 126.111 121.625 115.918	30 + Netmap Kam m alanı dışında Ölçeker - - -	u Cap Planet Ne 73 267.042 255.801 247.736 237.543	6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120	2yu <u>G</u> enel Yardim 3769.383 4025.184 4272.920 4510.463	-31 -40 -42 -45
□ ⊕ [≡] Q G 0+062.00 0+064.00 0+066.00 0+066.00 0+068.00 0+068.00 0+070.00 0+070.00	2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00	daqtu Bater ∼? Ґ∰₽	Netsurf Hesap arretleyici çizi 29.690 - 26.111 - 21.625 - 15.918 - 107.741 -	3D + Netmap Kam m alanı dışında Ölçekcı 4 - - - -	u Çap Planet Ne 73 267.042 255.801 247.736 237.543 223.659	6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120	yu <u>Genel Yardum</u> 3769.383 4025.184 4272.920 4510.463 4734.122	-37 -40 -42 -45 -47
Image: Control of the second secon	+¥ # 0 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00	Δαςίω Bater ~? (*) (*) (*) - - - - -	Netsurf Besap paretleyici çizi 29.690 - 26.111 - 121.625 - 115.918 - 107.741 -	20 + Njetmap Kam m alaru dajnda Oliçeku 4 - - - - -	u Çap Blanet Me 73 267.042 255.801 247.736 237.543 233.659 204.880	Pro Nettop Jomes 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120	yy Genel Yardm 3769.383 4025.184 4272.920 4510.463 4734.122	-37 -40 -42 -45 -47 -47
C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 Ara Uzaklik	Δiraşlar Bəter - ? / ∰ β - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Netsurf Hesap Iparetleyici çizi 129.690 126.111 121.625 115.918 107.741	20 - Njetmap Kam m alaw depinda Oliçeka 4 - - - - HAC (mi	v Sap Blanct Me 73 267,042 255,801 247,736 237,543 223,659 204,880 Sim 3)	Pro Nettop Joness 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 (m)	yy Genel Yardim 3769.383 4025.184 4272.920 4510.463 4734.122 TIF HACIM 3)	-31 -4(-42 -42 -41 BR0(DEC
Image: Control of the second secon	2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 Ara Uzaklik (m)	Araçlar Baster ? (* ● ? - - - ALA (m2 YARMA	Netsurf Hesap Iparethylici (pix) 129.690 126.111 - 121.625 - 115.918 - 107.741 - N) DOLLMA	20 - Njetmap Kam m alanu dupinda Öliçeka 4 - - - - HAC (m: YARMA	v Sap Blanct Me 73 267,042 255,801 247,736 237,543 223,659 204,880 3) DOLMA	Pro Nettop Igness 6,120 6,120 6,120 6,120 6,120 6,120 KUMULA (m) YARMA	yy Genel Yardim 3769.383 4025.184 4272.920 4510.463 4734.122 TIF HACIM 3) DDLMA	-31 -4(-42 -42 -41 BR0E DEC
Image: Control of the second secon	+ ★ # 9 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 4.ra Uzaklik (m)	Araçlar Bater 2 7 ∰ P - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Netsor Hesap Iparetteyici çizi 129.690 126.111 - 121.625 - 115.918 - 107.741 - DOLMA - 97.139 -	20 - Njetmap Kam m alanu dupinda Öliçeka 4 - - - - - HAC (M: YARMA	U Sap Blanet Me 73 267.042 255.801 247.736 237.543 223.659 204.880 10 DOLMA 170.722	Pro Nettop Joneso 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 KÜMÜLAI (m YARMA 6.120	yy Genel Yardim 3769.383 4025.184 42272.920 4510.463 4734.122 TIF HACIM DOLMA 4939.002	-31 -4(-42 -45 -47 DEC
Image: Control of the second	+ ★ # 0 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 Ara Uzaklik (m) 	Araçlar Baster ? / # P - - - ALLA (m2 YARMA	Netsor Heap Iparettoyici çisi 129.690 126.111 - 121.625 - 115.918 - 107.741 - DOLMA - 97.139 - 82.583 -	20 - Njetmap Kam malani dojnda Oliçeka 4 - - - - - HAC (m: YARMA	U Sap Elanet Me 73 267.042 255.801 247.736 237.543 223.659 204.880 30 DOLMA 179.722 140.561	Pro Nettop Jones 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 KÜMÜLA (m YARMA 6.120 6.120	yy Genel Yardim 3769.383 4025.184 4272.920 4510.463 4734.122 TIF HACIM 3) DOLMA 4939.002 5118.724	-33 -4(-42 -42 -41 BR0H DEC -49 -49 -55
Image: Control of the second	2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00	Araçlar Baster ? C 3 ALA (m2 YARMA	Netsort Besap Iparetleyici çüsi I 129.690 - 126.111 - 126.111 - 115.918 - 107.741 - N - 97.139 - 82.583 - 66.978 -	20 - Njetmap Kam m alan depinda Ölçeka 4 	v Sap Blanet Me 73 267.042 255.801 247.736 237.543 223.659 204.880 3) DOLMA 179.722 149.561 123.115	Pro Nettop Common 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 KÜMÜLAI (m. (m. (m. YARMA 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 (m.	yy Genel Yardm 3769.383 4025.184 4272.920 4510.463 4734.122 TIF HACIM 3) DOLMA 4939.002 5118.724 5268.285	-33 -4(-42 -42 -42 -45 -55 -55
Image: Control of the second	2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00	Araçlar Baster 2 7 ∰ 2 - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Netsor Beap Iparetleyici çizi 129.690 126.111 - 121.625 - 115.918 - 107.741 - N) - DOLMA - 97.139 - 82.583 - 66.978 - 56.137 -	20 - Njetmap Kam m alanu dupinda Ölçekar 	v Sap Blanct Me 73 267.042 255.801 247.736 237.543 223.659 204.880 3) DOLMA 179.722 149.561 123.115 106.450	Pro Nettop Joness 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 KÜMÜLAI (m YARMA 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120	yy Genel Yardim 3769.383 4025.184 4272.920 4510.463 4734.122 TIF HACIM 0DLMA 4939.002 5118.724 5268.285 5391.400	-31 -4(-42 -45 -47 -47 -45 -57 -55 -55
Image: Control of the second	+ ★ # 0 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00	årstær Bater - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Netson Bears Iparetteyici çisi 129.690 - 126.111 - - 121.625 - - 115.918 - - 107.741 - - DOLMA - - 97.139 - - 66.978 - - 56.137 - - 50.323 - -	20 - Njetmap Kam m alanu dupnda Ölçeka 4 	v Sap Blanct Me 73 267.042 255.801 247.736 233.543 223.659 204.880 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Pro Nettop Jones 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 KÜMÜLAI (m YARMA 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120	yy Genel Yardm 3769.383 4025.184 4272.920 4510.463 4734.122 TIF HACIM DOLMA 4939.002 5118.724 5268.285 5391.400 5497.880	-37 -40 -42 -45 -45 BRÜK DEC -49 -51 -52 -53 -53 -54
Image: Second second	+ ★ # 0 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 4.ra Uzaklik (m) 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00	Araçlar Bater - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Netson Heap Iparettoyici çisi 129.690 - 126.111 - - 121.625 - - 115.918 - - 107.741 - - DOLMA - - 97.139 - - 82.583 - - 66.978 - - 50.323 - - 36.984 - -	20 - Njetmap Kam malaw dejinda Ölçeka 4 	U Same Binnet Mer 73 267.042 255.801 255.801 247.736 237.543 223.659 204.880 204.880 204.880 30 30 DOLMA 119.722 149.561 106.460 87.307 50.977 50.977 50.977	Pro Nettop Jones 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 74RMA 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120	yy Genel Yardm 3769.383 4025.184 4272.920 4510.463 4510.463 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	-37 -40 -42 -45 -45 DEC -52 -53 -53 -54 -55
Image: Second second	+ ★ # 0 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 4.ra Uzaklik (m) 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00	Araçlar Baster - ? / ∰ ₽ - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Netson Heap Iparettoyic (sin 129.690 - 126.6111 - - 121.625 - - 115.918 - - 107.741 - - DOLMA - - 97.139 - - 82.583 - - 56.137 - - 50.323 - - 38.984 - - 22.093 - -	20 - Njetmap Kam malani dejinda Ölçekar 	v Sep Binet Me 73 267.042 255.801 247.736 237.543 223.659 204.880 204.880 30 DOLMA 179.722 149.561 123.115 106.460 87.307 59.077 59.077 232.562	Pro Nettop Jones 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 7 KUMULA (m. YARMA 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 6.120 7 KUMULA (m. (m. KUMULA (m.	y Genel Yardm 3769.383 4025.184 4272.920 4510.463 4734.122 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	-31 -4(-42 -45 -45 -55 -55 -55 -55 -55 -55
Image: Control of the second	+ ★ # 0 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 4ra Uzaklik (m) 2.00 2	Araclar Baster - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Netsor Beach Iparetleyici (pin 129.690 126.111 121.625 115.918 107.741 107.741 0 <td>20 - Njetmsp Kam m slanu depnda Ölçeka 4 </td> <td>v Sap Blanct Me 73 267.042 255.801 247.736 237.543 223.659 204.880 204.880 3) DOLMA 179.722 149.561 123.115 106.460 87.307 59.077 37.525 20.47</td> <td>Pro Mettop Jerrers 6.120 6.120 6.396 6.844 10.408 17.944</td> <td>y Genel Yarden 3769.383 4025.184 4272.920 4510.463 4734.122 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td> <td>-31 -4(-42 -45 -47 -47 -47 -49 -51 -53 -54 -55 -55 -55 -56 -56 -56</td>	20 - Njetmsp Kam m slanu depnda Ölçeka 4 	v Sap Blanct Me 73 267.042 255.801 247.736 237.543 223.659 204.880 204.880 3) DOLMA 179.722 149.561 123.115 106.460 87.307 59.077 37.525 20.47	Pro Mettop Jerrers 6.120 6.120 6.396 6.844 10.408 17.944	y Genel Yarden 3769.383 4025.184 4272.920 4510.463 4734.122 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	-31 -4(-42 -45 -47 -47 -47 -49 -51 -53 -54 -55 -55 -55 -56 -56 -56

Figure 6. Volume Calculation in NetCAD Software.

3. Results

In the parking lot study area, when comparing excavation volume data from both methods, the excavation amount calculated from the difference between the first flight conducted before excavation with the UAV and the second flight thereafter was 7121 m³, while the amount calculated from data obtained using terrestrial measurement methods was 7007 m³. There is approximately a 114 m³ difference between the values calculated by the two methods. The UAV results were found to be approximately 1.63% higher compared to the Electronic Distance Measurement. In the road study area, when comparing fill volume data from both methods, the fill amount calculated from the difference between the first flight conducted before filling with the UAV and the second flight thereafter was 5752m³, while the amount calculated from data obtained using terrestrial measurement methods. The UAV results were found to be on average 1.21% higher compared to the Electronic Distance Measurement (Table 1). It was determined that the values found as a result of both methods in the study areas were compatible with each other with an average of 98.58% in terms of accuracy.

Gülci and Kılınç (2018) evaluated soil pile volume measurements with UAVs and found a volume amount of 38.56 m³, noting a difference of 1.94 m³ (98.95% agreement) with Total Station measurements. Ulvi (2018) compared UAV and Total Station volume data in his study and found that the values obtained from both methods were 99.33% consistent in terms of precision. The study shows similarities with both of these studies. In a study by Türk et al. (2022), they found a total excavation of 384 m³ and a fill volume of 188 m³ on a 100-meter forest road using UAVs. Türk and Canyurt (2024) used UAV systems to calculate the excavation slope volume of a 640-meter section of a forest road. The study resulted in UAV data indicating an excavation volume of 2189 m³ and a fill volume of 4183 m³, whereas land survey results showed an excavation amount of 2080 m³. They also found a +5% difference between UAV data and land survey results. Additionally, Balaban (2024) monitored surface changes in a quarry for six months using UAVs, calculating the excavation amount as 104170 m³ and the excavation area as 44348 m². Such studies have demonstrated that UAVs can play a significant role in excavation and fill calculations.

Methods	UAV (A)	Total station (B)	Difference (A-B)	Mean Difference
Parking Lot Excavation Volume (m ³)	7121	7007	114 (%1.63)	%1.42
Road Fill Volume (m ³)	5752	5683	69 (%1.21)	

Table 1. Material volume amounts in study areas.

4. Conclusion

In this study, the material volume amount, which is crucial for determining excavation and fill costs, was calculated using UAV and terrestrial measurement methods, and the results from the two different methods were compared. Two UAV flights were conducted before and after the excavation at the parking lot of the Faculty of Sports Sciences and the fill work on the access road to the Environment and Health Specialization Laboratory at the Düzce University Konuralp Campus. Measurements were also taken using terrestrial measurement methods after each flight. The excavation area in question is approximately 1841 m², and the fill area is 2759 m².

There is an average difference of 1.42% between the UAV results and the terrestrial measurement methods involve a significant workload and are time-consuming in terms of land surveying for determining excavation and fill amounts. In addition, it should be taken into account that UAVs will be more advantageous in performing these works in places that cannot be walked in the field and that there is a high correlation between them and ground measurement in terms of accuracy. As an alternative to traditional methods for determining excavation quantities, this study demonstrates that UAVs can effectively determine material volume.

References

- Anonymous, (1999). 19-21 May 1998 Western Black Sea Flood Causes, Necessary Measures and Suggestions. Scientific Committee Report. TMMOB Chamber of Forest Engineers, Publication No. 22, p. 117, Ankara.
- Anonymous, (2002). *New Town New Life Düzce*. Düzce Governorship Press and Public Relations Directorate.
- Anonymous, (2024). Total station https://www.sistemas.com.tr/haber?h=total-station. Access: 20 Temmuz 2024,
- Akgul, M., Yurtseven, H., Gulci, S., & Akay, A. E. (2018). Evaluation of UAV-and GNSS Based DEMs for Earthwork Volume. *Arabian Journal for Science and Engineering*, 43(4), 1893-1909.
- Akgul, M., Yurtseven, H., Demir, M., Akay, A.E., Gülci, S., & Öztürk, T. (2016). Usage opportunities of generating digital elevation model with unmanned aerial vehicles on forestry. *Journal of the Faculty of Forestry Istanbul University*, 66(1), 104-118.
- Balaban, B. (2024). Comparison of UAV-based methods for monitoring surface change in open-pit mining sites in forests: Düzce-Tatlidere case. Düzce University, Institute of Graduate Studies, Department of Forest Engineering, Master's Thesis, Düzce.
- Erdin, K. (1992). *Photogrammetry*. İ.Ü. University Faculty of Forestry Publications İ.Ü. Publication No: 3674, O.F. Publication No. :421, Istanbul, ISBN 975-404-251-9.
- Eisenbeiss, H., & Sauerbier M. (2011). Investigation of UAV systems and flight modes for photogrammetric applications. *The Photogrammetric Record*, 26(136), 400–421.
- GH, (2024). Geomatik Hizmetler https://geomatikhizmetler.com.tr/urunler/total-station/#:~:text=Total%20Station%2C%20harita%20ve%20m%C3%BChendislik,oto matik%20%C3%B6l%C3%A7%C3%BCm%20yapabilen%20bir%20cihazd%C4%B
 1r. Total Station. Access: 02 December 2024.
- Gülci, S., Akgül, M., Akay, A. E., & Taş, İ. (2017). Using ready-to-use drone images in forestry activities: case study of Çınarpınar in Kahramanmaras, Türkiye, *Int. Arch. Photogramm. Remote Sens. Spatial Inf. Sci.*, XLII-4/W6, 51–53.
- Gülci, S., & G. Kılınç, 2018: Assessment of Drone-Assisted Soil Stockpile Volume Measurement. International Academic Research Congress, 30 Oct-03 Nov. 2018.
- Gülci, S., Yurtseven, H., & Akgül, M. (2021). Assessment of pre-flight block planning for lowcost unmanned air vehicles. *Turkish Journal of Forest Science*, 5(1), 114-126. İnan,

- Inan, M., & Öztürk, T. (2016). Investigations of using the low cost close-range photogrammetry for forest roads conditions. 6th Remote Sensing-Cbs Symposium (UZALCBS 2016), 5-7 October 2016, Adana. 254 - 258.
- Liang, H., Lee, S. C., Bae, W., Kim, J., & Seo, S. (2023). Towards UAVs in construction: advancements, challenges, and future directions for monitoring and inspection. *Drones*, 7(3), 202.
- Mitch, B., & Salah, S. (2009). Architecture for cooperative airborne simultaneous localization and mapping. *Journal Intelligent. Robotic System*, 55(4-5), 267-297.
- Luo, Y., Chen, J., Xi, W., Zhao, P., Qiao, X., Deng, X., & Liu, Q. (2016). Analysis of tunnel displacement accuracy with total station. *Measurement*, 83, 29-37.
- Netcad, (2024). Volume calculation from cross-sections https://wiki.netcad.com.tr/display/HELP/EXCANET+%7C+Hacim+Hesapla#8613a9 affba64c218bc5c193a2f55095. TCK Method. Access: 03 December 2024.
- Osborn, J., Dell, M., Stone, C., Iqba, I., Lacey, M., Lucieer, A., & McCoull, C. (2017). *Photogrammetry for forest inventory*. Forest& Wood Products Australia. 86.
- Özdemir, M. (2023). The use of data obtained in three dimensions with different devices in mining studies. *Journal of Scientific Reports-C*, *4*, 14-32.
- Pehlivan, H. (2019). Robotic Total Station and Analysis of GNSS Measurements. *Erzincan* University Journal of Science and Technology, 12(2), 1018-1027.
- Scherer, M., & Lerma, J. L. (2009). From the conventional total station to the prospective image assisted photogrammetric scanning total station: Comprehensive review. *Journal of Surveying Engineering*, 135(4), 173-178.
- Seki, M., Tiryakioğlu, İ., & Uysal, M. (2017). Comparison of volumes done with different data collection methods. *Geomatik*, 2(2), 106-111.
- Shervais, K. (2015). Structure from Motion, Introductory Guide https://www.unavco.org/education/resources/educational-resources/lesson/fieldgeodesy/module-materials/sfm-intro-guide.pdf. Access: 27 July 2016.
- Tahar, K. N., Ahmad, A., & Akib, W. A. A. W. M. (2011, December). UAV-based stereo vision for photogrammetric survey in aerial terrain mapping. In 2011 IEEE International Conference on Computer Applications and Industrial Electronics (ICCAIE), 443-447. IEEE.
- Tercan, E. (2018). Use of unmanned aerial vehicles in roadway measurements: Okurcalar city center example. Ömer Halisdemir University Journal of Engineering Sciences, 7(2), 649-660.

- Türk, Y., Canyurt, H., Eker, R., & Aydın, A. (2022). Determination of forest road cut and fill volumes by using un-manned aerial vehicle: A case study in the Bolu-Taşlıyayla. *Turkish Journal of Forestry Research*, Special Issue, 97-104.
- Türk, Y., & Canyurt, H. (2024). Capabilities of using UAVs to determine forest road excavation volumes in mountainous areas. *Sumarski List*, *148* (3-4), 137–150.
- Ulvi, A. (2018). Analysis of the utility of the unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) in volume calculation by using photogrammetric techniques. *International Journal of Engineering and Geosciences*, *3*(2), 43-49.
- Wallace, L., Lucieer, A., Malenovský, Z., Turner, D., & Vopěnka, P. (2016). Assessment of forest structure using two UAV techniques: A comparison of airborne laser scanning and structure from motion (SfM) point clouds. *Forests*, 7(3), 62.
- Watts, A. C., Ambrosia, V. G., & Hinkley, E. A. (2012). Unmanned aircraft systems in remote sensing and scientific research: classification and considerations of use. *Remote Sensing*, 4(6), 1671-1692.
- Westoby, M. J., Brasington, J., Glasser, N. F., Hambrey, M. J., & Reynolds, J. M. (2012). Structure-from-Motion photogrammetry: A low-cost, effective tool for geoscience applications. *Geomorphology*, 179, 300-314.
- Xiang, H., & Tian, L. (2011). Development of a low-cost agricultural remote sensing system based on an autonomous unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV). *Biosystems Engineering*, 108(2), 174–190.
- Yilmaz, H. M. (2010). Close range photogrammetry in volume computing. *Experimental Techniques*, 34, 48-54.