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VISUAL ACCESSIBILITY

- Environments that optimize the use of vision
  - to travel safely and efficiently through an environment
  - To perceive the spatial layout of key features in the environment
  - To keep track of one’s location in the layout
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- Environments that optimize the use of vision
  - to travel safely and efficiently through an environment
  - To perceive the spatial layout of key features in the environment
  - To keep track of one's location in the layout

- Several million in the USA with visual impairments
- Our aim is to increase accessibility for low vision individuals, by providing tools to aid Universal Design goals (unobtrusive solutions)
# PEOPLE IN USA OVER 65

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage of Population</th>
<th>Number of People (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 (projected)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Life expectancy in the USA**

- Currently ~78
- 1950’s ~68
- 1930’s ~58
Many types of low vision are also age related.
Many types of low vision are age related

Today, individuals with low vision traverse Subway stations, libraries, malls, restaurants, spas, parks, airports, casinos, universities, art galleries...

Any place you find normally sighted individuals
Age affects even “normal” vision
- Total light transmission decreases as people age
• Fully sighted acuity: 20/20
• Low vision (US definition) 20/40
• Legal Blindness Threshold (US): 20/200
• Utah site foil (sample¹) : 20/678
• Limit of functional acuity: 20/2000
The low vision population is growing as the US population is aging.

Blindness and low vision: 1 in 28 adults over age 40.

There are many more people with low vision than with blindness.

Majority of those with low vision able to see well enough to perform many tasks under the right conditions.

Legal blindness is not the same as absence of vision.

Only 20% of those classified as legally blind have no useful vision.
Observe room and screen through blur foil
- What can you identify?
- Could an environment be visually optimized to provide you with safe passage without aids?

This presentation introduces tools being developed to assist designers in accomplishing this task.

APPROXIMATION OF 20/678 ACUITY
Selected as the mean between “world” low vision definitions
ANSI/IESNA RP-28-07

- New Maintained Average Illuminance for seniors
- Design Guidelines for Senior Living
- Detailed Retirement Community recommendations
- Recurring general solutions:
  - higher illuminance levels
  - low glare
  - uniform luminance
  - contrast at architectural boundaries
  - reduced specular surfaces
- For environments which primarily serve seniors
ANSI/IESNA RP-28-07

• RP example:
  • Linear source illuminates all steps with similar distribution
  • Illumination levels comply with new Minimum Maintained Average Illuminance for Older Adults
  • Luminaire in close proximity to step features
  • Low glare illumination: molding conceals light source
  • No specular surfaces: no veiling/confusing reflections

Figure 51. A rope-light installed 30.5 cm (12 in.) above the stair tread and controlled by a motion sensor illuminates the steps at night. A decorative molding above the rope-light directs the light downward and out of the eyes of the user. (photographer: Eunice Noell-Waggoner)
BUT:

- What key visual features indicate a step-up?
- Are steps identifiable through a range of acuities and approaches? … what are related risks if not detected?
- Can distance to the first step be reasonably estimated?
  - Would an additional landmark aid distance judgment?

Complex nature of low vision means that generalized design rules alone are insufficient
VISUALLY ACCESSIBLE SPACES

- How does a designer go about improving or designing for visual accessibility?

- Tools are needed to provide feedback and to rate the consequences of designer choices.

- The following pictures are of relatively new public spaces.
  - Which situations might prove challenging to navigate
    - ... for a person with low vision?
    - ... for a person with normal vision?
Specular wall

False-possitive steps
Luminance patterns can mask potential hazards or signal false positive.
Potential hazards not limited to stairs and ramps...
A major goal:

- To develop computer graphics and analysis tools to enable designers to evaluate hazard visibility in existing and proposed environments.

- For use by lighting designers, interior designers, architects... risk management?

Radiance is a key player in this research.
HAZARD DETECTION – Initiative 1

- What visual patterns trigger detection?
  In step up or down, ramp up or down hazards?

Legge G.E., Yu D., Kallie C.S., Bochsler T. & Gage R.
The visual accessibility of ramps and steps. 2011. *Journal of Vision*
HAZARD DETECTION – Initiative 1

- Human study experiments performed using configurable sidewalk-like structure.
HAZARD DETECTION – Initiative 1

- Variations in lighting, viewing distance, and background
Importance of discontinuities in edge contours at step transitions are important cues for detection: contour kinks, bends and L junctions.

Step up is usually more visible than a step down (↑ risk)
HAZARD DETECTION – software development 1

Challenge: validate automated detection of visual cues

Process: Construct photometrically accurate model of the lab environment. Details in RW ’08 presentation.
Data collected from human subject studies in the lab is being used to compare and tune visibility predictions derived from the automated tool’s analysis of the related simulations. Image must match the physical luminance with 95%+ correlation.
Validated Model

HDR photograph
July 15, 2009
falsecolor

HDR rendering
July 7, 2009
falsecolor
(same scale)
SIMULATION

ramp/platform arrangements

ramp flat
ramp up
ramp down

step up
step down
SIMULATION:

**Lighting**

**“over”**
- 12 x Prismatic 2’x 4’ 4 fluorescent lamps

**Photometry:**
- *modified* Lithonia 2SP G 4 32 A12 1/4 GEB

**Lamp:**
- SP41 CRI 83
- CIE X = .3805 Y = .3769
- (Hunter lab an05-05.pdf)

**“near”**
- 1 x LightBox 3’ x 3’ 12 fluorescent lamps

**Photometry:**
- *data by Chris Kalle*
  - 5 degree samples at 16’

**Lamp:**
- SP65 CRI 90
- CIE X = .3129 Y = .3292
- (Hunter lab an05-05.pdf)

**“far”**
SIMULATION:

Grey
refl ~25%

Black
refl ~ 2.5%

White
refl ~ 87%

50
refl ~50%

typical walls refl 50%-70%
ceilings > 70%
floors < 50%

70
refl ~70%
PROCESS:

extract data
from 225 combinations

Extract pixel referenced xyz, object and material name (& surface slope)

```
vwrays -fd 001.pic | rtrace -fda `vwrays -d 001.pic` -os 001.oct > 001_obj.txt
vwrays -fd 001.pic | rtrace -fda `vwrays -d 001.pic` -op 001.oct > 001_xyz.txt
vwrays -fd 001.pic | rtrace -fda `vwrays -d 001.pic` -oM 001.oct > 001_mat.txt
```

Possibly extract luminance values of each pixel

```
vwrays -fd 001.pic | rtrace -fda `vwrays -d 001.pic` -ov 001.oct > 001_rad.txt
```

Object and Material definition files (text)
Generate “ground truth” for

- feature recognition (i.e., stepdown contour kink. Just started research)
- luminance pattern analysis (partially accomplished)
To explore a range of luminance patterns, a higher contrast dataset was generated. The doors of the basement lab were removed, replaced by windows, and room was elevated to ground level (also leveled Minneapolis).

An hourly daylight study was rendered from 5:00 am until 10:00 pm on July 4th using a clear sky condition at the coordinates of the lab in Minneapolis.
Approach: NORMAL ACUITY

Contrast in a selected region can predict visibility

Low contrast in target region

High contrast in target region

Higher contrast makes it easier to see step
LOW ACUITY

...but under loss of resolution, contrast in region can be a poor predictor of visibility

High contrast doesn’t mean better obstacle detection!
Low contrast in target region

High contrast from window illumination is misleading indicator of depth change

Contrast too low at important step edge

Low contrast in target region

High contrast in target region
A change in intensity can be due to several causes:
- depth or orientation change in geometry
- illumination/shadow change
- material change

Depth change is critical
- misperceiving depth changes are more costly than mistakes in detecting other causes
GEOMETRY-BASED VISIBILITY METRIC

How well do intensity changes in the image predict depth discontinuities in the “ground truth”? 

Image

Depth discontinuities determine “ground truth”
A low value of geometry-based metric predicts low visibility

This is when locations of large intensity changes don’t match the locations of the depth changes
AUTOMATED ANALYSIS–VISIBILITY & RISK FACTORS

- Region is selected, ready for automated analysis
- Various visibility indicators generated per picture

3 pm. July 4th
Day Sequence Analysis

- Geo
- Vis
- D-prime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Vis</th>
<th>D-prime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05hrs</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06hrs</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07hrs</td>
<td>-1.225</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08hrs</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>1.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09hrs</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>1.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10hrs</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>1.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11hrs</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12hrs</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13hrs</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14hrs</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15hrs</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>2.980</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16hrs</td>
<td>-0.800</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td>0.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17hrs</td>
<td>-1.100</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>0.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18hrs</td>
<td>-1.100</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19hrs</td>
<td>-0.800</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20hrs</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>0.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21hrs</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22hrs</td>
<td>-0.300</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AUTOMATED ANALYSIS – VISIBILITY & RISK FACTORS

- Predicted hours of highest and lowest step visibility:
  - Normal acuity and contrast
    - 08 hrs
    - 15 hrs

- Reduced acuity and contrast
    - 08 hrs
    - 11 hrs
AUTOMATED ANALYSIS—VISIBILITY & RISK FACTORS

- Explore the visibility consequences of different lighting systems plus daylight
AUTOMATED ANALYSIS–VISIBILITY & RISK FACTORS

- Compare nighttime aisle light systems and visibility

2 x aisle lights at step

LOWER

2 x aisle lights fore
2 x aisle lights aft

HIGHER
AUTOMATED ANALYSIS TOOL

Tool in early phases of development. Future iterations will include additional visibility factors in its predictions.

- Potential scenarios:
  - A year daylight/electric light study of a large city center atrium from several vantage points in pathways approaching potential hazards
  - Assessment report identifying most hazardous visual conditions with associated risk factors
  - Iteratively, the designers, in conjunction with owners and risk management, massage the design to achieve acceptable results, while striving to follow Universal Design principles
AUTOMATED ANALYSIS TOOL

Tool in early phases of development. Future iterations will include additional visibility factors in its analysis:

-Luminance *visibility thresholds* and *effects of glare*

University of Minnesota Study
AUTOMATED ANALYSIS TOOL

Tool in early phases of development. Future iterations will include additional visibility factors in its predictions:

- Accuracy in judging locations of objects in the environment

University of Utah Study
AUTOMATED ANALYSIS TOOL

Tool in early phases of development. Future iterations will include additional visibility factors in its predictions:

- Horizon effect on scene evaluation and orientation

University of Utah Study
AUTOMATED ANALYSIS TOOL

Tool in early phases of development. Future iterations will include additional visibility factors in its predictions.

Potential scenarios:

- A year daylight/electric light study of a large city center atrium from several vantage points in pathways approaching potential hazards
- Assessment report identifying most hazardous visual conditions with associated risk factors
- Iteratively, the designers, in conjunction with owners and risk management, massage the design to achieve acceptable results, while striving to follow Universal Design principles
INTERACTIVE DESIGN TOOL

- Present to normally sighted designers the appearance of a space under (simulated) low vision.
The challenges:

- Need photometrically correct model of low vision deficit being simulated

- Nature and magnitude of blurring and contrast reduction functions need to match a reasonable spectrum of the low vision population
The challenges:

- Need controlled viewing conditions that preserve contrast and acuity
  - Calibrated display device
  - Fixed viewing position relative to display
  - Control of ambient lighting
INTERACTIVE DESIGN TOOL

- Limitations:
  - Simulations of contrast/acuity are only approximate
  - Can't realistically simulate effects of field loss

- Spatial orientation (e.g., distance perception, updating) is different when viewing display than when viewing a physical environment

... but viewing a display will give a reasonable approximation of the visibility of hazards!
INTERACTIVE TOOL

- Mockup demonstration from lab
  - “Blurred” to approximate low acuity: 20/200 to 20/800

(image not calibrated : viewing distance not considered)
INTERACTIVE TOOL

- Mockup demonstration from lab
  - Compare visibility of 2 ¼” and ¾” stripes
INTERACTIVE TOOL – MOCK UP
INTERACTIVE TOOL – ground truth known

Geometric change without luminance change + hazard recognition

Luminance change without geometric change

FALSE-POSITIVE
Expanding the interactive tool’s range

More false positive cases
FALSE POSITIVE DETECTION

- This entry poses a significant challenge

Low Vision:
Appears to be a step-up
Build study model
Distance to identify false hazard (angular displacement)?

Distance to resolve NOT a false hazard?

Determine visibility ZONE for hazard
False Positive

Positive
Add glass reflection to studies
Add high contrast luminance patterns to challenge detection
Explore ranges of distance, contrast, reflections, & lighting, to expand visual accessibility range.
Add random trip hazards to study effectiveness of pathway lighting.
Wallwash: luminance threshold, glare, step identification, trip hazard visibility.
Too dim?

50 nits 20ft sd

100 nits 20ft sd

200 nits 20ft sd

Too bright?

50 nits 20ft sd

100 nits 20ft sd

200 nits 20ft sd
Current and Future work:

- A better understanding of low vision perception and action involving mobility
- Better methods for simulating the effects of low vision in design systems
- Better computational models for automating the prediction of the effects of lighting and other aspects of architectural design on visual accessibility
- Integration with the real-world design process
Principal goals for this session:

- Sensitize you to the challenges of low vision
- Present research in developing computer tools to aid in creating visual accessible spaces... using RADIANCE
DESIGNING VISUALLY ACCESSIBLE SPACES
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