NASA goals for increased aircraft efficiency
- Proof of concept architecture for flight control with load feedback
- Optimal control allocation with load constraints
- Wind energy challenges
- Wind turbine blade damage
- Adaptive contingency control

SUGAR Ray design by NASA sponsored team led by The Boeing Company
Subsonic Fixed Wing Project

WHAT
- Reduce environmental impact of aviation
- Increase aircraft efficiency
- Improve mobility of aircraft in airspace

WHY?
- Unacceptable community noise and other environmental emissions
- Need to reduce fossil fuel consumption
- Demands from NextGen airspace
- Air transportation plays key role in our economy and quality of life

HOW!
- Create prediction and analysis tools for design
- Develop concepts and technologies for significant improvements in noise, emissions and performance
- Partner with academia, industry, and government
Weight Reduction for Increased Efficiency

- Create new fabrication processes for lightweight materials, esp. large structures
- Design lightweight wing structures with aeroelastic tailoring to eliminate heavy control surfaces
- Use aerogels for super-lightweight insulation
- Increase temperature capability of composites for greater use in engines

Electron Beam Freeform Fabrication (EBF3)
Polymer-enforced aerogel
Fan containment system with high temperature capability
Drag Reduction for Increased Efficiency

- Increase laminar boundary layer by delaying transition to turbulent flow
  - Design surfaces with favorable pressure gradients (natural laminar flow)
  - Include active or passive local suction surfaces (hybrid laminar flow)
- Use active aeroelastic tailoring of wing to reduce drag during cruise
- Advanced CONOPS – formation flight
- Develop & validate CFD codes for design & analysis of advanced drag reduction concepts
Traditional Flight Control System

Traditional Approaches for Control Allocation
- **Ganging of Actuators**: use elevator for pitch, ailerons for roll, rudder for yaw
- **Mixers**: fixed combination of surfaces to achieve commands

Structural Limits
- Design engineers determine critical load paths in aircraft
- Mostly concerned with bending, torsion, and shear loads
- Load limits are determined through ground tests and flight tests
- Load limits imposed by restricting flight envelope; position & rate limiting actuators

Control Allocation: Determine surface deflections needed to achieve desired rates
New Challenges for Flight Control Systems

- Many redundant effectors
- Surfaces affecting multiple axes
- Actuator rate & position saturation
- Low control authority
- Lighter more flexible structures

**Optimal Control Allocation**

Given $B$, a desired vector $u_p$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, find $u$ such that

$$J = \left\| Bu - a_d \right\| + \varepsilon \left\| u - u_p \right\|$$

is minimized subject to $u_{\text{min}} \leq u \leq u_{\text{max}}$, $|\dot{u}| \leq \dot{u}_{\text{max}}$

No Structural Constraints!!
Objective:
Use multiple control surfaces in most effective way, while remaining within structural load limits

Approach:
Replace traditional control allocation with optimal control allocation with load constraints and real-time load feedback
- Measure internal (structural) loads along critical load paths
- Use aircraft aerodynamic and structural models to determine incremental loads due to incremental surface deflection
- Include structural load constraints and measured loads in optimal control allocation problem

Significance:
This approach enables fuel efficient aircraft with many multi-purpose control surfaces to achieve acceptable performance & safety
Study Assumptions

- Only considering static loads due to lift and rolling forces
- Finite element model (FEM) of aircraft wings and tail
- Loads due to lift and roll are applied to nodes in FEM model
- Bending moments calculated using finite element analysis (FEA)
- A select number of load points are monitored and included in the optimal control allocation constraints
Pilot Inputs

Stability & Control Augmentation System

Optimal Control Allocation

Aircraft

\( \delta_{\text{attitude}} \)

\( u_{\text{throttle}}, u_{\text{auxiliary}} \)

\( a_d, u_p, T, F_I \)

\( u \)

\( y \)

\( y_s, F_E \)

\begin{align*}
\text{a}_d & \quad \text{desired accelerations} \\
\text{u}_p & \quad \text{preferred delta surface positions} \\
\text{B} & \quad \text{control effectiveness matrix} \\
\text{T} & \quad \text{incremental loads matrix, where Tu gives the incremental loads at critical points} \\
\text{y}_s & \quad \text{structural loads from sensors (or model in sim)} \\
\text{F}_E & \quad \text{external forces due to lift and body moments} \\
\text{F}_I & \quad \text{internal structural loads at critical points}
\end{align*}
Optimal Control Allocation Problem:
Given $B$, a desired vector $u_d$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, find $u$ such that

$$J = \underbrace{\|Bu - a_d\|_1 + \varepsilon\|u - u_d\|_\infty}_{\text{error min}}$$

is minimized subject to:

$$u_{\min} \leq u \leq u_{\max}, \quad F_I + Tu \leq F_{I,\max}$$

where $F_{I,\max}$ are critical point load limits

Can also be formulated with load minimization, using constraints given above and cost function:

$$J = \|Bu - a_d\| + \varepsilon\|u - u_d\| + \gamma\|F_{I,\max} - F_I + T(u - u_p)\|$$

load min
Up-scale GTM Simulation

- Simulink model based on 5.5% dynamically scaled aircraft derived from wind tunnel & flight test data
- Up-scaled by incorporating Reynolds adjusted aero tables
- Actuator models sized for up-scale GTM
- NASA Glenn’s Simp2 engine (simplified version of C-MAPSS40k)
- GTM bare airframe
- 6 ailerons, 4 elevons, 2 rudders, 2 stabs, 2 flaps
- Vehicle Management System
  - sensor processing module
  - mission manager
  - guidance/control
- Vehicle Control Augmentation System
  - reference model dynamic inverse controller
  - optimal control allocator
Finite Element Modeling Approach

- Wings/tails modeled as cantilever beams with fixed ends at roots
- Constant thickness hollow aluminum shells following outer mold line give beam cross section properties
- Beam nodes located at centroids of wing cross sections

Vortex-lattice model of aircraft

Wing cross sections
Finite Element Model of GTM

- Beam mesh for each wing has 20 nodes and 19 beams
- Each beam has 6 degrees of freedom – 3 translation & 3 rotation
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- Assume static loads and static response, \( F = Kx \)
- Stiffness matrix \( K \) is derived from FEM
- \( K^{-1} \) is computed off-line
- Static loads applied during simulation to FEA nodes
- Measured loads are calculated from deflections using \( K^{-1} \)
- Elliptically distributed lift load applied to nodes along wings and horizontal tail
- Loads arising from roll moments applied as concentrated forces in z-direction on each aileron in proportion to aileron deflection
Integration with Simulation

- Flap-wise bending moment at critical points are calculated & passed to control allocator
- $K^{-1}$ and B are used during simulation to determine incremental loads matrix $T$
- Aileron forces are assumed to be proportional to surface deflections for calculation of $T$

Internal load monitoring points

Moment arms

Roll forces applied here
Flight conditions:
- Altitude 30,000 ft
- Mach 0.85

Test cases:
- Normal case
  Load limits set to values determined for safe flight
- Case I
  Right aileron load limit set to 55,000 ft-lb
- Case II
  Left outboard aileron deflection limits set to ±0.01 deg
Roll Doublet Case I

Normal Load Constraints

Reduced Load Constraints
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Bending Moment for Right Outboard Aileron

Case I: Outboard aileron critical point limit set to 55,000 ft-lb
Aileron Deflections Case 1

Right aileron 3 deflection reduced
Formulation & Solution Approaches

Mixed Optimization Formulation

Find \( u \) that minimizes \( J = \|(CB)u - a_d\| + \varepsilon\|u - u_p\| \)
subject to \( u_{\text{min}} \leq u \leq u_{\text{max}}, \ |\dot{u}| \leq \dot{u}_{\text{max}} \)

Solution Approaches Using Different Norms

- **\( L_1 \) norm:** \( \|u\|_1 = \sum_i |u_i| \)
  - Convert to linear programming problem
  - Simplex algorithms (Bodson)
  - Interior-point algorithms (Peterson, Bodson)

- **\( L_2 \) norm:** \( \|u\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_i u_i^2} \)
  - Active Set Method with norms squared (Härkegård)
  - Interior-point algorithms

- **\( L_\infty \) norm:** \( \|u\|_{\infty} = \max_i (u_i) \)
  - Simplex algorithm (Bodson, Frost)
Normal Case with $\ell_\infty$ versus $\ell_1$ Norm on Control

$\ell_\infty$ Norm on Control

$\ell_1$ Norm on Control

All surfaces are used

Outboard aileron is most effective
Normal Case with $l_\infty$ versus $l_1$ Control Norm

$\ell_\infty$ Control Norm

$\ell_1$ Control Norm

Left Aileron Deflections (°)

Right Aileron Deflections (°)

Time (s)
Proposed framework performed adequately in simulation & proof of concept demonstration was successful

- Control allocation
  - Try load minimization
  - Use weights on surfaces and critical points depending on health of components
  - Explore non-feasible solutions

- Loads model
  - Investigate robustness, computation time, sensitivity
  - Include torsion, structural dynamics

- Work with sensors to measure loads
- Include aeroelasticity in simulation
- Flight test technology at Dryden Flight Research Center
Our Next Challenge: Distributed Control Effectors

Objective:
• Develop variable stiffness materials for distributed control effector skins

Approach:
• Investigate mechanisms that can impart variable stiffness to material systems to enable novel control effectors to control lightweight flexible wings
• Test various concepts on distributed control effector model to determine feasibility as a structural element

Significance:
• Variable stiffness material systems can enable control of aeroelastically tailored lightweight wings to meet SFW fuel burn goals

Results:
• Bench model (shown top right) developed to study angles and deformations of distributed control effectors to develop requirements and test candidate variable flexibility control surface skins
• This activity will involve materials, structures, aeroelasticians, controls and dynamics experts working concurrently to design, analyze, build and test a distributed control surface concept

POC:  emilie.j.siochi@nasa.gov  LARC  
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Wind Industry Practices

- Industry is relatively low-tech and very protective of IP
- Research funding is limited
- Very little vertical stratification
- New technologies need quick and cost-effective integration

Wind Industry Challenges

- Building large turbines (>5 MW)
- Operating & maintenance costs
- Turbine reliability
- Grid integration
- Community noise
- Wind farm siting
**SCADA system**
- Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition for wind farm
- Medium- and long-term changes in environmental & operating conditions
- Minimal fault diagnosis
- Lots of data, not always useful

**Short-term condition monitoring**
- Equipment set up for one month for vibration, acoustic, strain, nacelle acceleration testing

**Scheduled maintenance & inspection**

**Acceptance of CM by operators/developers**
- Dependent on cost of CM system
- Might affect warranty

**Some OEMs are moving towards guaranteed uptime**

Image: www.vertigo.net.au
Leading Causes of Blade Failures\(^1\)

1) Manufacturing defects - wrinkles in laminate, missing or incomplete bond lines, dry fibers
2) Progressive damage initiating from leading-edge erosion, skin cracks, transport, handling, or lightning strikes
3) Excessive loads from turbine system dynamics or dynamic interaction with control system
4) Out-of-plane forces and distortion of blade sections (“bulging/breathing” effect) mostly in root transition region, due to blade loading
5) Excessive loads due to unusually severe atmospheric conditions

\(^1\)DNV Renewables, Seattle, WA, “Lessons Learned from Recent Blade Failures: Primary Causes and Risk-Reducing Technologies”, D.A. Griffin & M.C. Malkin, 49\(^{th}\) AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting, Jan 2011, paper no. 2011-259
Flexible Structure Control Challenge:

- Structural modes can be excited by feedback control
- Low pass filter can reduce problems, but they have limitations
- Residual mode filter (RMF) has model of structural mode, including phase and frequency, that can be removed from feedback
- Flexible structures ARE intrinsically modal systems

Flexible aerospace structures are difficult to model and they operate in poorly known environments

- Adaptive control helps, but requires minimum phase plants (ASPR)
- Residual Mode Filters (RMF) can cancel transmission zeros, restoring ASPR

Recall: A system \((A, B, C)\) is ASPR when \(CB > 0\) and its closed-loop transfer function \(P(s) = C(sI - A)^{-1}B\) is minimum phase.
Assume original system \((A_p, B_p, C_p)\) can be partitioned into:

\[
\begin{aligned}
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{x} \\
\dot{x}_Q
\end{bmatrix} &=
\begin{bmatrix}
A & 0 \\
0 & A_Q
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
x \\
x_Q
\end{bmatrix} +
\begin{bmatrix}
B \\
B_Q
\end{bmatrix} u_p +
\begin{bmatrix}
\Gamma \\
\varepsilon \Gamma_Q
\end{bmatrix} u_D \\
y_p &=
\begin{bmatrix}
C & C_Q
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
x \\
x_Q
\end{bmatrix} ; \quad \varepsilon \geq 0
\end{aligned}
\]

Use RMF to remove these modes from controller feedback.
Adaptive Controller using RMF

Nonlinear Wind Turbine Plant

\begin{align*}
\dot{x} &= Ax + Bu \\
y &= Cx + Du
\end{align*}

Retained Modes

\begin{align*}
\dot{x}_q &= A_q x_q + B_q u \\
y_q &= C_q x_q
\end{align*}

Residual Modes

Adaptive Controller

Residual Mode Filter

\[ y_c = y_p - \hat{y}_Q \]
Adaptive Pitch Control for FAST Simulator*

- **Objective:** Regulate generator speed and reject disturbances
- **Input:** Rotor speed
- **Output:** Collective blade pitch, constant generator torque
- **Disturbance:** Step function
- **How:** Model gusts as step functions
- **RMF:** Designed for drive-train rotational flexibility mode

FAST blade configuration files:
- 21 distributed stations along span
- Flapwise & edgewise stiffness
- Flapwise & edgewise bending modes

Assumption:
Blade damage can be represented by reduction in flapwise & edgewise stiffness

Damaged blade configuration files:
- Edgewise and flapwise stiffness are varied at a blade station
- Blade bending mode shapes are recomputed
- Structural damping and other parameters were left unchanged
Blade Node Sensitivity to Stiffness Changes

Full factorial study performed to determine node sensitivity:
- Parameters: blade damage, wind speed, blade pitch
- Levels: 8 for damage, 7 for wind, 10 for blade pitch

Loads on blades are primarily due to aerodynamic forces.
Preliminary study of effects of blade stiffness reduction

- Damage located on one blade at station 7, 30% from blade root
- Study run in open-loop with no generator speed tracking
- Generator torque held fixed at rated torque
- Simulation run with steady wind speeds from 12-24 mps
- Collective pitch varied from 0.1-0.45 radians
- Blade tip displacement was measured
- Pitch & wind speed dominate change in stiffness
- Damage detection tool needs to factor out impact of pitch and wind speed to use deflection
Hypothesis: Reducing power output through generator set-point reduction will reduce loads on turbine blades.

Out-of-plane tip deflection std. dev. for 3 generator set-points & 7 damage levels.
De-rating Generator for Reduced Loads

Simulation Wind Input

Top: Generator set-point
Bottom: Generator speed
Simulation demonstrating contingency controller lowering generator set-point for turbine with blade damage when winds are turbulent & above rated speed

Resulting decrease in blade root bending could extend service life

Blade root bending moment

No contingency control

Adaptive contingency control
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