# Robust Controller Design for the Active Mass Driver Benchmark Problem

Peter M. Young

Department of Electrical Engineering Colorado State University Fort Collins, CO 80523, U.S.A.

> Tel: (970) 491-5406 pmy@engr.colostate.edu

Bogusz Bienkiewicz

Department of Civil Engineering Colorado State University Fort Collins, CO 80523, U.S.A.

Tel: (970) 491-8232 bogusz@engr.colostate.edu

#### Abstract

In this paper we develop a robust controller design for the active mass driver (AMD) benchmark problem. The design process is based around the D-K iteration procedure for (complex)  $\mu$  synthesis, together with a balanced truncation procedure to reduce the controller order. The final design is a third order linear controller, which utilizes only four accelerometer measurements, and has desirable rolloff properties (i.e., small required bandwidth, and a high degree of robustness). Despite the simplicity of the controller, it is able to yield quite good performance, while using only modest control authority.

Keywords: structural control, active, optimal, robust

### 1 Introduction

The active mass driver (AMD) benchmark problem provides a fairly realistic testbed for the study of control algorithms applied to civil engineering structures. The problem is based on an experimental setup in the Structural Dynamics and Control/Earthquake Engineering Laboratory at the University of Notre Dame. The experiment consists of a three story test structure equipped with an active mass driver actuation system and accelerometer/displacement sensors. These are controlled by a DSP-based real-time digital feedback control system. A full description of the benchmark problem, including system models and design requirements/constraints, may be found in [1] (see also the Web Site at http://www.nd.edu/~ quake/). A very brief description is given in section 3.

The control design approach we use here is based on the D-K Iteration procedure for  $\mu$  synthesis. An overview of this approach is included in section 4 to illustrate the application of this design procedure to controller synthesis. The specific application to the benchmark problem is covered in detail in section 5, including the selection procedure for the design interconnection and the corresponding weighting functions.

The resulting controller, after some further simplifications/transformations, is evaluated using the benchmark criteria, and the results are discussed in section 6. It is seen that this design approach offers a great deal of flexibility for exploiting the various tradeoffs inherent to such a problem (e.g., control authority versus structural vibration attenuation). Furthermore, we are able to provide a final design for the controller which is very simple, has excellent robustness properties, and delivers good performance for modest control effort.

## 2 Notation and Definitions

The notation used here is fairly standard. For any matrix (or vector), M, we denote the transpose by  $M^T$ , and the complex conjugate transpose by  $M^*$ . The largest singular value is denoted by  $\overline{\sigma}(M)$ . We denote the  $k \times k$  identity matrix by  $I_k$ . Occasionally we will drop the subscript from I, whence it denotes an identity matrix of the appropriate size (from context).

We define the field of complex numbers by C, and define  $\mathcal{RM}$  to be the space of real-rational proper transfer matrices. A State Space representation for a transfer matrix  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{RM}$  is denoted by

$$\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ \hline C & D \end{bmatrix} \doteq C(sI - A)^{-1}B + D \tag{1}$$

and we will refer to such representations of elements of  $\mathcal{RM}$  as State Space systems. We define  $\mathcal{RH}_{\infty}$  to be the subspace of  $\mathcal{RM}$  with elements analytic in  $Re(s) \geq 0$ , also referred to as stable systems. Given a transfer matrix  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{RH}_{\infty}$  we denote its infinity norm by

$$\|\mathbf{P}\|_{\infty} \doteq \sup_{\omega \in \mathcal{R}} \overline{\sigma}(\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{j}\omega))$$
(2)

The definition of the structured singular value,  $\mu$ , is dependent upon the underlying block structure of the uncertainties, which is defined as follows. Suppose we have a matrix  $M \in C^{n \times n}$ and a non-negative integer  $m \leq n$ . Then the block structure  $\mathcal{K}(m)$  is an *m*-tuple of positive integers

$$\mathcal{K} = (k_1, \dots, k_m) \tag{3}$$

This *m*-tuple specifies the dimensions of the perturbation blocks, and we require  $\sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i = n$  in order that these dimensions are compatible with M. This determines the set of allowable perturbations, namely define

$$X_{\mathcal{K}} = \{ \Delta = \text{block diag} \left( \Delta_1^C, \dots, \Delta_m^C \right) : \Delta_i^C \in \mathcal{C}^{k_i \times k_i} \}$$
(4)

Note that  $X_{\mathcal{K}} \subset \mathcal{C}^{n \times n}$ . All the machinery presented here is *easily* generalized to the case where the uncertainty blocks need not be square. In fact allowing non-square blocks is often useful in practice (indeed we will use non-square blocks for the AMD problem). However, although this generalization adds little difficulty to the problem, it does makes the notation very cumbersome, and so, for clarity of exposition, we will present all the analysis/design tools in this paper for the set-up in (4).

It is also possible to extend these tools to handle more general uncertainty classes, which can include real parametric uncertainty. This leads to the so-called mixed (real and complex)  $\mu$  problem. We will not use these results here, and so we restrict our attention to the more standard (complex)  $\mu$  problem, but we refer the interested reader to [2, 3, 4, 5] and the references therein for an in-depth treatment of the mixed  $\mu$  problem. The following definition is taken from [6]:

**Definition 1 ([6])** The structured singular value,  $\mu_{\mathcal{K}}(M)$ , of a matrix  $M \in \mathcal{C}^{n \times n}$  with respect to a block structure  $\mathcal{K}(m)$  is defined as

$$\mu_{\mathcal{K}}(M) = \left(\min_{\Delta \in X_{\mathcal{K}}} \{\overline{\sigma}(\Delta) : \det(I - \Delta M) = 0\}\right)^{-1}$$
(5)

with  $\mu_{\mathcal{K}}(M) = 0$  if no  $\Delta \in X_{\mathcal{K}}$  solves  $\det(I - \Delta M) = 0$ .

In order to present the relevant theory we define the following set of block diagonal scaling matrices (which, like  $\mu$  itself, depends on the underlying block structure).

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}} = \{ \text{ block diag} \left( d_1 I_{k_1}, \dots, d_m I_{k_m} \right) : d_i \in \mathcal{C}, d_i \neq 0 \}$$
(6)

### 3 The Active Mass Driver Benchmark Problem

The active mass driver benchmark problem is described in detail in [1] (also see the Web Site at http://www.nd.edu/~quake/). The problem is based on an experimental setup in the Structural Dynamics and Control/Earthquake Engineering Laboratory at the University of Notre Dame, which consists of a three story single-bay structure which is equipped with an active mass driver (AMD) system, consisting of a single hydraulic actuator with an attached steel mass. The position of the mass is measured via a linear variable displacement transducer (LVDT) with a local position feedback control loop to stabilize the actuator. The LVDT position measurement is available for control purposes, along with 5 accelerometer measurements: one located on the actuator mass; one measuring the ground excitation; one on the floor of each bay of the structure (for a total of three). Additionally, five pseudo-velocity measurement are available, obtained by filtering the accelerometer measurements with approximate integrators. These measurements are fed back to a DSP-based real-time digital controller, which can then command the AMD system. The DSP controller utilizes A/D and D/A converters which have 12 bit precision, a span of  $\pm 3V$ , and operate at 1kHz. The controller is limited to 12 states, with an associated computation delay of 200 $\mu$ s. See [1] for a detailed description of the experimental setup (including schematics and photographs).

Two models of this setup are provided in the benchmark problem, both of which correspond to figure 1, where  $\ddot{x}_g$  is the ground acceleration,  $\tilde{u}$  is the (delayed) control signal,  $\tilde{z}$  are the signals to be controlled, and  $\tilde{y}$  are the measurements, namely:

$$\tilde{z} = (x_1 \ x_2 \ x_3 \ x_m \ \dot{x}_1 \ \dot{x}_2 \ \dot{x}_3 \ \dot{x}_m \ \ddot{x}_{a1} \ \ddot{x}_{a2} \ \ddot{x}_{a3} \ \ddot{x}_{am})^T \tilde{y} = (x_m \ \ddot{x}_{a1} \ \ddot{x}_{a2} \ \ddot{x}_{a3} \ \ddot{x}_{am} \ \ddot{x}_g)^T$$

$$(7)$$

where  $x_i$  ( $\dot{x}_i$ ) is the displacement (velocity) of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  floor relative to the ground,  $x_m$  is the displacement of the AMD mass,  $\ddot{x}_{ai}$  is the absolute acceleration of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  floor, and  $\ddot{x}_{am}$  is the absolute acceleration of the AMD mass.



Figure 1: Benchmark problem open-loop plant model

Two models of this system are provided, namely an evaluation model of the plant, and a design model of the plant. The design model of the plant is a fairly simple 10 state model of the system, intended to be used in the controller design process (where very high fidelity models are often not available). The evaluation model of the plant is a high fidelity 28 state model of the system, which serves as our "true" representation of the plant. This model is used after the design to evaluate each controller via simulation. The primary goal of the controller design is to provide structural vibration attenuation for this setup during an earthquake. The benchmark problem includes a detailed simulink model to reflect the above setup and constraints, which provides for closed-loop simulation using a pseudo-random disturbance weighted with a Kanai-Tajimi spectrum, and recorded signals from the El Centro and Hachinohe earthquakes. Based on these simulations, a number of additional design constraints on the controller authority, and a set of performance evaluation criteria,  $J_1 - J_{10}$ , are defined in [1].

### 4 Controller Synthesis Techniques

Consider the general synthesis problem illustrated in figure 2. In this figure  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{RM}$  is the nominal transfer matrix (assumed to be known), and  $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{RM}$  is the controller (to be designed). The closed loop system is perturbed by a structured uncertainty  $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$ . In this figure the signals w, z, y, u represent exogenous disturbances, error signals, measurements, and control signals respectively. These are vector signals of dimension  $n_w, n_z, n_y, n_u$  respectively. The general design problem we will consider is to choose  $\mathbf{K}$  so as to meet robust performance, i.e., choose  $\mathbf{K}$  so that the perturbed closed loop system is stable, and the gain from exogenous disturbances (w) to error signals (z) is small, for all allowable  $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$ .



Figure 2: Feedback interconnection for  $\mu$  synthesis

We will make the above definition rigorous shortly, but first we would like to make some brief remarks about the motivation for this problem. Note first of all that there is no particular structure imposed on  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{RM}$ . This gives us a very general problem, and in fact it is easy to rearrange any linear fractional interconnection of systems and uncertainties into the canonical form of figure 2 by simple block diagram manipulations. In particular the uncertainty descriptions and performance goals can both be weighted, though not shown as such in figure 2, since one may simply absorb all the weights into  $\mathbf{P}$ . There is extensive engineering motivation for this problem, and we refer the interested reader to [7, 2, 3] and the references therein.

Since the (complex) uncertainties are typically used to cover unmodeled dynamics, then we wish to be able to consider perturbations which are themselves dynamical systems, with the block diagonal structure of the set  $X_{\hat{\mathcal{K}}}$ . Associated with any block structure  $X_{\hat{\mathcal{K}}}$ , let  $\mathcal{M}(X_{\hat{\mathcal{K}}})$  denote the set of all real-rational, proper, stable, block diagonal transfer matrices, with block structure like  $X_{\hat{\mathcal{K}}}$ :

$$\mathcal{M}(X_{\hat{\mathcal{K}}}) \doteq \{ \mathbf{\Delta} \in \mathcal{RH}_{\infty} : \mathbf{\Delta}(\mathbf{j}\omega) \in X_{\hat{\mathcal{K}}} \text{ for all } \omega \in \mathcal{R} \}$$
(8)

In this context we interpret the (complex) uncertainties as the frequency response of any unmodeled dynamics.

Let  $\mathbf{T}_{zw}$  denote the transfer matrix from w to z in figure 2. Our performance goal is to keep the gain of this transfer matrix small (since this is the transfer matrix from disturbance to error) and we will measure this gain as  $\|\mathbf{T}_{zw}\|_{\infty}$ . Our robust performance goal can thus be stated rigorously

as: Choose  $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{RM}$  so that the perturbed closed loop system in figure 2 is stable, and  $\|\mathbf{T}_{zw}\|_{\infty} \leq 1$ , for all  $\mathbf{\Delta} \in \mathcal{M}(X_{\hat{\mathcal{K}}})$  with  $\|\mathbf{\Delta}\|_{\infty} < 1$ .

This problem can be converted into a  $\mu$  synthesis problem as follows. First define an augmented uncertainty structure  $X_{\mathcal{K}}$  as

$$X_{\mathcal{K}} \doteq \{ \text{block diag}(\Delta, \Delta_p) : \Delta \in X_{\hat{\mathcal{K}}}, \Delta_p \in \mathcal{C}^{n_w \times n_z} \}$$
(9)

The perturbation  $\Delta_{\mathbf{p}}$  is a "performance block" and by closing the loop from z to w with  $\Delta_{\mathbf{p}}$  (i.e., let  $w = \Delta_{\mathbf{p}} z$ ) the robust performance problem is converted to a robust stability problem, which can be tackled directly with  $\mu$ . The situation is illustrated in figure 3.



Figure 3: Equivalent robust stabilization problem

We define  $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{K})$  as the nominal closed loop transfer matrix formed from  $\mathbf{P}$  and  $\mathbf{K}$  (see figure 3). To be explicit given any  $\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{K}$  as above then partition  $\mathbf{P}$  in the obvious way as

$$\mathbf{P} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{P}_{11} & \mathbf{P}_{12} \\ \mathbf{P}_{21} & \mathbf{P}_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$
(10)

where  $\mathbf{P}_{22}$  has  $n_y$  outputs and  $n_u$  inputs. Then  $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{K})$  is defined by the standard Linear Fractional Transformation formula as

$$\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{K}) \doteq \mathbf{P}_{11} + \mathbf{P}_{12} \mathbf{K} \left( I - \mathbf{P}_{22} \mathbf{K} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{P}_{21}$$
(11)

With these definitions we have the following well known robust performance theorem.

**Theorem 1** Suppose that the nominal system  $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{K})$  is stable. Then the perturbed closed loop system in figure 2 is stable, and

$$\|\mathbf{T}_{zw}\|_{\infty} \le 1 \tag{12}$$

for all  $\mathbf{\Delta} \in \mathcal{M}(X_{\hat{\mathcal{K}}})$  with  $\|\mathbf{\Delta}\|_{\infty} < 1$  iff

$$\sup_{\omega \in \mathcal{R}} \mu_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{K})(\mathbf{j}\omega)) \le 1$$
(13)

In light of this result our goal becomes that of the general  $\mu$  synthesis problem, namely that of finding a controller  $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{RM}$  achieving:

$$\inf_{\mathbf{K}\in\mathcal{K}_{S}}\sup_{\omega\in\mathcal{R}}\mu_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{P},\mathbf{K})(\mathbf{j}\omega))$$
(14)

where  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{S}}$  denotes all  $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{RM}$  that render  $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{K})$  internally stable (i.e., the set of *nominally* stabilizing controllers).

#### 4.1 $\mu$ Analysis Methods

Before considering the  $\mu$  synthesis problem we first very briefly review the  $\mu$  analysis problem, i.e., given  $M \in C^{n \times n}$  how does one compute  $\mu_{\mathcal{K}}(M)$ ? In fact the general analysis problem appears to be computationally intractable (except for small problems or special cases). Nevertheless approximate computation methods have been developed which rely on readily computable upper and lower bounds (see [5, 4] respectively). In this paper we will concentrate on the upper bound, since that actually provides a robustness guarantee. The following well-known result is taken from [6].

**Theorem 2 ([6])** For any matrix  $M \in C^{n \times n}$  and any compatible block structure  $\mathcal{K}$ 

$$\mu_{\mathcal{K}}(M) \leq \inf_{D \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}}} \overline{\sigma}(DMD^{-1})$$
(15)

The reason that this upper bound is useful is that it can be computed efficiently. It can be reformulated as a Linear Matrix Inequality (LMI) minimization, and hence a (quasi) convex optimization problem [5]. Efficient software for this bound is now available commercially [8] as part of the  $\mu$ -Tools Matlab toolbox [9].

### 4.2 $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}$ Optimal Control

The  $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}$  optimal control problem can be viewed as a special case of the above  $\mu$  synthesis problem, where there are *no* uncertainties (i.e., m = 0). Thus we have only  $\Delta_{\mathbf{p}}$  (and not  $\Delta$ ) in figure 3, and hence only a *nominal* performance (and stability) requirement. The problem thus becomes that of finding a controller  $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{RM}$  achieving

$$\inf_{\mathbf{K}\in\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{S}}}\|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{P},\mathbf{K})\|_{\infty}$$
(16)

This illustrated in figure 4. Note that here, since there are no uncertainties,  $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{K})$  becomes simply the transfer matrix from w to z in figure 4.

It turns out that finding a (sub) optimal solution to the above is a convex problem, so that the globally optimal controller can be found. The solution was obtained by Doyle et al. in [10], and involves the solution of two Riccati equations. Software for computing the  $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}$  (sub) optimal controller is now commercially available [11]. This special case can be used to tackle more general problems (and in particular the  $\mu$  synthesis problem), by using an appropriately constructed **P** in the above synthesis problem.

### **4.3** $\mu$ Synthesis and *D*-*K* Iteration

Here we briefly review the  $\mu$  synthesis problem. For a more detailed exposition see [12, 13]. As we have already discussed, computing  $\mu$  is difficult and we are forced to resort to computing bounds. Fortunately the upper bound is typically very good, and in fact for the type of problems considered



Figure 4: Standard framework for  $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}$  optimal control

here no example with a gap larger than 15% (between  $\mu$  and its upper bound) has been found. Thus we consider the problem given by replacing  $\mu$  by its upper bound in (14), namely

$$\inf_{\mathbf{K}\in\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{S}}} \sup_{\omega\in\mathcal{R}} \inf_{D(\omega)\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}}} \overline{\sigma}(D(\omega)\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{P},\mathbf{K})(\mathbf{j}\omega)D^{-1}(\omega))$$
(17)

Note that if we fix **K** then the problem of finding  $D(\omega)$  is just the standard  $\mu$  upper bound problem (across frequency) which is a convex problem and can be efficiently solved. If we choose  $D(\omega)$  matrices at a set of frequency points (from the  $\mu$  upper bound) we can fit a real-rational, stable, minimum-phase transfer matrix to them. If we fix this transfer matrix, **D**, then the problem of finding **K** can be reduced to a standard  $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}$  problem. This is explained in more detail below.

The above approach leads to the following D-K iteration scheme, which attempts to find a  $\mu$  optimal controller (and hence attempts to optimize robust performance for problems with structured dynamic uncertainty):

#### **Procedure 1** (D-K Iteration)

- 1. Find an initial estimate of the scaling matrices  $D(\omega)$  pointwise across frequency. One possibility is to use the identity matrix at each point.
- 2. Find any State Space realization,  $\mathbf{D}_{\text{fit}}$ , fitting the pointwise scaling matrices  $D(\omega)$  in magnitude. Factor out an all-pass function to yield  $\mathbf{D}$  as a stable minimum phase system (so that  $\mathbf{D}$  and  $\mathbf{D}^{-1}$  are stable) with the same magnitude as  $\mathbf{D}_{\text{fit}}$ . Augment this with identity matrices as

$$\mathbf{D}_{L} \doteq \operatorname{block} \operatorname{diag}\left(\mathbf{D}, I_{n_{v}}\right) \qquad \mathbf{D}_{R} \doteq \operatorname{block} \operatorname{diag}\left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}, I_{n_{v}}\right) \tag{18}$$

and construct the State Space system

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{D}} \doteq \mathbf{D}_L \mathbf{P} \mathbf{D}_R \tag{19}$$

so that by construction we have (see figure 5).

$$\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{D}}, \mathbf{K}) = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{K})\mathbf{D}^{-1}$$
(20)

3. Find the  $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}$  optimal controller  $\hat{\mathbf{K}}$  minimizing  $\|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{D}}, \mathbf{K})\|_{\infty}$  over all stabilizing, proper, real-rational controllers  $\mathbf{K}$ .

4. Find  $D(\omega)$  solving the minimization problem

$$\inf_{D(\omega)\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}}}\overline{\sigma}(D(\omega)\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{P},\hat{\mathbf{K}})(\mathbf{j}\omega)D^{-1}(\omega))$$

pointwise across frequency.

5. Compare  $\hat{D}(\omega)$  with the previous estimate  $D(\omega)$ . Stop if they are close, else replace  $D(\omega)$  with  $\hat{D}(\omega)$  and return to step 2.

This iteration (assuming perfect State Space realizations of  $D(\omega)$ ) results in  $\|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{P_D}, \mathbf{K})\|_{\infty}$  being monotonically nonincreasing, so that we are guaranteed convergence of the scheme. Having converged then the controller  $\hat{\mathbf{K}}$  from step 3 is the resulting  $\mu$  synthesis controller. Note that although the individual problems (the  $\mu$  upper bound and  $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}$  optimal control) are convex, the joint problem is not convex (see [12] for a counterexample to convexity). Thus the *D*-*K* iteration described above is not guaranteed to converge to the global optimum of (17), and in fact it may converge to a saddlepoint of the problem which is not even a *local* minimum (with respect to *D* and *K jointly*). However many designs have been performed using this technique in recent years (see [14, 15] for example), and it has usually been found to work well in practice. There are further subtleties to the above procedure, which we will not go into here (see [13, 9] for more details).



Figure 5: *D*-*K* Iteration as an  $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}$  optimal control problem

This D-K iteration scheme is the basis of  $\mu$  synthesis controller design. The design process consists essentially of the following stages.

### **Procedure 2** ( $\mu$ Synthesis)

- 1. Decide on an appropriate interconnection structure to model the system, including the uncertainty structure against which robustness is desired.
- 2. Choose appropriate weights to reflect the desired performance specifications, and any information known about the uncertainties.
- 3. Implement the above D-K iteration. Note that this involves deciding on an appropriate frequency range of interest, and selecting the order of the State Space fit in step 2.

This procedure is by no means mechanical, and a good deal of engineering judgement is still required, particularly in steps 1 and 2. Also, as with any control design technique, the full design process may well involve an iterative application of the above process, together with an evaluation of each resulting controller.

### 4.4 Controller Order Reduction and Balanced Truncation

Having obtained a design, it is often desirable, for numerical and implementation reasons, to reduce the number of states in the controller. Here we very briefly review the balanced truncation technique for controller order reduction. For a more detailed treatment we refer the interested reader to [16]. For a stable state space system  $\mathbf{K}$ ,

$$\mathbf{K} = \begin{bmatrix} A_k & B_k \\ \hline C_k & D_k \end{bmatrix}$$
(21)

the controllability (P) and observability (Q) grammians are defined as the solutions of the following Lyapunov equations:

$$A_k P + P A_k^T + B_k B_k^T = 0$$
  

$$A_k^T Q + Q A_k + C_k^T C_k = 0$$
(22)

A balanced realization is a State Space representation in which these Grammians are equal and diagonal:

$$P = Q = \Sigma = \operatorname{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n_k}) \tag{23}$$

where  $n_k$  is the order of **K**. In light of this, the above Hankel Singular Values (HSV),  $\sigma_i$ , of the system represent the degree to which each state is both controllable and observable. Hence we may delete states whose HSV is small to produce a reduced order model  $\mathbf{K}_{\text{red}}$ , whose input-output properties should not differ greatly from **K**. In fact it can be shown that if the  $\sigma_i$  are in decreasing order, and we delete the smallest  $(n_k - n_{\text{red}})$  balanced states (so that  $\mathbf{K}_{\text{red}}$  is of order  $n_{\text{red}}$ ) then we are guaranteed that:

$$\|\mathbf{K} - \mathbf{K}_{\text{red}}\|_{\infty} \leq 2 \sum_{i=n_{\text{red}}+1}^{n_k} \sigma_i$$
(24)

Thus, one choice for model reduction is to first employ a State Space similarity transformation to yield a balanced realization of the system, and then truncate this system by deleting the undesirable states. This process is referred to as balanced truncation.

# 5 Application to the Benchmark Problem

The benchmark problem provides us with a model of the open-loop plant, including models for the sensors and actuator. In order to apply the  $\mu$  synthesis design technique to the benchmark problem, we first need to decide on the design system interconnection. This will specify:

- 1. What uncertainties are present in the system?
- 2. Which disturbance signals act on the system?
- 3. Which signals do we wish to penalize in the optimal control problem?
- 4. What measurements will the controller use?

After several design iterations, we came up with the interconnection shown in figure 6, where the signals  $\hat{z}, \hat{y}$  are given as:

$$\hat{z} = (d_1 \ d_2 \ d_3 \ \ddot{x}_{a1} \ \ddot{x}_{a2} \ \ddot{x}_{a3} \ x_m \ \dot{x}_m \ \ddot{x}_{am})^T$$
 (25)

$$\hat{y} = (\ddot{x}_{a1} \ \ddot{x}_{a2} \ \ddot{x}_{a3} \ \ddot{x}_{am})^T \tag{26}$$

The above four questions are addressed in the selection process for the design interconnection structure, as follows:

- 1. The design includes two uncertainties. Firstly there is additive uncertainty,  $\Delta_a$ , on the plant model. Note that the *design* model is obtained via a model reduction procedure on a higher order *evaluation* model, which is a more accurate representation of the true system (see [1] for details). Thus we clearly need this uncertainty to account for unmodeled dynamics, particularly at high frequency. However it is important to note that some uncertainty of this type would always be required for a robust design, even if we used the more accurate model, because no model will exactly capture the behavior of the true system. We also include some multiplicative uncertainty,  $\Delta_m$ , on the AMD, to account for deficiencies in the actuator model. These uncertainty descriptions are very important in the design process, to prevent the optimal control design from being too aggressive. This can lead to controllers which exploit the model properties to such an extent that they perform very well in simulation, but not at all well on the actual system. For the benchmark problem an attempt to capture this effect is made by using the low order *design* model of the plant for controller synthesis, and a more accurate *evaluation* model of the plant for the simulations.
- 2. The choice of disturbance signals for the design is fairly natural. Clearly we wish to consider the ground acceleration due to the earthquake as one disturbance signal. In any meaningful problem there is always sensor noise present, and so we also include this as a disturbance signal. Note also that without the sensor noise disturbance one has a singular control problem, which leads to numerical difficulties.
- 3. The choice of which signals to penalize is also fairly natural. The performance criteria for the benchmark problem are all specified in terms of the nine signals  $d_1, d_2, d_3, \ddot{x}_{a1}, \ddot{x}_{a2}, \ddot{x}_{a3}, x_m, \dot{x}_m, \ddot{x}_{am},$  which correspond to interstory drift on each floor, absolute acceleration of each floor, and the displacement/velocity/acceleration of the AMD system. Thus we wish to penalize these signals, hence the (weighted) penalty on  $\hat{z}$ . In addition, for any control design we always wish to limit the control authority, and so we include a (weighted) direct penalty on the control signal, u. Again, this is desirable from a numerical viewpoint to avoid a singular control problem.
- 4. The choice of measurements to use in the controller is more difficult. We did not use the pseudo-velocity measurements since, from an optimal control viewpoint, these signals provide no additional information content (they are merely filtered versions of signals the controller already has access to). Our goal was to only use the accelerometer measurements from each floor and from the AMD,  $\ddot{x}_{a1}, \ddot{x}_{a2}, \ddot{x}_{a3}, \ddot{x}_{am}$ , since these are measurements that one could reasonably expect to have available in a (full-scale) field setup. However, the initial designs were performed using also the ground acceleration and AMD displacement  $\ddot{x}_g, x_m$ , so as to determine the best control design we could provide. Having obtained this design, we determined that the controller gains for these two measurements were the least significant, which suggested that one could obtain similar performance without using them. Thus, the

controller was redesigned using only the four accelerometer measurements,  $\hat{y}$ , in figure 6. This final design provided almost the same level of performance as the initial design using all the available measurement information. This illustrates one of the advantages of an optimal controller synthesis procedure. Not only were we able to come up with a design using a small number of measurements, but we could also quantify the loss in performance resulting from not using all the measurements. This loss was acceptably small. An analysis of the final design showed that all the controller gains were significant, so we would expect some degradation in performance if we tried to use even fewer measurements. Since we had already met our goal in this regard, we did not attempt any further reduction in the measurements.



Figure 6: Interconnection for  $\mu$  synthesis design

The interconnection system shown in figure 6 includes the following elements:

#### **Transfer Matrices:**

Plant\_red: This is the nominal transfer matrix of the system from ground acceleration and (delayed) control input,  $\ddot{x}_g$ ,  $\tilde{u}$ , to the penalty signals and measurements  $\hat{z}$ ,  $\hat{y}$ . It is straightforward to obtain this model from the *design* model of the plant provided in the benchmark problem (yielding Plant\_red with 10 states, 13 outputs, and 2 inputs).

Pade: This system is given as

Pade = 
$$\frac{-s + 10^4}{s + 10^4}$$
 (27)

and is a first order Pade approximation to a time delay of  $200\mu s$ , included to account for the computation time required by the DSP controller.

#### Weights:

 $W_{ao}, W_{ai}$ : These weights were chosen based largely on the difference between the *evaluation* and *design* plant models, so that the additive uncertainty could account for unmodeled dynamics in the system.

$$W_{ao}(s) = \frac{13s^2 + 243.4s + 2637}{s^2 + 71.3s + 2623.4}$$
(28)

$$W_{ai} = 0.01 I_6$$
 (29)

 $W_{mo}, W_{mi}$ : These weights were simply chosen to include 0.2% actuator uncertainty:

$$W_{mo} = \sqrt{0.02} \tag{30}$$

$$W_{mi} = 0.1\sqrt{0.02} \tag{31}$$

Dist\_in: This weight was chosen to reflect the frequency content of the Kanai-Tajimi power spectral density:

$$\operatorname{Dist\_in}(s) = \frac{\sqrt{S_0}(2\zeta_g\omega_g s + \omega_g^2)}{s^2 + 2\zeta_g\omega_g s + \omega_g^2} \implies |\operatorname{Dist\_in}(\mathbf{j}\omega)|^2 = \frac{S_0(4\zeta_g^2\omega_g^2\omega^2 + \omega_g^4)}{(\omega^2 - \omega_g^2)^2 + 4\zeta_g^2\omega_g^2\omega^2} \quad (32)$$

Worst-case values were selected as  $S_0 = 0.1$ ,  $\zeta_g = 0.3$ ,  $\omega_g = 37.3$  rad/s.

Dist\_out: This weight can be used to vary the penalty placed on each of the nine signals in  $\hat{z}$ . Our performance goal was to have each of the performance indices  $J_1 - J_{10}$  below one. These goals relate naturally to the signals in  $\hat{z}$ , and hence the weights in Dist\_out. After a number of design iterations our final weight selection was:

$$Dist_out = diag(0.002, 0.0015, 0.001, 0.01, 0.015, 0.02, 0.0004, 0.055, 0.2)$$
(33)

Sens\_in: These weights are chosen to reflect 1% sensor noise in each measurement:

Sens\_in = diag 
$$(0.02, 0.03, 0.04, 0.04)$$
 (34)

Cont\_out: This weight was chosen to penalize the use of large control signals. Cont\_out is a high-pass filter (see figure 7 for a Bode magnitude plot) which places a very high penalty on signals above 35Hz (220 rad/s). This ensures that the controller rolls off adequately at high frequencies (so as not to excite high frequency modes), and does not require excessive bandwidth.

Cont\_out(s) = 
$$\frac{0.55s + 13.62}{s + 285.1}$$
 (35)



Figure 7: Bode magnitude plot for Cont\_out

This design interconnection results in a  $\mathbf{P}$  (see figure 2) with 16 states, 16 outputs and 11 inputs. The uncertainty structure is given as

$$X_{\mathcal{K}} = \left\{ \text{block diag} \left( \Delta_a, \Delta_m, \Delta_p \right) : \Delta_a \in \mathcal{C}^{4 \times 1}, \Delta_m \in \mathcal{C}^{1 \times 1}, \Delta_p \in \mathcal{C}^{5 \times 10} \right\}$$
(36)

with 4 measurements in y and one control signal in u. The *D*-*K* Iteration for controller synthesis outlined in section 4.3 was carried out for this interconnection. It was found that constant D-scales were adequate for the design, so the resulting  $\mu$  synthesis controller was 16<sup>th</sup> order. This design yielded a peak value for  $\mu$  across frequency of 0.88, and  $\mu_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{P},\mathbf{K})(\mathbf{j}\omega))$  is plotted in figure 9. Note that the robust performance is dominated by the first mode of the structure at 36.5 rad/s, and  $\mu$  is very small away from this frequency. Thus it appears that the performance specifications for this problem are dominated by the need to get good control of the first vibration mode of the structure. This is confirmed by examining the plot in figure 8, which shows  $\overline{\sigma}(T(\mathbf{j}\omega))$  plotted against frequency, for both the open and closed loop systems. Here T(s) is the transfer matrix from  $\ddot{x}_g$  to  $(d_1 \ d_2 \ d_3 \ \ddot{x}_{a1} \ \ddot{x}_{a2} \ \ddot{x}_{a3})^T$ . Thus it represents the gain from the ground excitation to the vibration of the structure. It is clear that the controller provides large attenuation of the first mode at 36.5 rad/s, some attenuation of the second mode at 111 rad/s, and little effect on any higher order modes.



Figure 8:  $\overline{\sigma}(T(\mathbf{j}\omega))$  for the open (solid) and closed (dashed) loop systems

The fact that the peak value of  $\mu$  across frequency is less than one means that we have met all our robust performance goals. Furthermore, since  $\mu$  is very small above 50 rad/s, we have a very high degree of robustness to any uncertainties in the higher order modes.



Figure 9: Robust performance  $\mu$  plot

Note that the solution of the  $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}$  optimal control problem always returns a controller of the same order as the design interconnection, and hence (if we include D-scales) so does  $\mu$  synthesis. However, many of the controller states may be operating at high frequency, and hence contributing very little to the performance. Examining the Hankel Singular Values of this controller revealed that only the first three were significant, and so the balanced truncation procedure outlined in section 4.4 was used to reduce to a 3<sup>rd</sup> order controller. Repeating the above  $\mu$  analysis with this controller revealed a negligible increase in the peak value of  $\mu$ , and hence a negligible loss of robust performance.

The final stage of the design was to convert this continuous-time controller to a discrete-time controller operating at 1kHz, by implementing a bilinear transformation. Note that the effects of a discrete-time implementation of the controller have already been accounted for in the design process, by the use of the Pade approximation to the computation time delay.

### 6 Results and Discussion

We chose a performance goal for our design of keeping all the performance measures  $J_1 - J_{10}$  below one (note that this requirement is not met by the  $\mathcal{H}_2$  optimal control design example provided in [1], because of the difficulty of keeping  $J_{10}$  small). The results from running the supplied simulation model (which uses the full order *evaluation* model of the plant, and implements some constraints on the controller in terms of sampling-time/computation delay, A/D and D/A precision/range, and sensor noise) are tabulated in table 1. Note that  $J_1 - J_5$  were calculated using  $\zeta_g = 0.3$ ,  $\omega_g =$ 37.3 rad/s, and averaging over a 300 second time period. For  $J_6 - J_{10}$  the Hachinohe earthquake was the limiting value in each case, and the corresponding value for the El Centro earthquake is given in parentheses.

$J_1$	0.244	$J_6$	0.406	(0.389)
$J_2$	0.376	$J_7$	0.730	(0.591)
$J_3$	0.638	$J_8$	0.983	(0.868)
$J_4$	0.636	$J_9$	0.999	(0.821)
$J_5$	0.570	$J_{10}$	0.754	(0.714)

Table 1: Performance measures for the final design

It can be seen that this design meets our goals. If we consider group 1 of the measures as  $J_1, J_2, J_6, J_7$ , then these correspond to the structural vibration attenuation of the system, and hence lower numbers here correspond to smaller interstory drift and absolute acceleration of the bays of the structure. Group 2 of the measures,  $J_3 - J_5$  and  $J_8 - J_{10}$ , corresponds to the displacement/velocity/acceleration of the AMD system. Thus, these values reveal the control effort we expend. It is clear that there is a natural tradeoff between group 1 (vibration attenuation) and group 2 (control effort) of the measures, and we would expect that the control designer can reduce the numbers in group 1 at the expense of increasing those in group 2. Indeed this is the case and it is fairly easy to produce an array of designs, whereby vibration attenuation is traded off against control effort, by varying the weight selection in the design interconnection in figure 6. For reasons of brevity we do not include the details here.

This controller design meets all of the constraints. It is a  $3^{rd}$  order discrete-time controller (operating at 1kHz), which is itself stable, and it stabilizes the closed-loop system (both verified by eigenvalue analysis). The peak/allowed values for various signals obtained from the above simulations are tabulated in table 2.

Constraint	Kanai-Tajimi			Hachinohe			El Centro		
	RMS	Allowed	%	Max	Allowed	%	Max	Allowed	%
u	0.21	1	21	0.45	3	15	0.83	3	28
$x_m$	0.84	3	28	1.63	9	18	2.93	9	33
$\ddot{x}_a_m$	1.02	2	51	1.95	6	$\overline{32}$	3.60	6	60

Table 2: Performance constraints for the final design

Note that this design is not very aggressive, since it easily passes all the required constraints, with the largest value being 60% of the allowed maximum for  $\ddot{x}_{am}$  for the El Centro earthquake. In light of this it seems likely that we could obtain better vibration attenuation for this problem with a more aggressive design. Indeed we were able to produce designs with significantly higher performance, at the expense of increased control effort (we do not include them here for reasons of brevity). Note however that this increases the performance measures in group 2 (control effort), and our stated goal was to keep all the measures below one.

The continuos-time version of the controller is given in State Space form as:

$$\mathbf{K} = \begin{pmatrix} -9.6293 & 28.6195 & -14.1659 & 0.5983 & 0.8746 & 1.2081 & -0.5156 \\ -28.4550 & -10.9452 & 27.0656 & 0.6523 & 0.6011 & 0.8082 & -0.4113 \\ 8.0171 & -14.2982 & -10.0320 & -0.1379 & -0.4698 & -0.3309 & -0.8106 \\ \hline 1.6877 & -1.2685 & 1.0031 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$
(37)

Note that it is strictly proper and stable. The Bode plots for the controller are given in figure 10, which shows that each of the (four) controller gains is significant. This controller was designed to be robust, as verified by the  $\mu$  plot in figure 9. As a result, the controller gains appear well behaved, with no sharp resonances, and all the gains roll off well before 35Hz (220 rad/s) so that the controller bandwidth is not excessive. The robustness of this design is best verified via a  $\mu$  plot as discussed earlier, but in order to facilitate comparison with other approaches the benchmark robustness test suggested in [1] was also carried out. The loop gain transfer function is plotted in figure 11, and the suggested criterion is that it should remain below -5dB above 35Hz (220 rad/s). It can be seen that the design easily meets this robustness criterion, and in fact the loop gain remains below -25dB for frequencies above 35Hz (220 rad/s).



Figure 10: Bode magnitude plots for controller



Figure 11: Loop gain for the final design

It appears that the  $\mu$  synthesis procedure is an effective design approach for this problem. We are able to provide a simple linear controller, which is low order with small required bandwidth, has excellent robustness properties, and meets all of the design constraints, using only the four accelerometer measurements. Furthermore, it delivers decent performance with good vibration attenuation for only modest control effort, so that our criterion of keeping  $J_1 - J_{10}$  all below one was met. The performance tradeoff could easily be varied to yield a more/less aggressive design as desired. The design was performed using commercially available software, and the computational requirements were not excessive. Designs using this approach can readily be performed in a reasonable time using a PC.

### 7 Concluding Remarks

This problem placed high performance requirements on the first mode of the structure, together with robustness requirements on the higher order modes. Robust designs are required so as to avoid spillover problems, which are an important consideration in controller design for civil engineering applications. At the same time the controller should use limited actuator authority, and satisfy certain implementation constraints typical of a practical setting. We found the  $\mu$  synthesis procedure for robust controller design to be an excellent vehicle for studying these tradeoffs in a systematic fashion, and we were able to design a simple controller which met the above requirements. The controller had a low order, and a small required bandwidth, both of which are desirable properties often lacking in optimal control designs.

### References

- B. F. Spencer Jr., S. J. Dyke, and H. S. Deoskar, "Benchmark Problems in Structural Control - Part I: Active Mass Driver System," to appear in *Proceedings of the ASCE 1997 Structures Congress.*
- [2] P. M. Young, M. P. Newlin, and J. C. Doyle, "μ analysis with real parametric uncertainty," in Proceedings of the 30<sup>th</sup> Conference on Decision and Control, pp. 1251–1256, 1991.
- [3] P. M. Young, Robustness with Parametric and Dynamic Uncertainty, PhD thesis, California Institute of Technology, 1993.
- [4] P. M. Young and J. C. Doyle, "Computation of  $\mu$  with real and complex uncertainty," in *Proceedings of the 29<sup>th</sup> Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 1230–1235, 1990.
- [5] M. K. H. Fan, A. L. Tits, and J. C. Doyle, "Robustness in the presence of mixed parametric uncertainty and unmodeled dynamics," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 36, pp. 25–38, 1991.
- [6] J. C. Doyle, "Analysis of feedback systems with structured uncertainty," IEE Proceedings, Part D, vol. 129, pp. 242–250, November 1982.
- [7] A. K. Packard and J. C. Doyle, "The complex structured singular value," Automatica, vol. 29, pp. 71–109, 1993.
- [8] P. M. Young, M. P. Newlin, and J. C. Doyle, "Practical computation of the mixed μ problem," in Proceedings of the American Control Conference, pp. 2190–2194, 1992.
- [9] G. J. Balas, J. C. Doyle, K. Glover, A. K. Packard, and R. S. Smith, "The  $\mu$  analysis and synthesis toolbox," MathWorks and MUSYN, 1991.
- [10] J. C. Doyle, K. Glover, P. Khargonekar, and B. A. Francis, "State space solutions to  $\mathcal{H}_2$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}$  control problems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 34, pp. 831–847, August 1989.
- [11] G. J. Balas, A. K Packard, J. C Doyle, K. Glover, and R. Smith, "Development of advanced control design software for researchers and engineers," in *Proceedings of the American Control Conference*, pp. 996–1001, 1991.
- [12] J. C. Doyle, "Structured uncertainty in control system design," in Proceedings of the 24<sup>th</sup> Conference on Decision and Control, pp. 260–265, 1985.
- [13] G. Stein and J. C. Doyle, "Beyond singular values and loop shapes," Journal of Guidance, Control and Dynamics, vol. 14, pp. 5–16, January 1991.
- [14] G. J. Balas, C. Chu, and J.C. Doyle, "Vibration damping and robust control of the JPL/AFAL experiment using μ-synthesis," in Proceedings of the 28<sup>th</sup> Conference on Decision and Control, pp. 2689–2694, 1989

- [15] G. J. Balas and J. C. Doyle, "Robustness and performance tradeoffs in control design for flexible structures," in *Proceedings of the 29<sup>th</sup> Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 2999– 3010, 1990.
- [16] K. Zhou, J. C. Doyle, and K. Glover, Robust and Optimal Control, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1996.