## **General Disclaimer**

## **One or more of the Following Statements may affect this Document**

- This document has been reproduced from the best copy furnished by the organizational source. It is being released in the interest of making available as much information as possible.
- This document may contain data, which exceeds the sheet parameters. It was furnished in this condition by the organizational source and is the best copy available.
- This document may contain tone-on-tone or color graphs, charts and/or pictures, which have been reproduced in black and white.
- This document is paginated as submitted by the original source.
- Portions of this document are not fully legible due to the historical nature of some of the material. However, it is the best reproduction available from the original submission.

Produced by the NASA Center for Aerospace Information (CASI)

 $N64 - 31267$ DISITAL CONTROL SYSTEM FOR  $(NASA-CL-173867)$ Annual Report SPACE STRUCTURAL LAMPERS 59 g nc AC4/Hr AO1 (Virginia Dniv.) **Uncias** CSCL 22B 01011  $G3/18$ 

Annual Report

Grant No. NAG-1-349

DIGITAL CONTROL SYSTEM FOR SPACE STRUCTURAL DAMPERS

Submitted to:

National Aeronautics and Space Administration Langley Research Center Hampton, Virginia 23665

> Attention: Dr. Garnett C. Horner SDD, MS 230

> > Submitted by: J. K. Haviland Professor

Report No. UVA/528224/MAE85/102 July 1984



DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICAL AND AEROSPACE ENGINEERING

Annual Report

Grant No. NAG-1-349

DIGITAL CONTROL SYSTEM FOR SPACE STRUCTURAL DAMPERS

Submitted to:

National Aeronautics and Space Administration Langicy Research Center Hampton, Virginia 23665

Attention; Dr. Garnett C. Horner SDD, MS 230

Submitted by;

J. K. Haviland Professor

Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING AND APPLIED SCIENCE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA

Report No. UVA/528224/MAE85/102 Copy No. July 1984

#### **ABSTRACT**

This is an annual progress report on a study of digital control systems for space structural dampers, also referred to as "inertia" or "proof-mass" dampers. Under work performed to date, a recently developed concept for a damper has been improved by adding a small taper to the proof-mass, and using a proximeter to determine position. Also, an experimental damper has been built using a three-inch stroke in place of the standard one-inch stroke. Initially, an analog controller was used to drive the damper, this has now been replaced by an independent digital controller slaved to a TRS-80 Model I computer, which also serves as a highly effective, low-cost development system. Since numerical analyses of the system have indicated a resonance of the proof-mass, leading to "st hang" of the stops, provisions have been made for a relative velocity feedback. In one approach, the digital controller has been modified to accept the signal from a linear velocity transducer. In the other, the velocity feedback is included in the digital program. An overall system concept for the use of proof-mass dampers is presented.

#### PRECEDING PAGE BLANK NOT FILMED

iii

^.i

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(1-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt$ 

#### SECTION I

#### INTRODUCTION

#### Discussion

The work covered in this report originated with a study of large space structure damping under NASA Grant No. NAG-1-137-1 (1). The work of Auburn and Margulies  $(2,3)$  was available at that time, as was the work by Miller (4) on a pivoted proof-mass actuator. The present design grew out of an attempt to design a more weight-effective proof-mass actuator, and much is owed to verbal communications with Dr. Garnett Horner, the NASA project monitor, and with Dr. William Hallauer of VPI&SU.

The present work was started under NASA Grant No. NAG-1-349, following Proposal No. MAE-NASA-2548-83 (5), and was briefly reported in January (6).

Mr. M. Mallette (7), a graduate student, has worked on control laws in parallel with the present work. Some of his results are presented here.

#### Active Damper Design

The active damper design which is the subject of the present study was originally proposed under NASA Grant No. NAG-1-137-1 (1). During the period of the latter grant, the prototype damper shown in Figure 1 was developed, and development of the analog control system shown in Figure 2 was initiated. Under a further purchase order from NASA, No. L-46164B, the damper was redesigned as in Figures 3 and 4. Twelve of these dampers were delivered to NASA.

1

**ORIGINAL PASE OF POOR Q**



Figure I. UVA Prototype Inertia Damper



# Analog Control System for Inertia Damper Figure 2.

ORIGINAL PAGE MANUS







 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

**ACTIVE DAMPER<br>ASSEMBLY<br>IR-28-82<br>JALD.** 

FOR ITEM DESCRIPTION SEE PARTS LIST

 $\frac{1}{4}$ 

ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY



Figure 4. Inertia Damper Supplied to NASA

i 2019 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 192<br>1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 - 1920 الكاريس فاق



During this period, Mr. M. Mallette, a graduate student, has worked in parallel with the work reported here, under NASA Grant No. NGT-47- 005-800,

The time of writing this report has coincided with considerable activity on the project, so that it will be outdated by the time that it is released. An arbitrary cutoff date of June 30, 1984, has been used; changes after this date are not reported.

r

6

#### SECTION II

#### DAMPER AND ANALOG CIRCUIT

#### Damper Design

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

ANTERNE

Examples of one-inch and three-inch stroke dampers currently used in Lhe laboratory are shown in Figures 5 and 6, Transparent covers permit their action to be observed at all times. The essentirl difference between these designs and the design of the dampers delivered to NASA is that the LVDT has been replaced by a proximeter. A small taper has been introduced on the proof-mass body so that its position can be determined by the proximeter.

#### Analog Control Circuit

The analog control circuit, as finally developed, is shown in Figure 2. Values shown for gains were selected during tests, with the actuator attached to a 15 ft. beam. Equations developed for this circuit are given in the next section; these feature the three transfer functions  $H_1$ ,  $H_2$  and  $H_3$ , which represent coil force due to inputs from the accelerometer, the proximeter, and a signal generator, respectively. The latter is used for testing the system.

ti

A block diagram for the complete system is shown in Figure 7. From this, the equation for the overall closed-loop transfer function was developed. This can be expressed as  $H_{\rho}$ , the complex damping coefficient, which limits to the design damping coefficient c at high frequencies in most cases.

 $\cdot$  7

ORIGINAL PAGE IS

主叫



Figure 5. Modified Prototype Damper, One-Inch Stroke



**ORIGINAL PACE TV** 

**A.**

Figure 6. Three-Inch Damper Prototype





Anal **si**g of A nalog Circuit

**Definitionc;**

**xi** = Structural velocity (m/s) **x2** Structural deflection (m) **x3** = Proof-mass velocity (m/s) **x4** = Proof-mass relative displacement (m) **x5** = Integrator output (V) **x6** = Integrator output (V)  $E_{\rho}$  = Output volts (V) **I** = Output current (A) F = y = Coil force (N) M = Proof mass (m)  $G_1 =$  Gain of accelerometer (Vs $^2/m$ ) G $_{2}$  = Gain of proximeter (V/m)  $\texttt{G}_{\Lambda}$  = Coil force for unit current (N/A) G<sub>5</sub> = Gain of coil driver (A/V) u = Input signal (V)

Equations:

$$
F = y = H_1 x_2 + H_2 x_4 + H_3 u \tag{N}
$$

$$
F = y = H_1 x_2 + H_2 x_4 + H_3 u
$$
  
\n
$$
F/ms^2 = x_2 + x_4
$$
 (N)

$$
H_1 = \frac{100G_1G_4G_5P_4P_5s^2}{s + 10 P_2} = \frac{cs^2}{s + \omega_A}
$$
 (N/m)

$$
c = Design damping coefficient (Ns/m)
$$

## ORIGINAL HAND

Ρ

 $\mathbf{r}$ 

 $\begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array}$ 

 $\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \end{array}$ 

 $\label{eq:1} \begin{array}{lllllllll} \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{1}$ 

f

$$
w_A = \text{Roll-off frequency for acceleration}
$$
 (s<sup>-1</sup>)

$$
H_2 = \frac{100G_2G_4G_5F_3F_6}{s + 10 P_7} = \frac{-\kappa\omega_P}{s + \omega_P}
$$
 (N/m)

$$
k = Design stiffness (N/m)
$$

$$
w_p = \text{Roll-off frequency for proximeter} \qquad (s^{-1})
$$

$$
H_3 = \frac{10 G_4 G_5 P_6}{s + 10 P_7} = \frac{F_0 w_P}{s + w_P}
$$
 (N/V)

$$
F_o = Coil Force for Unit SignalGenerator Voltage (N/V)
$$

Typical Values:

$$
G_1 = 0.5 \text{ (Vs}^2/\text{m})
$$
;  $G_2 = -132 \text{ (V/m)}$   
\n $G_4 = 0.4 \text{ (V/A)}$ ;  $G_5 = 1.55 \text{ (N/A)}$   
\n $H_1 = \frac{31s^2}{s + 10} \text{ (N/m)}$ ;  $C = 31 \text{ (Ns/M)}$   
\n $w_A = 10(s^{-1})$   
\n $H_2 = \frac{-117}{s + 10} \text{ (N/m)}$ ;  $K = 11.7 \text{ (N/m)}$   
\n $w_n = 10(s^{-1})$ 

$$
H_3 = \frac{0.316}{s + 10}
$$
 (N/V);  $F_0 = 0.0316$  (N/V)

Derivation of H<sub>c</sub>  $F = H_1 x_2 + H_2 x_4 + H_3 u$  (N)  $F = ms^{-}(x_4 + x_2)$  (N)

$$
F = \frac{H_1 - H_2}{1 - H_2/ms^2} x_2 + \frac{H_3}{1 - H_2/ms^2} u = H_c s x_2 + H_u u
$$
 (N)

$$
H_{c} = \frac{cs^{3}(s + w_{p}) + kw_{p}s(s + w_{A})}{s^{2}(s + w_{A})(s + w_{p}) + kw_{p}(s + w_{A})/m}
$$
  
= True damping coefficient (Ns/m)

#### SECTION III

#### DIGITAL CONTROL CIRCUIT

#### Analog Part

The analog part of the digital control circuit is shown in Figure B. The four input signals are:

- 1. The signal from a Sundstrand Model 305B servo accelerometer. This will eventually be replaced by a Model QA-900 accelerometer. Output is about 20 mV at one g.
- 2. The signal from a Hewlett-Packard Model 3311A signal generator, Any signal generator with a voltage offset could be used. This input is used to test the response of the system and to trim it by centering the mass.
- 3. The signal from a Bently-Nevada 3106-2800-190 amplifier derived from a Model 190 proximeter probe. This signal has a range of approximately -2V to -8V, depending on the probe adjustment. However, with the taper used on the moving mass, the double amplitude of the signal is about one Volt.
- 4. The signal from a Schaevitz VT-Z series linear velocity transducer. There are no provisions for attaching this to the laboratory damper of Figure 5. However, two of the NASA dampers of Figures 3 and 4 are being modified by adding tapered sleeves to the moving masses, and redesigning the cases to take proximeter probes. This will leave the present LVDT ports free for the attachment of the velocity transducers. Large signals with zero offset can be generated by these devices.

13



8. Digital Control Syscem for Inertia Damper. Figure

 $\ddot{\cdot}$ 

医肠淋巴管炎 为罪 79 Y

> The offset and amplifier bank shown in Figure 8 consists of voltage followers and operational amplifiers. Output ports from this bank can be sampled with a voltmeter, and potentiometers can then be adjusted so that the full  $0 - 5V$  range can be obtained with  $-1$  to  $+1$  g on the accelerometer, and with the full range of travel of the moving mass on the proximeter. No simple method has been devised for calibrating the velocity pickup, but this will be done when the necessary hardware is available.

> The analog-to-digital converter shown in figure 8 is presently a Datel DAS-952R 16-channel 8-bit monolithic data acquisition system. It has a convergence time of about 60 µsecs when a one MHz clock is used. This is adequate for present requirements, especially if "pipelining" is used in the digital control program.

> The digital-to-analog converter system shown in Figure 8 is presently a Datel Model DAC-7523 8-bit monolithic multiplying converter, <sup>k</sup>' driven by an 8-bit latch, and in turn driving two operational amplifiers. It's overall range is  $0-5$  V, this is used to drive a current amplifier supplied by NASA, which delivers -1 to +1 amps to the coil.

> The gains of the circuit elements external to the digital computer are shown in Figure 8, note that the  $D/A$  and  $A/D$  converters cancel each other. A positive input voltage, unless inverted in the digital program, tends to the accelerate the moving mass away from the structure  $(i.e., positive x<sub>4</sub>),$  whereas the coil reaction acts in the opposite (i.e., negative  $x_2$ ) direction.

An overall analysis of this system is given in the next section.

15

 $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$ 

#### Overall Analysis of Analog Components

Assume

 $\blacktriangleright$ 

$$
u = f \{x_A, x_P, x_S, x_V\} \tag{V}
$$

then coil force,

$$
F = G_{l_r} G_5 f (0.255 s_2, 200 x_4, x_5, K_v s x_4)
$$
 (N)

where

$$
G_5 = (2 \text{ Amps}) \div (5 \text{ volts}) = 0.4
$$
 (A/V)

and, based on NASA measurements, with a connection for 8 vs. 10 lavers of winding:

$$
G_4 = (8/10) \times (0.51 \text{ lb}) \times (4.45 \text{ N/lb}) \times (8.5 \text{ ohms}) \div (10 \text{ V})
$$
  
= 1.55 (N/A)

Note that, based on calculations assuming a perfect magnet,

$$
G_4 = F/I = n\Phi \qquad (N/A)
$$

where  $I = current$ , Amperes

 $n = # turns/meter$  $\Phi$  = magnetic flux, Maxwells

given

$$
\Phi = (0.8 \text{ Tesla}) \div (190 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}^2)
$$
  
= 152 \t( $\mu$ M)  
 $n = (67 \text{ turns}) \times (8 \text{ layers}) \times (39.4 \text{ in/m}) \div (1.25 \text{ in.})$   
= 16,900 \t( $\text{m}^{-1}$ )  
 $G_4 = 2.60$  (N/A).

Thus, the measured value is about 60% of the ideal. This could possibly be improved with more attention to the design of the magnet. Using the experimental value,

$$
F = f \{0.158s^{2}x_{2}, 124 x_{4}, 0.62 x_{5}, 0.62 K_{V}sx_{4}\}
$$
 (N)

#### Digital Computer

A logic diagram of the digital computer is shown in Figure 9. The Z80 module can be accessed directly from the TRS-80 through the control logic, which causes the responses shown in Table 1.



Notes: (1) X is any BASIC variable or constant.

(2) Bits D3, D4, and D5 are placed on line when the Z80 responds to the interrupt.

When BUSREQ is held low, the Z80 responds by pulling BUSAK low, this enables the buffers to the TRS-80, and disconnects the Z80. The complete circuit can now be accessed from the TRS-80. When BUSREQ is held high, the Z80 controls the circuit. A RESET command now starts the Z80 from memory location 0, while an interrupt starts the Z80 from locations 0, 8, 10H, 18H, 20H, 28H, 30H, or 38H, according to the values of bits D3, D4, and D5.

ORIGINAL DANS TO



Digital Computer Schematic  $\ddot{\mathbf{a}}$ Figure

Memory can either be 4K RAM or 2K RAM and 2K EPROM. This constitutes the complete memory range of the Z80 as installed, and is mapped fourfold into the TRS-80 from COOOH to FFFFH. Foil must be cut in the expansion module of the TRS-80 to make this memory space available without line contention. In addition, 1K of INPUT or OUTPUT is available, both on the control board and in the TRS-80.

The logic module enables the input buffers, the memory, and the select module. The latter responds to INPUT or OUTPUT commands as shown in Table 2.



TABLE 2. Select Commands

The clock is driven by a 4 MHz oscillator, with a divide chain down to 250 IIz, providing a 4 MHz signal to the Z80, a one-only START pulse to the  $A/D$ , a one MIIz signal to the  $A/D$ , and six timing bats to the status module, ranging from 8 kHz to 250 Hz, as bits DO to D5. It can be reset by IN A, (20H), as shown in Table 2. The EOC (end-ofconvergence) signal from the A/D appears as bit D7 in the status module.

Ţ.

Kalendari Ro

The D/A module includes an 8-bit latch enabled by the D/A OUT line, so that the D/A puts out a steady signal except during the 100 ns settling time. As mentioned earlier, the D/A is a Datel model DAC 7523.

Of the 16 input channels available, the Datel model DAS-952R A/D converter uses four in the present application.

#### SECTION IV

#### DIGITAL CONTROL PROGRAMS

#### Development Plan

The digital control program essentially completes the block marked "digital computer" in Figure 8. Since the system is not exactly a control system, with input and output, conventional design practices are not necessarily applicable, causing some difficulty in coming up with a suitable design.

Determination of a suitable control law has been the responsibility of a graduate student, Mr. Mallette. In order to compare results, it has been found convenient to evaluate two functions of frequency, the overall dimensionless damping,  $Re\{h_c\}$ , and the relative amplitude of the mass and of the structure,  $|R_c|$ . Further, it has been convenient to define a design damping factor, c, a design stiffrass, k, a damping roll-off frequency,  $w_A$  (the subscript A is for accelerometer), a stiffness roll-off frequency,  $w_p$  (the subscript P is for proximeter), a mass damping,  $c_p$ , and a corresponding critical damping ratio  $\zeta_p$ . All of these terms are discussed in the next section.

It is immediately obvious that the overall damping,  $h_c$ , should go to zero at zero frequency to limit the mass travel. Its magnitude at any frequency, together with the damping, c, is a direct measure of the performance of the damper, however, when  $|R_c|$  becomes greater than unity, the structural amplitude must be restricted to less than the travel of the proof mass between its stops. It has, in fact, proved difficult to achieve large damping values without large resonances of the proof mass.

21

r

The practical result has been that, if the gain controlling damping is set high, the proof-mass strikes the stops when low-frequency or pendulum modes of the structure are excited.

Most of the circuits examined have been designed with a theoretipal limit on  $h_c$  of unity as frequency goes to infinity. Of course, the digital computer limits the true high frequency response of the system. Definitions of Control Terms used in Digital Control

Some of these terms are identical to those already defined under the description of the analog control. circuit.

With  $X_4$ ,  $X_5 = 0$ Design Damping = c =  $\frac{L}{S^2}$   $\frac{F}{S X \cdot 9}$  ( $\frac{N_S}{m}$ ) With  $X_2$ ,  $X_5 = 0$ Design Stiffness = k =  $\frac{L}{S+Q}$  -  $\frac{F}{X_4}$  ( $\frac{N}{m}$ ) Mass Natural Frequency =  $w_N$  =  $\sqrt{k/m}$  (s<sup>-1</sup>)<br>Mass Damping = c<sub>p</sub> =  $\frac{L}{s+0}$  -  $\frac{F}{s\times4}$  ( $\frac{Ns}{m}$ ) Critical Damping Ratio =  $\zeta_{\text{p}}$  =  $\text{c}_{\text{p}}/2\sqrt{\text{mk}}$ With  $X_4$ ,  $X_5 = 0$ Accelerometer Feedthrough =  $H_1 = \frac{F}{x_2}$  ( $\frac{N}{m}$ ) With  $X_2$ ,  $X_5 = 0$ Proximeter Feedthrough =  $H_2 = \frac{F}{x_4}$  ( $\frac{N}{m}$ ) With  $X_2$ ,  $X_4 = 0$ Signal Generator Feedthrough =  $H_3 = \frac{F}{x_S}$  ( $\frac{N}{V}$ )

j,

ήÌ

For overall system:

Overall Damping =  $H_c = \frac{F}{sx_2}$  ( $\frac{Ns}{m}$ )  $\hbox{Overall Dimensionless Damping}$  =  $\hbox{h}_{c}$  $\mathfrak{m}_n$ c Relative Amplitude =  $R_c$  =  $\frac{X_4}{X_2}$ 

Note that, from the dynamics of the mass

$$
F = ms2(x4 + x2)
$$
 (N)

 $^{\text{II}}$ hence  $R_c = \frac{1}{ms} - 1$ also  $sH_c = \frac{H_1 - H_2}{1 - H_2/ms^2}$  (Ns/m)

#### Control Laws

System diagrams for a number of control laws which have been considered are shown in Figures 10 to 17. In all cases, the digital equations, expressions for c, h, etc., and expressions for  $h_c$  are given. Z-transform notation has not been used because the sampling period is sufficiently small to permit the use of simple integration. Addition of 80H to input and output is necessary so that signed arithmetic can be used in the CPU. This has been omitted from the figures for clarity. Evaluation of Control Laws

It will be noted that the P1 parallel realization is the same as the earlier analog control system, provided that corresponding gains are selected. The S1 and S2 series realizations of Figures 13 and 14 represent departures from the parallel to the series realization. Of the two series forms, the overall damping,  $h_c$ , for S2 limits to unity as s approaches infinity, as it does for P1, while it limits to zero for S1. Another variant is B1, a parallel system with direct feedback from the proximeter, and no roll-off as s increases.

23



 $\pmb{\cdot}$ 

Figure 10. P1 (Farallel) System Logic.



Figure 11. P1-V (Parallel with Velocity Input) System Logic.

一个

ORIGENNE E



ORIGINAL PACE IS OF POOR QUALITY



Figure 13. S1 (Series) System Logic.



## Figure 14. S2 (Series) System Logic.

. 4

 $28$ 



Figure 15. S2-V (Series with Velocity Input) System Logic.



n.

Figure 16. S2-D (Series 2, Damped) System Logic.

-- --\_





$$
u_{A_{i+1}} = u_{A_{i}} - w_{A} u_{A_{i+1}} + G_{A} u_{A_{i+1}}
$$
  
\n
$$
u_{i+1} = u_{A_{i+1}} - G_{P} x_{P_{i+1}} + x_{S_{i+1}}
$$
  
\n
$$
c = 0.158 G_{A} ; \qquad k = 124 G_{P}
$$
  
\n
$$
H_{1} = \frac{cs^{2}}{s + w_{A}} ; \qquad H_{2} = -k
$$
  
\n
$$
h_{c} = \frac{s^{3} + (k/c) s (s + w_{A})}{(s + w_{A}) (s^{2} + k/m)}
$$

 $\bar{z}$ 

 $\lambda$ 

Figure 17. Bl (Direct Stiffness) System Logic.

Figures 18 to 21, supplied by Mr. Mallette, show plots of  $Re\{h_c\}$ and  $|R_c|^2$  against frequency for the P1 and S2 systems with two values for c. For these figures, c has values of 10.11 or 20.22 Ns/m as indicated. Other parameters are  $w_A = 16$  rps,  $w_p = 8$  rps, and k = 15.5 N/m. It will be noted that the "resonance" amplitude of the proof-mass, as indicated by  $|R_{c}|^{2}$  is greater for the P1 system than for the S2 system, and appears to increase more rapidly as c is increased. However, the overall damping  $Re\{h_c\}$ , is lower for low frequency values for S2, as compared with P1, indicating that this improved behavior may be obtained at the expense of poorer performance.

In an attempt to reduce the apparent resonance of the proof-mass, provisions were made for a velocity feedback in systems P1-V and S2-V of Figures 11 and 15, in anticipation of the availabilility of hardware which would accommodate a velocity transducer. Also, internal velocity feedbacks were introduced into the P1-D and S2-D systems of figures 12 and 16. The latter two systems are incorporated in the digital program currently under investigation, which are discussed in a later section. Control Law Design

A justification for the use of velocity feedback can be given as follows. Note first that

$$
R_c = H_c / ms - 1
$$

and that the limits on  $R_c$  for s equal to zero and infinity are zero and unity respectively. Thus, if any "resonance" is to occur, it will be due to the behavior of some  $H_c$  at some intermediate frequency.

Now consider the expression for  $H_c$  derived earlier

32

jį  $\begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( \$ 

 $\overline{\mathbf{v}}$ 



Figure 18. P1 System Damping and Response.  $c = 10.11$  Ns/m

 $\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)$ 

计数字调整



Figure 19. P1 System Damping and Response. c = 20.22 Ns/m



S2 System Damping and Response. Figure 20.  $c = 10.11$  Ns/m

 $\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{2}$ 



 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ 

Ď.

Figure 21. S2 System Damping and Response. c = 20.22 Ns/m

$$
sH_c = \frac{H_1 - H_2}{1 - H_2/ms^2}
$$

in which  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  are themselves well-behaved. The problem must occur in the denominator of the above equation, which suggests the closed loop transfer function of a control system whose open loop transfer function is  $-H_2/ms^2$ . These open-loop transfer functions are summarized in Table 4 below for the systems with internal velocity feedback. Three of these systems, S1-V, \$1-D and B1-V have not been shown in Figures 10 to 17.

#### TABLE 4. Open-Loop Transfer Functions



S2-V, S2-D  
\n
$$
(1 + 2\zeta_{P} s/w_{N})
$$
  
\n $(1 + 2\zeta_{P} s/w_{N}) (s/w_{N})^{2}$ 

B1-V 
$$
\frac{(1 + 2\zeta_P s/w_N)}{(s/w_N)^2}
$$

The stability criterion is that the phase angle of the open-loop transfer function is equal to -180 +  $\phi_m$ , where  $\phi_m$  is a suitable phase margin, when the magnitude of the open-loop transfer function is unity. Clearly, a large critical damping ratio is very helpful. On the other hand, a low value for the roll-off frequency  $w_p$  could cause problems with P1-D and S2-D, while a low value for the roll-off frequency  $\omega_A$ could cause problems with S2-D because a lag-lead system would result. Provided that suitable stability has been provided, as indicated by the open-loop transfer functions in Table 4, the behavior of  $H_c$  should be reasonably close to that of  $H_1/c$ . The major remaining question is whether to select the S1 type behavior, limiting to zero at high frequency, or the behavior of the other systems shown, limiting to unity.

A further, criterion for overall stability is that the damper absorbs energy at all frequencies, i.e.,

$$
\frac{1}{\bar{T}}\int\limits_{0}^{T}\,F\dot{x}_{2}dt\,>\,0
$$

where  $T = 2\pi/w$ .

If  $x_2 = |x_2| \sin wt$  $x_2 = w|x_2|$  cos wt  $F = w|H_c| |x_2| \cos (wt + \phi)$ 

Then the above condition becomes

$$
T = 2\pi/w.
$$
  
\n
$$
x_2 = |x_2| \sin wt
$$
  
\n
$$
\hat{x}_2 = w|x_2| \cos wt
$$
  
\n
$$
F = w|H_c||x_2| \cos (wt + \phi)
$$
  
\nthe above condition becomes  
\n
$$
\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T w^2 |x_2|^2 |H_c| \left(\cos^2 wt \cos \phi - \cos wt \sin wt \sin \phi\right) dt
$$
  
\n
$$
= \frac{1}{2} w^2 |x_2|^2 |H_c| \cos \phi > 0
$$

This is satisfied so long as

 $|H_c|$  cos  $\phi = \text{Re}\{H_c\} > 0$ .

Thus the damped absorbs energy at all frequencies for which  $H_c$ , and therefore  $h_c$ , have positive real parts.

#### Digital Computer Program

The most recent digital computer program is shown in figure 22. This is written in assembly language for the TRS-80 model 1 using the Editor/Assembler 1.0.

The upper part of the program is run on the TRS-80, whereas the lower half is transferred to addresses starting at COOOH, and is therefore loaded into the memory located in the controller when the program



大臣

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

 $\chi$  ).  $M_{\rm H}^2$  is فمستعلقة

 $\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array}$ 

t,

सम्बद्धाः<br>सम्

 $\sim$ 

**REAL PROPERTY** 

Figure 22. Control Program (continued on following pages through<br>pg. 45)

ORIGINAL PROGRAM

a.<br>W

i.

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

 $\cdot$ 

ï

**REPARTMENT SERVICE STATE** 

J.

- 75

 $\bar{\beta}$ 

J,

i m سيحي



ONE POOR CONSINUT

مي في المجموعة<br>المسيحة المجموعة<br>المسيحة المجموعة

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

化二苯基甲基

**REPORT DAY TWO TO BE AND THE REAL PROPERTY.** 

Ą,



 $\epsilon_{\star}$ 

 $\bar{z}$ 

年 芝氏科特拉

Ù

 $\frac{1}{2}$  .

ORIGINAL FACE IS



# ORIGINAL PAGE IS<br>OF POOR QUALITY

and the same contract and contract the same of

J.



 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_k$ 

# ORICENCE RACE VI

EXX<br>POP<br>LD

CALL<br>PUSH<br>CALL<br>LD<br>LD<br>LD<br>OR

ADC<br>CALL

 $\begin{array}{c}\n\downarrow \mathbf{D} \\
\downarrow \mathbf{D} \\
\mathbf{A}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{D} \\
\mathbf{A}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{D} \\
\mathbf{D}\mathbf{U}\mathbf{T} \\
\mathbf{F}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{P} \\
\mathbf{J}\mathbf{R} \\
\mathbf{I}\mathbf{D}\n\end{array}$ 

**HOP**  $\mathbf{m}$ AND<br>JR<br>IN QUT **NOP**  $\frac{1}{10}$  $10<sup>7</sup>$ AND  $JB$ IN<br>OUT<br>JR

END



- Шаркете с сегу на центрина на полетин

 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

 $\pmb{\cdot}$ 

 $\lambda$ 



 $\pmb{\mathsf{I}}$ 

INTO HL

 $\chi/\Lambda_c$ 

 $\bar{z}$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 



## CRIGINAL P.

 $\bar{\mathbf{r}}$ 

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 



 $\ddot{\phantom{1}}$ 

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

 $\bar{\alpha}$ 

is first run. At the same time, gains are loaded into the memory of the controller, and a display of gain values is shown on the monitor. Finally, BUSAK is brought high, the Z80 is reset, and the controller runs a program called DEM03.

IVERSITE ...

Meanwhile, the TRS-80 continues to monitor the keyboard, responding to the entries in Table 4.



:t

Î

46

The subroutines DEM01, DEM02, DEM03 and DEM04 read  $x_A$ ,  $-x_p$ ,  $x_S$ , and  $-x<sub>V</sub>$ , respectively, and output them again with zero gain. These programs are useful for system checkout. In the P1-D and S2-D programs, gain changes are always made by shifting, thus only powers of two are possible. Since the clock is reset every 2 ms, the time interval T equals  $2^{-9}$ , so that all of the gains except for  $G_V$  can have values from unity to 256, whereas the latter can only have gains of  $\frac{1}{2}$  or less. This simple method of multiplication will be replaced when it appears to be justified to do so. The digital program can be modified to accommodate any seven programs.

The program shown does not use the interrupt feature to select subroutines. In its place, software RESET commands are loaded into low memory, so that the required subroutines are accessed when the hardware RESET is pulsed (SHIFT 2 on the keyboard). The effect is much the same, but could not work if an EPROM were used in the controller.

#### SECTION V

#### EXPERIMENTAL WORK

Three versions of the damper design have been under test by Mr. Mallette since the inception of this program. Tests have mainly been run on a flexible 15 foot beam, suspended by long cables, with the damper attached horizontally. Some tests have already been run on the **<sup>11</sup>** grillage" at NASA Langley.

The normal procedure has been to use the signal generator to excite a vibration mode, then to cut the signal, and to observe the decay rate of the excited vibration.

Typical results from such tests are shown in Figures 23, 24 and 25. However, most runs have been made to characterize the behavior of the control system, without careful recording of the results.

Typically, the achievement of a satisfactory control law has not proved as simple as was first hoped. Certainly, the final chapter has not yet been written on this problem.



**ORIGINAL PAGE 19 OF POOR QUALI7Y**  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

(b) c= 10.11 Ns/m

Figure 23. Measured Damping at 5.79 Hz. Pl System

ORIGINAL PAGE 19 OF POOR OUALITY

ï



```
(a) SYSTEM OFF
```


 $(b) c = 10.11$  Ns/m



**ORIGINAL PAGE.** ► **4 OF POOR QUALITY**



(b) c = 20.22 Ns/m

F

(a) SYSTEM OFF

 $\mathbf{r}$  ,  $\mathbf{r}$  ,

Figure 25. Measured Damping at 4.60 Hz. P1 System

J

í,

#### SECTION VI

#### SYSTEM CONSIDERATIONS

Our original conception was that considerable emphasis must  $b$ e placed on determining optimum locations for dampers, However, it now seems to be evident that the typical large space structure will undergo considerable modifications and additions during its life, so that optimization of damper locations for any given configuration makes little sense,

Our present concept is that a general purpose damper should be developed, controlled by an individual digital system, whose control law can be dictated by a central computer. Under such a system, the only fixed parameters would be the value of the proof mass and its permissible double amplitude. Given these constraints, the permissible damping factor c can be determined for any given structural amplitude and frequency. Thus assuming a control law which rolls off suitably at low frequencies, the permissible structural amplitude should be only slightly less than the permissible double amplitude of motion of the proof mass.

Following this thinking, we intend to emphasize the development of more sophisticated control laws, paying special attention to the reduction of resonance peaks now present. We also intend to investigate the consequences of "bumping," i.e., of allowing the proof mass to strike the stops. In particular, we want to be sure that no limit cycle motions are possible, in which the proof mass repeatedly strikes the stops.

52

your and the second line

Figure 26 shows the hypothetical control configuration for a large space structure in which the inertial (or proof-mass) dampers are individually controlled, but are connected to a central computer, so that they can be reprogrammed as required.

i` i

r:

 $R$  -axis and the set of  $\mathcal{L}$ 

ORIGINAL FOUR THE



Hypothetical Control Configuration for Large Space Structure with Dampers. Figure 26.

#### SECTION VII

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### Summary

**DA ALAZZAR ARABET TELLARE E HE** 

In summary, a digital controller has been developed for the linear proof-mass damper, based on a Z80 microcomputer. However, this development is regarded as an interim step, permitting an early look at control law problems, before the final development of a controller based on the INTEL 8051 microcontroller.

Although workable control programs have been developed for the Z80, it has proved difficult to develop a program which employs the full potential of the proof-mass damper.

Typically, the problem has been that there has been a poorly damped resonance of the proof-mass as a result of the virtual centering spring synthesized by the proximeter feedback. Accordingly, much of the recent effort has gone towards damping this mass.

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ 

i H.

a

Two approaches are now being tried. In one the signal from a velocity transducer is used as a rate feedback to damp the proof-mass. In the other, a rate feedback is synthesized within the digital program. Conclusions

- (1) The linear proof-mars damper is a feasible concept.
- (2) A digital control system can be used for this system.
- (3) It may prove desirable to incorporate a velocity feedback into the system.
- $(4)$  There is no apparent reason why an 8051 based controller should not be feasible.

 $\mathsf{c}\mathsf{c}$  contrary  $\mathsf{c}\mathsf{c}$  contrary  $\mathsf{c}\mathsf{c}$ 

#### REFERENCES

**THE REAL PROPERTY OF SHELF** 

A.

- 1. Pilkey, W. D., and Haviland, J. K., "Large Space Structure Damping Design," University of Virginia, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Report No. UVA/528201/MAE83/101, February 1983.
- 2. Aubrun, J. N., and Margulies, G., "Gyrodampers for Large Scale Space Structures," NASA Contractor Report 159171, February 1979.
- 3. Aubrun, J. N., and Margulies, G., "Low-Authority Control Synthesis for Large Space Structures," NASA Contractor Report 3495, Contract No. NAS1-14887, September 1982.
- 4. Miller, D. W., "Dynamic Profile of a Prototype Pivoted Proof-Mass Actuator," NASA (SDD, LaRC), August 1981.
- 5. Haviland, J. K., "Digital Control System for Space Structure Dampers," University of Virginia, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Proposal No. MAE-NASA-2548-83 to the NASA Langley Research Center, January 1983.
- 6. Haviland, J. K., "Digital Control System for Space Structure Dampers," University of Virginia, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Semi-Annual Report No. UVA/528224/MAE84/101, January 1984.
- 7. Mallette, M. F., "Large Space Structure Damping Actuator Design," University of Virginia, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Proposal No. MAE-NASA-2553-83, January 1983.