Semi-active Control of Tall Building Subjected to Wind Loads Using Magneto-rheological Fluid Dampers

1. Introduction

Slender and tall buildings are very sensitive to wind loads. To enhance the human comfort under wind loads, tuned mass dampers and active tuned mass dampers have been widely used for response control of wind excited tall buildings (Yang & Samali 1983, Koh et al. 1998, Kim & Yun 2000). In this study, a recently developed semi-active control system using MR dampers is applied to control the wind-induced vibration of tall buildings. A numerical simulation study is carried out on a 76-story building, which was proposed for benchmark studies on control of wind-induced vibration by ASCE. Genetic algorithm is used to determine the optimal locations and capacities of the MR dampers. The performance of the semi-actively controlled case is compared with those of the passively and actively controlled cases, and the effectiveness of the semi-actively controlled MR dampers is discussed.
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2. Model of Control System

2.1 Modeling of Structure

Referring to the 76-story building structure for the ASCE benchmark problem of wind vibration control as in Figure 1, the dynamic behavior of the structure with a set of MR dampers can be modeled as

\[ M \ddot{y}(t) + C \dot{y}(t) + K y(t) = f(t) + B f_{MR}(t, v_{app}) \]  

(1)

where \( y(t) \), \( f(t) \), \( f_{MR}(t, v_{app}) \), and \( v_{app} \) = vectors for displacement, wind force, force from MR dampers, and applied voltage; \( M \), \( C \), and \( K \) = mass, damping, and stiffness matrices; and \( B \) = boolean matrix representing the effects of the MR dampers.

The problem organizer constructed a reduced system with 23 DOF’s using the state order reduction method for computational efficiency. The selected DOF’s are the horizontal displacements of 23 floors: i.e. 3, 6, 10, 13, 16, 20, 23, 26, 30, 33, 36, 40, 43, 46, 50, 53, 56, 60, 63, 66, 70, 73 and 76th floors. The corresponding state and measurement equations are

\[ \dot{x}(t) = A x(t) + B_d f_{MR}(t, v_{app}) + B_j f(t) \]

\[ y_c(t) = C_j x(t) + D_{dc} f_{MR}(t, v_{app}) + D_{df} f(t) \]

\[ y_m(t) = C_n x(t) + D_{mc} f_{MR}(t, v_{app}) + D_{mf} f(t) + v(t) \]

(2)

where \( x(t) \), \( y_c(t) \), \( y_m(t) \), and \( v(t) \) = state, control signal, measured signal, and measurement noise vectors; and \( A \), \( B_d \), \( B_j \), \( C_j \), \( D_{dc} \), \( D_{df} \), \( C_n \), \( D_{mc} \), and \( D_{mf} \) = system matrices.

2.2 Model of MR Fluid Damper

The MR has several unique characteristics, such as high dynamic yield strength, wide operating temperature range, requirement of small voltage to control the damper force, and short response time (Carlson et al. 1994). Many researchers studied on modeling of the MR fluid. In this paper, the bi-viscous model shown in Figure 2 (Stanway et al. 1996) is used to predict the behavior of the MR damper. Then the damper force can be modeled as

\[ f_{MR} = \begin{cases} c_i \dot{y}_{MR}, & \text{if } |\dot{y}_{MR}| < \dot{y}_{MR}^y \\ c_0 \dot{y}_{MR} + f_{MR} \text{sgn}(\dot{y}_{MR}), & \text{if } |\dot{y}_{MR}| > \dot{y}_{MR}^y \end{cases} \]

(3)

where \( \dot{y}_{MR} \) is velocity of the MR damper, \( \dot{y}_{MR}^y \) is yield velocity, \( f_{MR} \) is yield force; \( c_0 \) and \( c_i \) are damping coefficients for post- and pre-yield conditions.

The functional dependence of the parameters on the input voltage \( v_m \) to the damper is considered as follows (Dyke et al. 1998)

\[ f_{MR}(v_m) = f_{MRn} + f_{MRp} v_m, \quad c_i(v_m) = c_{in} + c_{ip} v_m \]

(4)

The dynamics involved in the system reaching equilibrium due to the resistance and inductance in the circuit are considered through the first order filter suggested by Spencer et al. (1997)

\[ \dot{v}_m = -\eta(v_m - v_{app}) \]

(5)

where \( v_{app} \) is the applied voltage.
The MR dampers with a capacity of 200kN and a dynamic ratio of 10 for each unit, which were designed by Lord Corporation and tested at University of Notre Dame (Spencer et al. 1997), are selected for this study. Damper parameters are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(c_{1e} )</td>
<td>(10000 \text{ kN/m} )</td>
<td>(f_{MRy} )</td>
<td>(20 \text{ kN} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c_{1b} )</td>
<td>(18000 \text{ kN/mV} )</td>
<td>(f_{MRb} )</td>
<td>(36 \text{ kN/V} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\dot{y}_{MRy} )</td>
<td>(0.002 \text{ m/s} )</td>
<td>(c_{0} )</td>
<td>(50 \text{ kN/m} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\eta )</td>
<td>(50 \text{ sec}^{-1} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Benchmark structure of wind vibration control
Figure 2. Bi-viscous model of MR damper

2.3 Model Reduction and State Observer

Before designing the controller, two stages of pre-design were carried out. The first stage is for another model reduction from 23 DOFs to 5 DOFs for the computational efficiency in the control process. The DOFs of the reduced system are the horizontal displacements of 16, 30, 40, 60 and 76th floors. The second is for design of observer. The Kalman-Bucy filter is used to estimate the state from the measured signal as (Goodwin & Sin 1984)

\[
\dot{x} = A\dot{x}(t) + B_x f_{MR}(t) + L_{obs}(y_{obs}(t) - C_{obs} \dot{x}(t) - D_{obs} f_{MR}(t))
\]  

(6)

where \(\dot{x} \) = estimated state vector; \(y_{obs} \) = measured signal \([\ddot{y}_{30}; \ddot{y}_{40}; \ddot{y}_{60}; \ddot{y}_{76}] \); \(L_{obs} = (P_{obs} C_{obs}^T + S_{obs})R_{obs}^{-1} \) = observer gain matrix, which can be obtained by solving the following algebraic Riccati equation for \(P_{obs} \)

\[
\bar{A}_s P_{obs} + P_{obs} \bar{A}_s^T - P_{obs} C_{obs}^T R_{obs}^{-1} C_{obs} P_{obs} + Q_{obs} - S_{obs} R_{obs}^{-1} S_{obs}^T = 0
\]

(7)

where

\[
\bar{A}_s = A_s - C_{obs}^T R_{obs}^{-1} S_{obs}^T,
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
Q_{obs} & S_{obs} \\
S_{obs}^T & R_{obs}
\end{bmatrix}
\delta(\tau) = E\begin{bmatrix}
B_x f_{MR}(t) \\
D_{obs} f_{MR}(t) + v_s(t)
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
B_x f_{MR}(t) \\
D_{obs} f_{MR}(t) + v_s(t)
\end{bmatrix}^T.
\]
3. Design of Controller

3.1 Clipped Optimal Control for MR Dampers

Conventional control algorithms based on the ordinary linear optimal control have inherent limitations for applying to the semi-active control. Hence, the clipped optimal control proposed for semi-active control system by Sack & Patten (1994) and Dyke et al. (1998) is employed in this study. To calculate the desired optimal control force \( f_{LQC} \), a linear optimal controller is designed using the linear quadratic Gaussian control theory based on the measured structural acceleration \( \ddot{y} \) and the measured damper force \( f_{MR} \) as

\[
f_{LQC} = L^{-1} \left[ -K_{LQC}(s) L \begin{bmatrix} \ddot{y} \\ f_{MR} \end{bmatrix} \right]
\]

where \( L\{ \} \) is the Laplace transform, \( K_{LQC}(s) \) is the transfer function of the ordinary LQG controller. The control variables are taken as \( y_c = [\ddot{y}_1, \ddot{y}_m, \ddot{y}_{u1}, \ddot{y}_{u2}, \ddot{y}_{u3}, \ddot{y}_{u4}, \ddot{y}_{u5}, \ddot{y}_{u6}, \ddot{y}_{u7}]^T \). The force generated by the MR damper cannot be directly controlled to get the desired optimal control force \( f_{LQC} \) only the command voltage to the MR damper \( v_{app} \) can be directly controlled to increase or decrease the force produced by the device. Hence, to induce the MR damper to generate approximately the desired optimal control force, the voltage is selected as follows. If the device generates the desired optimal control force (i.e., \( f_{MR} = f_{LQC} \)), the command voltage remains at the present level. However, if \( f_{MR} \) is smaller than \( f_{LQC} \) and their signs are same, \( v_{app} \) increases to the maximum level to make \( f_{MR} \) increase. Otherwise, the command voltage is set to zero. This algorithm can be expressed using Heaviside step function as (Dyke et al. 1998)

\[
v_{app} = v_{max} H \{(f_{LQC} - f_{MR})/f_{MR}\}
\]

3.2 Design of Locations and Capacities of MR Dampers by Genetic Algorithm

The performance of the MR dampers depends strongly on their locations in the structure. The determination of the locations and capacities (numbers of units) of the MR dampers is an integer programming, which requires extensive search and heavy computational efforts. Moreover, the total number of the possible locations is so great for the 76-story building and the cost surfaces may be extremely complex. The genetic algorithm has some advantages that match well with the present problem such as, (1) it optimizes with continuous or discrete parameters; (2) it does not require derivative information; (3) it deals with a large number of parameters; (4) it optimizes parameters with extremely complex cost surfaces; and (5) it can jump out of a local optimum (Goldberg 1989). For these reasons, the genetic algorithm was used to find the optimal locations and capacities of MR dampers in this study. To reduce the computational time, a preliminary study was carried out on 3 cases, such that (1) MR dampers placed on the lower floors (3, 6, 10, 13, and 16th floors), (2) MR dampers placed on the middle (33, 36, 40, 43, and 46th floors), and (3) MR dampers placed on the higher floors (63, 66, 70, 73, and 76th floors). The results show that it is more effective to place the MR dampers at the higher floors. Therefore, only 63, 66, 70, 73, and 76th floors were considered in determining the capacities of the MR dampers using genetic algorithm. The objective function was defined considering the performance criteria related to acceleration, because the purpose of vibration control under wind loads is mainly to reduce the discomfort of the occupants. Finally, the optimum number of the MR dampers on each floor is determined as 2, 2, 5, 4, and 3 on 63, 66, 70, 73, and 76th floors, respectively.
4. Numerical Simulation Study

A numerical simulation study is carried out on the benchmark structure subjected to wind loads proposed by Yang, et al. (2000). It is a 76-story concrete office tower, and it is modeled as a system with 24 DOF's for structural analysis by the problem organizer. Detailed data related to this problem are given at the web site of the problem organizer. In this study, it is further reduced to a system with 5 DOF's (i.e. 10 dimensional state vector) using the state order reduction method for the computational efficiency in the control process.

Wind force data in along- and across-wind directions were determined from wind tunnel tests, which were performed by Samali et al. (1999). For this benchmark problem, 900 seconds of across-wind data are given for the computation of the structural response. In these wind data, the mean wind force on each floor has been removed, since it produces only the static deflection of the building. The reference mean wind speed, $V_e$, at the height of 10 meters above the ground is assumed to be 13.5m/s, which represents to serviceability level related to the comfort of the occupants. Ten performance indices among twelve defined by the problem organizer are used in this study. They are J1 and J2 for rms acceleration performance, J3 and J4 for rms displacement performance, J7 and J8 for peak acceleration performance, and J9 and J10 for peak displacement performance. The smaller the index, the better the control performance. Figure 3 shows time histories of structural responses with and without semi-active control, and Figure 4 shows time histories of the forces of the MR dampers. The peak and RMS responses of the 76-story building with passive MR dampers and semi-actively controlled MR dampers are shown in Tables 2 and 3. For simplicity only the responses of 30, 60, 75 and 76th floors are presented. Similar results for the cases with a tuned mass damper (TMD) and an active tuned mass damper (ATMD) obtained by Yang et al. (2000) are also shown for comparison. The performance indices for various control methods are compared in Table 4. The maximum damper forces are shown in Table 5. It is found that the semi-active control system employing MR dampers reduces the peak and RMS displacements of the building by 28-33% and 45-47% of the uncontrolled cases, and the peak and RMS acceleration by 49-58% and 61-65%. The improvement for the acceleration reduction is more significant, because the controllers are designed mainly for the reduction of the acceleration. The maximum allowable floor acceleration is $15\text{cm/sec}^2$ (or $5\text{cm/sec}^2$ in RMS value), based on the design code for office buildings. It is observed that the semi-active control system with MR dampers satisfies the design requirement. The performances of the semi-actively controlled MR dampers are found to be much better than those with a TMD, while they are fairly comparable to those with an ATMD. The performance indices of the MR dampers related to the peak accelerations (J7 and J8) are slightly higher than those with and ATMD, while the one related to the RMS acceleration (J2) is slightly lower.

5. Concluding remarks

MR dampers are studied as semi-active control devices for a tall building subjected to wind loads. Clipped optimal control is used to control the strength of the magnetic filed applied to the dampers. Genetic algorithm is used for the optimal design of the controller locations and capacities. To verify the applicability of the MR dampers and the suggested control algorithm, a numerical simulation study is carried out on the ASCE benchmark problem on wind-excited building. The results indicate that the presented semi-active control system employing magneto-rheological (MR) fluid dampers can reduce the wind-induced vibration very effectively. The control performances of the MR dampers for wind is found to be fairly comparable to those of the system with an ATMD.
Figure 3. Time histories of the structural responses with and without semi-active control

Figure 4. Time histories of MR damper forces
Table 2. Peak response quantities of 76-story building with various dampers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>( \dot{y}_{m} )</th>
<th>( \ddot{y}_{m} )</th>
<th>( \dot{y}_{w} )</th>
<th>( \ddot{y}_{w} )</th>
<th>( \dot{y}_{w} )</th>
<th>( \ddot{y}_{w} )</th>
<th>( \dot{y}_{w} )</th>
<th>( \ddot{y}_{w} )</th>
<th>( \dot{y}_{w} )</th>
<th>( \ddot{y}_{w} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cm</td>
<td>cm/s²</td>
<td>cm</td>
<td>cm/s²</td>
<td>cm</td>
<td>cm/s²</td>
<td>cm</td>
<td>cm/s²</td>
<td>cm</td>
<td>cm/s²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. RMS response quantities of 76-story building with various dampers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>( \sigma_{r} )</th>
<th>( \sigma_{\dot{r}} )</th>
<th>( \sigma_{n} )</th>
<th>( \sigma_{\dot{n}} )</th>
<th>( \sigma_{m} )</th>
<th>( \sigma_{\dot{m}} )</th>
<th>( \sigma_{w} )</th>
<th>( \sigma_{\dot{w}} )</th>
<th>( \sigma_{\ddot{w}} )</th>
<th>( \sigma_{\dot{w}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cm</td>
<td>cm/s²</td>
<td>cm</td>
<td>cm/s²</td>
<td>cm</td>
<td>cm/s²</td>
<td>cm</td>
<td>cm/s²</td>
<td>cm</td>
<td>cm/s²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Control performance indices for various dampers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>w/ MR Dampers</th>
<th>w/ TMD</th>
<th>w/ ATMD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive Off</td>
<td>Clipped Optimal</td>
<td>(Yang et al. 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( J_1 )</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( J_2 )</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( J_3 )</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( J_4 )</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( J_5 )</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( J_6 )</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( J_7 )</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( J_{10} )</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Maximum damper forces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locations (Floor)</th>
<th>No. of Dampers</th>
<th>Max. Forces (kN)</th>
<th>Clipped Optimal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>145.3</td>
<td>1261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>105.1</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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