

Optimal System Design with Geometric Considerations

by

Kwang Jae Lee

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Mechanical Engineering)
in The University of Michigan
2014

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Panos Y. Papalambros, Co-Chair
Research Scientist Michael Kokkolaras, Co-Chair
Professor Michael M. Bernitsas
Assistant Professor Dohoy Jung

© Kwang Jae Lee 2014

All Rights Reserved

To Jinsook

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	ii
LIST OF FIGURES	vi
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF SYMBOLS	ix
ABSTRACT	xiii
CHAPTER	
I. Introduction	1
1.1 Motivation	1
1.2 Running Example : Thermal Management System for a Heavy Duty Tracked Series Hybrid Electric Vehicle	3
1.2.1 Introduction	4
1.2.2 Vehicle Simulation	5
1.2.3 Cooling System Modeling	7
1.2.4 Performance Requirements	13
1.2.5 Geometric Requirements	15
1.2.6 Baseline Design	15
1.3 Dissertation Objectives	17
1.4 Dissertation Overview	18
II. Geometric Realization in System Design	19
2.1 Introduction	19
2.2 Component-level Realization	20
2.2.1 Abstract Model	21
2.2.2 Bounding Volumes	24
2.2.3 Convex and Concave Shapes	25
2.2.4 Parametric and Non-parametric models	26

2.2.5	Geometric Representation	27
2.3	System-level Realization	28
2.3.1	Packaging Problem	29
2.3.2	Non-overlapping Constraint	29
2.3.3	Topology Representations	31
2.3.4	Pipe Routing	33
2.3.5	Solution Methods	34
2.4	Computational Environment	41
2.4.1	Introduction	41
2.4.2	Wrapper Class	43
2.4.3	Integrated Optimization Algorithms	44
2.5	Summary	46
III. Geometry Consideration in System Design Optimization . . .		47
3.1	Introduction	47
3.2	Elementary Example	48
3.3	Optimal Design for Functionality	51
3.3.1	Software Implementation	51
3.3.2	Surrogate Model Development for Radiators	56
3.3.3	Formulation	61
3.3.4	Results	66
3.4	Optimal Design for Geometric Requirements	66
3.4.1	Geometry for Components	66
3.4.2	Software Implementation	67
3.4.3	Formulation	68
3.4.4	Results and Discussion	72
3.5	Integrated Problem	73
3.5.1	Formulation	73
3.5.2	Results and Discussion	75
3.6	Concluding Comments	75
IV. Pipe Routing		79
4.1	Introduction	79
4.2	Previous Work	80
4.3	Proposed Method	81
4.4	Software Implementation	82
4.4.1	Motion Planning Kit	82
4.4.2	Implementation Issues	83
4.5	Problem Formulation	88
4.6	Result and Discussion	91
4.7	Concluding Comments	92
V. Conclusion		94

5.1	Summary	94
5.2	Contributions	95
5.3	Future Work	96
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	98

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

1.1	System design	1
1.2	Schematic of a series hybrid vehicle propulsion system	4
1.3	Off-road profile	7
1.4	Schematic of oil cooler	10
1.5	Schematic of cooling system architecture C	14
2.1	Model simplification example reproduced from [73]	22
2.2	Abstract representation example	23
2.3	An example of the envelope of an assembly	24
2.4	Types of bounding volumes reproduced from [22]	25
2.5	An example of compact packing reproduced from [74]	29
2.6	Separating axis adapted from [21]	30
2.7	Layout representation by sequence pair reproduced from [25]	32
2.8	O-tree and its corresponding layout reproduced from [34]	33
2.9	Rubber band packing reproduced from [19]	40
2.10	The wrapper class architecture	44
2.11	Class hierarchy	44
3.1	Simulink model of the running example	48
3.2	Components and a container of an elementary example	49
3.3	Initial layout for an elementary example	49
3.4	Execution of a software in batch mode	52
3.5	MATLAB Compiler™	53
3.6	Real-Time Workshop®	53
3.7	OLE Server Busy dialog box	55
3.8	Proposed framework for MATLAB interface	56
3.9	Structure of a radiator and its core reproduced from [43]	57
3.10	Design parameters of the radiator core adapted from [43]	58
3.11	Architecture of radial basis networks reproduced from [48]	59
3.12	Results of vehicle simulation with baseline design	63
3.13	Layout of radiators in the running example	65
3.14	Image and specification of Detroit DD13 Engine reproduced from [16]	67
3.15	Example of an input file for packaging problem	69
3.16	Position and orientation of a component	70

3.17	Initial layout for the running example	72
3.18	Optimization results of packaging problem for the elementary example	73
3.19	An optimization result of the running example	74
3.20	Initial layout with the optimal sizes from performance optimization	75
3.21	Optimization results of the elementary example	77
3.22	Optimization result with the optimal sizes from the performance optimization	78
4.1	Manhattan (a) vs. nonorthogonal (b) routing with obstacles reproduced from [69]	80
4.2	Motion planning reproduced from [65]	81
4.3	Path smoothing	84
4.4	Input and output ports for a pipe	85
4.5	Defining the port locations in CAD systems	86
4.6	Information for pipe generation in the input file	86
4.7	Export of geometry from NX to MPK	87
4.8	Creation of pipe geometry	87
4.9	Integration of MPK library	88
4.10	Initial layout for the running example with pipe routing	90
4.11	Optimization results of revised packaging problem for the elementary example	92
4.12	Optimization result for revised packaging problem for the running example	93

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1.1	Specification of the selected SHEV	6
1.2	Driving conditions	6
1.3	Model summary of heat source components	9
1.4	Model summary of heat sink components	11
1.5	Model summary of media delivery components	12
1.6	Control target temperatures of the components	14
3.1	Elementary problem parameters	50
3.2	Input and output variables for DOE study	58
3.3	R-squared values for neural network model	59
3.4	Computation time of vehicle simulation	60
3.5	R-squared values for polynomial model	61
3.6	Design variables for optimization problem for functionality	64
3.7	Optimization results for functionality	66
3.8	Initial sizes and degree of freedom for the components	68

LIST OF SYMBOLS

\mathbf{d}_i	vector of all dimensions of component i; size of vector d_i can vary depending on i
\mathbf{x}_g	design variable vector for optimization problem for packaging
\mathbf{x}_p	design variable vector for optimization problem for functionality
C_i, C_c	geometric space occupied by i-th component and container, respectively; they are sets of points
$C_i \cap C_j$	intersection of C_i and C_j
d_{ij}	j-th dimension of component i
f_g	objective function for optimization problem for packaging
f_p	objective function for optimization problem for functionality
i	index for i-th component; $i=1, \dots, N$
L_{pipe_i}	length of i-th pipe
L_{pipe}	total length of pipes
N	number of components
N_{pipe}	number of pipes
P_{comp}	power consumed by component
T_i	Tower i; $i=1, 2$
T_iCAC	charge air cooler in tower i
T_iFan	fan in tower i
T_iP_j	pump j in tower i
T_iR_j	radiator j in tower i
$Vol(C_i)$	volume of C_i

Running Example

\dot{m}	mass flow rate
\dot{V}	volumetric flow rate
A	area
a, b, c	pressure drop coefficients
C	heat capacity rate
C_f	friction coefficient
C_p	specific heat
C_r	the ratio of minimum to maximum fluid heat capacity rate (C_{min}/C_{max})
d	diameter
f	friction factor
H	height
h	convection heat transfer coefficient
I	electric current
K_{loss}	loss coefficient
L	length
N	number of revolutions per minute (rpm)
NTU	number of transfer units
p	pressure
q	heat generation rate per heat transfer rate
Re	Reynolds number
T	temperature
t	thickness
U	overall heat transfer coefficient
V	voltage
α	scale factor
ϵ	effectiveness of heat exchanger

η	efficiency
μ	dynamic viscosity
ω	angular velocity
ρ	density
σ	Stefan-Boltzmann constant
τ	torque

Subscripts and Superscripts in Running Example

<i>act</i>	active area
<i>air</i>	air
<i>c</i>	cold
<i>CAC</i>	charge air cooler
<i>cap</i>	capacity
<i>co</i>	coulomb
<i>comp</i>	component
<i>cond</i>	condenser
<i>cool</i>	coolant
<i>eng</i>	engine
<i>ext</i>	external
<i>gen</i>	generator
<i>h</i>	hot
<i>heat</i>	heat source
<i>i</i>	input
<i>int</i>	internal
<i>low</i>	louver
<i>min</i>	minimum
<i>mot</i>	motor
<i>o</i>	output

<i>oil</i>	oil cooler
<i>pb</i>	power bus
<i>r</i>	ratio
<i>rad</i>	radiator
<i>ref</i>	reference
<i>T/S</i>	thermostat
<i>tc</i>	turbo charger

ABSTRACT

Optimal System Design with Geometric Considerations

by

Kwang Jae Lee

Co-Chairs: Panos Y. Papalambros and Michael Kokkolaras

System design is tied to both functionality and geometric realization. The former is pertinent to system performance, and the latter is related to packaging. Packaging is an optimization process that finds a desirable placement for the system components within a given space. When the components do not fit into the allocated space at the packaging stage, the design engineers must make modifications that can affect the performance of the system. The modification of a component can also affect the geometry and positions of other components in the system. These changes might lead to an infeasible layout. Therefore, optimizing the system performance considering packaging is desirable.

Packaging problems and solution methods have been studied in many applications, such as electrical circuit layout, glass or metal cutting, truck loading, trunk packing, rapid prototyping (RP), architectural floor plan layout, routing, and mechanical component layout. Packaging problems in a mechanical system design are more challenging than 2D applications such as circuit layout and the metal cutting problem; this is due to a larger design space and increased complexity of geometry. Complex 3D geometry leads to increased computational time for interference checking,

which is inevitable for finding a feasible layout. Detailed 3D CAD models, however, are not required or not available at the preliminary design stage. Therefore, abstract representation of the components is necessary during the layout process. Abstract models should balance accuracy of geometry representation and rapid computation capturing designers intent.

This dissertation presents a computational environment for addressing the combined packaging and optimal system design. The packaging problem also includes pipe generation because pipe routing is also important problems in mechanical system design. The simulation model of a thermal management system for heavy duty series hybrid electric vehicles is used to demonstrate the usefulness of the proposed framework.