

**Optimal Partitioning and Coordination Decisions in
Decomposition-based Design Optimization**

by

James T. Allison

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Mechanical Engineering)
in The University of Michigan
2008

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Panos Y. Papalambros, Chair
Professor Noboru Kikuchi
Professor Romesh Saigal
Associate Research Scientist Michael Kokkolaras
Terrance Wagner, Ford Motor Company

© James T. Allison

All Rights Reserved

2008

to Ellie, Jonathan, Brian, and Michael

Acknowledgments

I have been very fortunate to study under the masterful guidance of my advisor, Panos Papalambros. I am grateful for his remarkable support throughout my challenges and adventures at the University of Michigan; I have been inspired by his example. It was because of the opportunity to work with him that I chose to come to Michigan, and I undoubtedly made the right choice. I want to thank my dissertation committee for the time and effort they volunteered to guide my dissertation work. I want also to recognize my wife, Natalie, who has labored just as ardently as I toward my graduation, and my extended family and friends, who gave of themselves so that I could realize my ambitions.

Much of my work has been collaborative. Michael Kokkolaras has been a valuable mentor and research collaborator throughout my graduate studies. Thanks to my affiliation with the Optimal Design Laboratory at the University of Michigan, I've had fantastic opportunities to work with people from around the world, including Brian Roth, Emanuele Colomba, Guido Karsemakers, Simon Tosserams, David Walsh, and others. I want to thank all of my ODE friends for enriching my experiences, including Ryan Fellini, Erin MacDonald, Jeongwoo Han, Jarod Kelly, Kwang Jae Lee, Kuei-Yuan Chan, Jeremy Michalek, Subroto Gunawan, Marc Zawislak, Eric Rask, Mike Sasena, Bart Frischknecht, and many others. I am grateful to my other friends at the U of M, including Mike Cherry, April Bryan, Natasha Chang, Eduardo Izquierdo, Brian Trease, Ken Pollary, and others.

Many individuals contributed to the electric vehicle design case study. Kwang Jae Lee played an important role in system integration, optimization, and programming. Jeongwoo Han provided the Li-ion battery model, and Jarod Kelley developed the frame design and structural model. Emanuele Colomba helped define chassis design and overall vehicle geometry. Michael Alexander assisted with structural model development. Dushyant Wadivkar, Burit Kitterungsi, and Mikael Nybacka all provided support for the vehicle dynamics model, and Hisashi Heguri generously furnished tire model data.

Many experiences helped prepare me for graduate school. My involvement with the solar car team at the University of Utah not only helped me discover my research interests, but gave me glimpses of the possible. My fellow solar car teammates, including Andy Rahden, Jayme Allred, Tadd Truscott, and Brad Hansen, played a vital role. Eberhard Bamberg, also of the University of Utah, was an important mentor who offered timely direction and

encouraged me to seek the best possible graduate school experience. Dennis Rosier, my high school auto shop teacher, helped ignite my passion for learning, and Corinne Barney, my high school math teacher, inspired me to expand my horizons. My parents offered regular encouragement to live to my potential, and my father provided long hours of math tutoring through my early college years that were key to my academic success.

Finally, I would like to recognize support from the U.S. National Science Foundation, the Automotive Research Center at the University of Michigan, the Rackham Graduate School, and the University of Michigan College of Engineering and Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Table of Contents

Dedication	ii
Acknowledgments	iii
List of Tables	viii
List of Figures	ix
List of Symbols	xii
Abstract	xv
Chapter 1 Decomposition-based Design Optimization	1
1.1 Engineering System Design	2
1.2 Design Optimization	4
1.3 Decomposition-based Design Optimization	8
1.4 Introductory Example	11
1.4.1 Coordination Decisions	13
1.4.2 Partitioning Decisions	15
1.5 Dissertation Overview	16
Chapter 2 Partitioning and Coordination Decisions	18
2.1 Decomposition-based System Design	18
2.1.1 System Consistency	20
2.1.2 System Optimality	20
2.1.3 Distributed Optimization	21
2.2 Decision Framework	22
2.3 System Representation	24
2.3.1 Structural Matrix	24
2.3.2 Design Structure Matrix	25
2.3.3 Other Design Matrices	26
2.3.4 Reduced Adjacency Matrix	27
2.4 Partitioning and Coordination Decision-Making	28
2.4.1 Traditional Decision Techniques	29
2.4.2 Formal Decision Techniques	30
2.5 Summary	34

Chapter 3	Demonstration Examples	35
3.1	Air Flow Sensor Design	35
3.2	Turbine Blade Design	38
3.2.1	Analysis Model	39
3.2.2	System Analysis	43
3.3	Aircraft Family Design	44
3.3.1	Product Families in Aircraft Design	44
3.3.2	Aircraft Performance Analysis	45
3.3.3	Aircraft Family Problem Formulation	46
3.4	Generalized Truss Design	48
3.4.1	Truss Analysis	48
3.4.2	Truss Design Formulation	51
3.5	Electric Water Pump Design	52
3.5.1	Water Pump Design	53
3.5.2	Analysis Overview	55
3.5.3	Thermal Analysis	58
3.5.4	Motor Current Analysis	64
3.5.5	Motor Speed Analysis	65
3.5.6	Torque and Pressure Analysis	65
3.5.7	Optimization Results	68
3.6	Concluding Comments	69
Chapter 4	System Design Optimization Formulations	70
4.1	Single-Level Formulations	70
4.1.1	Multidisciplinary Feasible Formulation	71
4.1.2	Individual Disciplinary Feasible Formulation	72
4.1.3	All-at-Once Formulation	74
4.2	System Analysis for Single-level Formulations	75
4.2.1	Fixed Point Iteration	76
4.2.2	Example: Hidden Optima	78
4.2.3	Coupling Strength in Single-Level Formulations	79
4.3	Multi-Level Formulations	85
4.3.1	Classes of Multi-Level Formulations	86
4.3.2	Analytical Target Cascading	87
4.3.3	Example: Aircraft Family Design	91
4.3.4	Augmented Lagrangian Coordination	94
4.3.5	Example: Air Flow Sensor Design	96
4.4	Concluding Comments	98
Chapter 5	Optimal Partitioning and Coordination: Theoretical Framework	99
5.1	P/C Problem Formulation	99
5.2	P/C Problem Solution	101
5.3	Examples	103
5.4	Water Pump Electrification Example	107
5.5	Concluding Comments	108

Chapter 6	Extension to Larger Systems	110
6.1	Evolutionary Algorithms	110
6.2	Evolutionary Algorithm for Partitioning and Coordination	113
6.2.1	Partition Genotype Representation	114
6.2.2	Sequence Genotype Representation	115
6.2.3	Comparative Examples	117
6.3	Generalized Truss Design Problem	117
6.3.1	System Partitioning	118
6.3.2	Example: Eight-bar Truss	119
6.3.3	EA Results	120
6.4	Concluding Comments	122
Chapter 7	Consistency Constraint Allocation for Augmented Lagrangian Co-ordination	123
7.1	Parallel ALC	123
7.2	Linking Structure Analysis	126
7.2.1	Consistency Constraint Graphs	127
7.2.2	Valid Consistency Constraint Graphs	128
7.2.3	Example Consistency Constraint Graph	132
7.3	Optimal Partitioning and Coordination Decisions for Parallel ALC	132
7.4	Example: Electric Water Pump Design Problem	136
7.5	Concluding Comments	138
Chapter 8	Electric Vehicle Design	140
8.1	Vehicle Description	141
8.2	Powertrain Model	147
8.2.1	Vehicle Model	148
8.2.2	Induction Motor Model	153
8.2.3	Lithium Ion Battery Model	163
8.3	Vehicle Dynamics Model	166
8.3.1	Directional Stability	167
8.3.2	Steering Responsiveness	168
8.3.3	Quarter-Car Model	169
8.4	Structural Model	172
8.5	Mass Distribution and Packaging	173
8.6	Optimal P/C Decision Results	175
8.7	Concluding Comments	180
Chapter 9	Conclusion	181
9.1	Summary	181
9.2	Extension of Simultaneous P/C Decision Making	183
9.3	Contributions	184
9.4	Future Work	184
Bibliography		186

List of Tables

Table

1.1	Experimental results for evaluation sequence variation	13
1.2	Experimental results for evaluation sequence and partition variation	16
2.1	Summary of formal partitioning and coordination decision methods	33
3.1	Turbine blade design parameters	44
3.2	Design variables for the aircraft family design problem	47
3.3	Design constraints for the aircraft family design problem	48
3.4	Analysis functions and design variables for the electric water pump design problem	54
3.5	Electric water pump model parameters	56
3.6	Optimization results for the electric water pump design problem	68
4.1	ALC solution progress for the air-flow sensor problem	98
6.1	Redundancy in $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$ partition representation	114
6.2	Design parameters and optimal geometry for the 8-bar truss problem	120
8.1	EV design variables	144
8.2	EV coupling variables	144
8.3	EV design constraint parameters	147
8.4	Vehicle model parameters	153
8.5	Motor model parameters	163
8.6	Vehicle dynamics model parameters	172
8.7	Mass distribution and packaging model parameters	175

List of Figures

Figure		
1.1	Sample sequential design process: automotive example	3
1.2	Illustration of global and local optima in a nonlinear programming example	5
1.3	Aeroelastic analysis	9
1.4	Process for implementing decomposition-based design optimization	10
1.5	Dissertation hypothesis: Existence of coupling between partitioning and coordination decisions	11
2.1	Input and output relationships for a system of analysis functions	19
2.2	Aspects of partitioning and coordination decisions	23
2.3	Hypergraph for relationships in Eqs. (2.4)	25
2.4	Digraph of functional relationships expressed in the DSM	26
3.1	Vane airflow sensor schematic (after [34])	36
3.2	Simplified representation of a vane airflow sensor	36
3.3	Coupling relationship in airflow sensor analysis	37
3.4	GE J-79 turbojet engine turbine blades [57]	39
3.5	Turbine blade model schematic	40
3.6	Turbine blade coupling and functional relationships	43
3.7	Truss geometry and free-body diagram	49
3.8	Electrically driven centrifugal water pump [39]	54
3.9	Analysis interactions in electric water pump model	55
3.10	Schematic of permanent magnet DC motor	57
3.11	Section view of DC motor armature	58
3.12	Schematic of centrifugal water pump	58
3.13	DC motor thermal resistance model	60
4.1	MDF architecture	71
4.2	IDF architecture	73
4.3	AAO architecture	75
4.4	Two element coupled system	76
4.5	System with multiple fixed points	77
4.6	IDF optimization space visualization	79
4.7	Coupling relationship in airflow sensor analysis	80
4.8	Comparison of MDF and IDF solution time as a function of coupling strength	81
4.9	Comparison of MDF and IDF function evaluations as a function of coupling strength	82
4.10	Turbine blade coupling and functional relationships	83

4.11	Comparison of MDF and IDF solution time as a function of coupling strength	85
4.12	Hierarchical system analysis structure	88
4.13	ATC subproblem as an optimal value function	90
4.14	Influence of β on $RMS(\mathbf{c})$ (system consistency)	94
5.1	Independent (P, C) optimization approach	102
5.2	$P \rightarrow C$ sequential optimization	102
5.3	$C \rightarrow P$ sequential optimization	103
5.4	Simultaneous $(P C)$ optimization	103
5.5	CS and SS_{\max} histograms for first example system	104
5.6	Optimization results for \mathbf{A}_1	104
5.7	CS and SS_{\max} histograms for \mathbf{A}_2	106
5.8	Optimization results for \mathbf{A}_2	106
5.9	Optimal P/C results for pump problem	108
6.1	Typical evolutionary algorithm process	111
6.2	Genotype and phenotype representation partition size distributions	115
6.3	Subproblem sequence distribution	116
6.4	Combined subproblem sequence and partition size distribution	116
6.5	Surjective mapping from genotype space to phenotype space	116
6.6	EA results for first example system	117
6.7	EA results for second example system	117
6.8	EA results for third example system	118
6.9	Geometry and applied loads for the 8-bar truss problem	119
6.10	Non-dominated solutions for 8-bar truss problem	121
7.1	Analysis function digraph for example system	124
7.2	Subproblem graph	125
7.3	Condensed subproblem graph	125
7.4	Stage graph	126
7.5	Graph representation of consistency constraint options for x_1	133
7.6	ALC P/C results for electric water pump problem	136
7.7	Consistency constraint allocation option for point 3	138
8.1	Vehicle systems and interactions in the EV design problem	140
8.2	Top view of EV component layout	142
8.3	Relationships between analysis functions in the EV design problem	143
8.4	Simplified overview of EV powertrain model	147
8.5	Block diagram of dynamic vehicle model	148
8.6	Simplified federal urban drive schedule	149
8.7	2 DOF vehicle pitch model	151
8.8	Slip data for electric vehicle tire	153
8.9	Diagram of an induction motor	154
8.10	Equivalent circuit of an induction motor	155
8.11	Typical IM maximum torque curve	158
8.12	Example IM efficiency map	161
8.13	Example IM power loss map with points visited during SFUDS	162
8.14	Flat-wound lithium-ion battery cell (after [68])	164
8.15	Battery and motor power output during SFUDS cycle	165

8.16	Battery power output and charge and discharge limits during range test . . .	166
8.17	Quarter-car vehicle suspension model	169
8.18	Sample road profile created using gaussian random number generator and digital filters	171
8.19	FEA model of the EV frame	173
8.20	Optimal partitioning and coordination decision results for the EV problem .	176

List of Symbols

\circ	Hadamard product
β	method of multipliers penalty function multiplier parameter
γ	method of multipliers penalty function threshold parameter
π	optimal value function for all ALC subproblems
π_i	optimal value function for ALC subproblem i
ϕ	augmented Lagrangian penalty function
θ_{ij}	consistency constraint vector between subproblems i and j
Θ	consistency constraint matrix
v_i	number of subproblems linked by the i -th external linking variable
ζ_{ij}	data persistence metric
\mathbf{a}	vector of all analysis functions for a system
\mathbf{a}_i	i -th analysis function
$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i$	analysis function vector that corresponds to $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i$
\mathbf{A}	reduced adjacency matrix
$\bar{\mathbf{A}}$	subproblem graph adjacency matrix
B_m	m -th Bell number
B_{allow}	maximum allowed subproblem size imbalance
C	coordination decision problem
\mathbf{c}_i	ATC consistency constraint for subproblem i
$\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{ij}$	ALC external consistency constraint between subproblems i and j
CM	correlation matrix
CS	coordination problem size
\mathcal{C}	set of consistency constraint graphs for all external shared design variables
DSM	design structure matrix
f	design objective function
FDT	functional dependence matrix
\mathbf{g}	inequality design constraint vector
\mathbf{g}_i	inequality design constraint vector for subproblem i
G_c	consistency constraint graph
\mathbf{h}	equality design constraint vector

\mathbf{h}_{aux}	auxiliary equality constraint vector
\mathbf{h}_i	equality design constraint vector for subproblem i
m	number of analysis functions in a system
n	number of design variables in a system
n^s	stage depth
n_{ai}	number of analysis functions in subproblem i
n_{P_i}	number of subproblems that share i -th external shared variable
$n_{x_{li}}$	number of local design variables in subproblem i
$n_{\bar{x}_s}$	number of external shared design variables
$n_{\bar{x}_s ci}$	number of consistency constraints for external shared variables in subproblem i
$n_{\bar{x}_s i}$	number of external shared design variables in subproblem i
$n_{\bar{x}_s m}$	approximate number of external shared design variable consistency constraints
$n_{\bar{y}_f}$	number of external feedback coupling variables
$n_{\bar{y}_f i}$	number of external feedback coupling variables for subproblem i
n_{y_i}	number of internal coupling variables in subproblem i
$n_{\bar{y}_i}$	number of consistency constraints for external coupling variables in subproblem i
$n_{\bar{y}_i i}$	number external input coupling variables for subproblem i
n^z	number of subproblems linked by linking variable z
n_z	number of external linking variables
N	number of subproblems
\mathbf{o}	analysis function sequence vector
\mathbf{o}_s	subproblem sequence vector
$\hat{\mathbf{o}}$	genotype analysis function sequence vector
\mathbf{p}	partition vector
$\hat{\mathbf{p}}$	genotype partition vector
p_{ij}	path from vertex i to vertex j
P	partitioning decision problem
P/C	partitioning and coordination
P_i	subproblem i
\mathbf{RM}	relation matrix
\mathbf{r}_{ij}	ATC responses from subproblem j to subproblem i
\mathbf{S}_{ij}	\mathbf{a}_i selection matrix for \mathbf{y}_{ij}
\mathbf{SM}	structural matrix
SS_i	size of subproblem i
SS_{max}	maximum subproblem size
\bar{SS}_{max}	average maximum subproblem size for each stage

\mathbf{t}_{ij}	ATC targets from subproblem j to subproblem i
\mathbf{v}	linear penalty weights
\mathbf{v}_i	linear penalty weights for subproblem i
\mathbf{w}	quadratic penalty weights
\mathbf{w}_i	quadratic penalty weights for subproblem i
\mathbf{x}	design variable vector
\mathbf{x}^*	optimal design variable vector
\mathbf{x}_i	design variables input to \mathbf{a}_i
\mathbf{x}_{ℓ_i}	design variables local to \mathbf{a}_i
\mathbf{x}_{s_i}	shared design variables associated with \mathbf{a}_i
$\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i$	design variables input to subproblem i
$\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^{(j)}$	copy of $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i$ local to subproblem i
$\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\ell_i}$	design variables local to subproblem i
$\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{s_i}$	external shared design variables associated with subproblem i
$\bar{\mathbf{x}}_s^{ij}$	design variable copies shared between subproblems i and j , local to subproblem i
$\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{s\mathcal{C}_i}$	external shared design variables associated child elements of subproblem i
$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i$	internal shared design variables for subproblem i
\mathcal{X}	set of feasible design points
\mathbf{y}	coupling variable vector
\mathbf{y}_p	consistent coupling variable vector
\mathbf{y}_{ij}	coupling variable vector from \mathbf{a}_j to \mathbf{a}_i
$\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i$	external coupling variables input to subproblem i
$\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{ij}$	coupling variable vector from \mathbf{P}_j to \mathbf{P}_i
$\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathcal{C}_i}$	external coupling variables associated child elements of subproblem i
$\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i$	internal coupling variable vector for subproblem i
\mathbf{z}_i	vector of linking variables associated with \mathbf{a}_i
$\bar{\mathbf{z}}$	vector of all external linking variables
$\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$	vector of all copies of linking variable z
$\bar{\mathbf{z}}_i$	vector of external linking variables associated with subproblem i
$\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{ij}$	external linking variables between subproblems i and j
$\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{\bullet i}$	subproblem i output vector

Abstract

Successful design of complex modern products is a grand challenge for design organizations. The task is becoming increasingly important due to economic competition and concern over safety, reliability, and energy efficiency. Automotive and aerospace products, for example, are composed of numerous interdependent subsystems with a level of complexity that surpasses the capability of a single design group. A common approach is to partition complex design problems into smaller, more manageable design tasks that can be solved by individual design groups. Effective management of interdependency between these subproblems is critical, and a successful design process ultimately must meet the needs of the overall system. Decomposition-based design optimization techniques provide a mathematical foundation and computational tools for developing such design processes. Two tasks must be performed so that decomposition-based design optimization can be used to solve a system design problem: partitioning the system into subproblems, and determining a coordination method for guiding subproblem solutions toward the optimal system design. System partition and coordination strategy have a profound impact on the design process. The effect of partitioning and coordination decisions have been studied independently, while interaction between these decisions has been largely ignored. It is shown here that these two sets of decisions do interact: how a system is partitioned influences appropriate coordination decisions, and vice versa. Consequently, addressing partitioning and coordination decisions simultaneously leads to improved system design processes. The combined partitioning and coordination decision problem is a difficult combinatorial problem. An evolutionary algorithm that solves this decision problem effectively is presented. The set of all partitioning and coordination options for a specific formulation framework, augmented Lagrangian coordination (ALC), is derived, and a method for choosing Pareto-optimal solutions from amongst these options is described. Concepts and techniques are demonstrated using several engineering example problems. A detailed model for an electric vehicle design problem is presented that considers three vehicle systems: powertrain, chassis, and structure, and partitioning and coordination decisions for this problem are analyzed.