



Available online at www.sciencedirect.com



Journal of Terramechanics

Journal of Terramechanics 71 (2017) 45-56

www.elsevier.com/locate/jterra

## Bayesian calibration of Vehicle-Terrain Interface algorithms for wheeled vehicles on loose sands

Ian Dettwiller<sup>a</sup>, Masoud Rais-Rohani<sup>a,e</sup>, Farshid Vahedifard<sup>b,\*</sup>, George L. Mason<sup>c</sup>, Jody D. Priddy<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Dept. of Aerospace Engineering and Center for Advanced Vehicular Systems, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS 39762, USA

<sup>b</sup> Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Center for Advanced Vehicular Systems, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS 39762, USA

<sup>c</sup> Center for Advanced Vehicular Systems, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS 39762, USA <sup>d</sup> U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, 3909 Halls Ferry Road, Vicksburg, MS 39180, USA

<sup>e</sup> Department of Mechanical Engineering, The University of Maine, Orono, ME 04469, USA

Received 12 May 2016; received in revised form 31 January 2017; accepted 14 February 2017

#### Abstract

The Vehicle-Terrain Interface (VTI) model is commonly used to predict off-road mobility to support virtual prototyping. The Database Records for Off-road Vehicle Environments (DROVE), a recently developed database of tests conducted with wheeled vehicles operating on loose, dry sand, is used to calibrate three equations used within the VTI model: drawbar pull, traction, and motion resistance. A two-stage Bayesian calibration process using the Metropolis algorithm is implemented to improve the performance of the three equations through updating of their coefficients. Convergence of the Bayesian calibration process to a calibrated model is established through evaluation of two indicators of convergence. Improvements in root-mean square error (RMSE) are shown for all three equations: 17.7% for drawbar pull, 5.5% for traction, and 23.1% for motion resistance. Improvements are also seen in the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) performance of the equations for drawbar pull, 2.8%, and motion resistance, 2.5%. Improvements are also demonstrated in the coefficient of determination for drawbar pull, 2.8%, and motion resistance, 2.5%, equations, while the calibrated traction equation performs similar to the VTI equation. A randomly selected test dataset of about 10% of the relevant observations from DROVE is used to validate the performance of each calibrated equation.

© 2017 ISTVS. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

*Keywords:* Off-road mobility; Vehicle Terrain Interface (*VTI*) model; Bayesian calibration; Metropolis algorithm; Sand; Drawbar pull (*DP*); Traction; Motion resistance; Database Records for Off-road Vehicle Environments (DROVE)

#### 1. Introduction

Off-road vehicles serve a crucial role for both civilian and military transportations. Effective modeling of offroad vehicle mobility at diverse fidelities and on various terrains is an important task for many vehicle design applications. Two popular off-road vehicle performance models are the NATO Reference Mobility Model (NRMM) (Ahlvin and Haley, 1992; Vong et al., 1999) and the Virtual Autonomous Navigation Environment (VANE) (Jones et al., 2007), although other models have also been used (Lee, 2015; Taheri et al., 2015). These models relate vehicle performance, environmental conditions, and the terrain.

The Vehicle Terrain Interface (VTI) model is a highresolution empirical model that addresses the interactions at the traction-terrain element interface and was developed as part of the NRMM and VANE models. The VTI serves

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author.

*E-mail addresses:* idd4@msstate.edu (I. Dettwiller), masoud. raisrohani@maine.edu (M. Rais-Rohani), farshid@cee.msstate.edu (F. Vahedifard), mason@cavs.msstate.com (G.L. Mason), Jody.D. Priddy@erdc.dren.mil (J.D. Priddy).

<sup>0022-4898/© 2017</sup> ISTVS. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

### Nomenclature

VTI	Vehicle Terrain Interface	$\epsilon$	observation error
DROV	E Database Records for Off-road Vehicle	$L(D \theta)$	likelihood function
D D	Environments	$P(\theta)$	prior distribution
DP	drawbar pull	$P(\theta D)$	posterior distribution
NRMM NATO Reference Mobility Model		D	data for calibration
VANE	Virtual Autonomous Navigation Environment	PDF	probability density function
$F_t$	net tractive effort	v	variance of an observation
<i>R</i>	total motion resistance	У	property being modeled
ISTVS	International Society for Terrain-Vehicle	$\theta_{can}$	candidate vector of calibration parameters
	Systems	$\theta_0$	previous vector of calibration parameters
DBP	coefficient of drawbar pull	V	variance-covariance matrix
Т	coefficient of traction	$P_{can}$	prior distribution of candidate vector
MR	coefficient of motion resistance	$L_{can}$	likelihood function of candidate vector
S	slip	$P_0$	prior distribution of previous vector
$r_R$	rolling radius	$L_0$	likelihood function of previous vector
ω	angular velocity of the wheel	γ	Metropolis ratio
$V_v$	forward velocity of the vehicle	п	Length of the Markov chain
W	vehicle or wheel load	$\theta^n$	final set of accepted calibration parameters from
α	steering angle		Markov Chain
$N_s$	sand numeric	Min <sub>ref</sub>	minimum for reflection
G	penetration gradient	Max <sub>ref</sub>	maximum for reflection
b	tire width	$\sigma$	standard deviation
h	section height	а	term to adjust step size in the Metropolis algo-
δ	difference between loaded and unloaded section		rithm
	heights	$\mu$	mean
$X_i$	general coefficients for calibration	С	second term to adjust step size of the Metropolis
$N_{s,u}$	unpowered sand numeric		algorithm
$CI_{0-15}$	average soil cone index from 0 to 15 cm	UB	upper bound
BC	Bayesian calibration	LB	lower bound
$\theta$	calibration parameters	RMSE	root-mean square error
$\phi$	variable parameters	$R^2$	coefficient of determination
η	model output	CAVS	Center for Advanced Vehicular Systems

as a practical tool to support virtual prototyping of off-road vehicles without the computational cost of the larger models, a valuable part of the computer-aided design process (MacLeod, 2001). One advantage of the VTI model is its flexibility, being able account for both tracked and wheeled vehicles, steering conditions, and whether or not the vehicle is operating on ridged or fixed materials (Rohde et al., 2009). Steering is supported in the VTI model by equations for turning of the wheel on a deformable media developed by Melzer (1976), reorganized by Durham (1976) and implemented in the VTI (Jones et al., 2007).

The empirical nature of the VTI model allows for, or even necessitates, updating of the VTI equations as new data become available through either laboratory or fieldtesting. A recent effort to evaluate the performance of vehicle mobility models resulted in the Database Records for Off-road Vehicle Environments (DROVE) (Vahedifard et al., 2016, 2017), and suggested the performance of the VTI model could be improved for loose, dry sands. In the current study, a two-stage Bayesian calibration technique was employed to improve the performance of the drawbar pull, traction, and motion resistance equations within the VTI model. The following sections of this paper include a brief discussion of the VTI model and the equations considered, an overview of Bayesian calibration, and results including the calibrated algorithms and their performance.

#### 2. Vehicle performance parameters

Three vehicle performance parameters described in the VTI model are considered in this effort: drawbar pull force (DP), gross traction force  $(F_p)$ , and total motion resistance (R) defined according to the ISTVS standards (Meyer et al., 1977; Priddy, 1999). Each parameter is normalized by weight to give the coefficient of drawbar pull (DBP), coefficient of traction (T), and coefficient of motion resistance (MR) illustrated for non-steered tires in Fig. 1.

Download English Version:

# https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5018359

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/5018359

Daneshyari.com