

Extending the Minimum Principle

State-Dependent Control

Constraints

- Our classes of optimal control problems thus far have all included a specification;

$u \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, Ω a fixed set.

- In many applications of interest, this is not sufficiently general. For example, the minimum-time horizontal turns in H.W. Set 6, should incorporate an *aerodynamic* limit on the

admissible load factor. We have

$$n = \frac{L}{W}$$

where the L is the lift, the component of the aerodynamic force normal to the velocity vector. The usual aerodynamic model expresses the lift in terms

of the *lift-coefficient*

$$C_L = \frac{L}{\bar{q}S},$$

where S is the wing-area and the dynamic-pressure $\bar{q}$ is related to the the air-density ρ and the flight-speed V as

$$\bar{q} = 1/2\rho V^2.$$

- The aerodynamic-limit imposes an upper-bound on C_L

$$C_L \leq C_{L \text{ max}}.$$

In the simplest case, $C_{L \text{ max}}$ is a specified positive number.

- In terms of the load-factor n

the result is

$$n \leq C_{L \max} 1/2\rho V^2 S,$$

so that the limit on the control n depends on the value of state component V .

- We shall require that the admissible set $\Omega(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is

specified by a finite number of
smooth functions

$$\beta_i(x, u) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, \ell$$

$$\beta_{\ell+j}(x, u) \geq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, r$$

State-Dependent Control Constraints

- It might seem that admitting $\Omega(x)$ is a minor change in the problem. Actually, it is a major extension.

➤ Consider our original problem

$$\dot{x} = f(x, u), \text{ with } u \in \Omega \mathbb{R}^m$$

Let's introduce n additional
control variables z and
reformulate the problem as

$$\dot{x} = z$$

with the n equality constraints

$$\beta(x, u, z) = f(x, u) - z = 0$$

- The transformed dynamics appear to be trivial since $\tilde{f}(x, u, z) = z$ is completely independent of the state ! All of the dynamics is hidden in the constraints

$(u, z) \in \Omega(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ as
represented by the functions
 $\beta(x, u, z) = 0$.

- Such transformation can be exploited in a finite-dimensional transcription similar to the *POST* and *OTIS* methods discussed earlier.

Extended Minimum Principle

State-Dependent Control

Constraints

- In addition to the *variational*

Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H(\tilde{\lambda}, x, u) &\equiv \langle \tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{f}(x, u) \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^n \lambda_i f_i(x, u) \end{aligned}$$

we define the *augmented*

Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H^a(\lambda_0, \lambda, \mu, x, u) &= H(\lambda_0, \lambda, \mu, x, u) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell+r} \mu_i \beta_i(x, u) \end{aligned}$$

➤ Note that the $\min H$ operation now requires that the minimization be subject to the constraints

$$\beta_i \geq 0$$

where we have abused the notation since the first ℓ

components of these are equalities.

- The problem of minimizing H subject to mixed (equality/inequality) constraints is a finite-dimensional problem and is amenable to the treatment in Chapter 3 of

G-M-W. The K-K-T theory for this problem leads to

- $\beta(x, u^*) \geq 0$, with $\hat{\beta}(x, u^*) = 0$
- $\nabla_u H^a(x, u^*) = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$
- $\mu_{\ell+j} \geq 0$

➤ The *Lagrange* multipliers μ for this problem are called

Valentine multipliers. Valentine did a 1937(?) thesis at the U. of Chicago under G.A. Bliss.

➤ The adjoint differential equations

$$\dot{\lambda}(t) = -\frac{\partial H^T}{\partial x}$$

is replaced by

$$\dot{\lambda}(t) = -\frac{\partial H^{aT}}{\partial x}$$