Modeling and Control of a Balloon Borne Stabilized Platform

A balloon borne stabilized platform has been developed for a remotely operated altitude-azimuth pointing of a millimeter wave telescope system. A modeling and controller design of the azimuth point system of the platform is presented. Simulation results show that the system is capable of continuous operation with pointing rms to better than 0.01 deg. Ground testing results show continuous operation with pointing rms to better than 0.02 deg; while results of the first flight from the National Scientific Balloon Facility (NSBF) at Palestine, Texas show pointing rms better than 0.02 deg.

1 Introduction

A balloon borne stabilized platform is a package that performs altitude-azimuth pointing of a telescope system for observations of celestial sources. It is similar in operation to a ground based altitude-azimuth telescope system except that the platform or the gondola is suspended under a 100,000 m³ zero pressure helium filled balloon. The gondola is suspended from a balloon with a flight train of ~18 m steel ladder and ~36 m parachute, as shown in Fig. 1. The balloon floats at an altitude of about 30 km where it encounters prevailing winds ranging from as low as a couple of knots to 45 knots maximum. Wind directions vary with the time of the year. Ambient temperature is about −40°C.

There is no active means of controlling the balloon position as it drifts with the wind. A natural rotation of less than a revolution per minute is imparted to the balloon by the atmosphere, and this motion is effectively transferred to the gondola. A natural pendulating motion is experienced by the gondola but this has a slow period and is usually only in the arc minute level at float altitude (Hazen, 1985 and Nigro, 1985). Natural pendulum period is ~18 s.

Balloon borne stabilized platforms are used for making astronomical and cosmological observations. It is relatively inexpensive compared to rockets and space shuttle launches. At float altitude of 30 km, noise and fluctuations from the atmosphere are virtually eliminated. Compared to sounding rockets, balloon flights also offer longer observation time for the experiment.

The stabilized platform described in this paper was developed at the Physics Department of the University of California, Santa Barbara, and is used for sensitive measurements of anisotropy in the Cosmic Background Radiation (CBR), a remnant of the Big Bang.

This paper presents a modeling of the azimuth point system of a stabilized platform. Special features of the hardware are singled out to show how coupling between the balloon and the gondola is minimized. A simplification of the model serves as the basis for designing a PID control with constant desaturation of the flywheel angular velocity. The primary goal of the controller is to achieve azimuth pointing and stabilization of better than 0.1 deg and, the secondary goal is to maintain the flywheel angular velocity below saturation level. Qualitative root locus analyses are used to show the necessity of the desaturation control for continuous operation of the pointing system and also requirement of integral control to remove pointing offset. The implementation of the azimuth pointing system, simulation, ground test, and flight results are discussed.

2 A Model of the Azimuth Pointing System

2.1 Description of Azimuth Pointing Hardware. Figure 2 shows the balloon borne stabilized platform that was designed and built for this project. Azimuth pointing is achieved by torquing directly into inertial space with the use of the reaction wheel system shown in Fig. 3. The flywheel or reaction wheel...
is spun up by the torque motors causing the gondola to react in the opposite direction. As the reaction wheel operates to keep the gondola pointed correctly, the flywheel will eventually be accelerated to a high angular velocity to the point that the back emf produced prevents any more torqueing capability. This condition is referred to as the flywheel reaching saturation. Desaturation can be done by despinning the flywheel, dumping angular momentum to the balloon. Intermittent desaturation, however, can result in the loss of valuable observation time during balloon flight.

To achieve continuous observation time, the reaction wheel is prevented from saturating by employing an active double bearing motor assembly. This device called the RCUBE (Pelling and Duttweiler, 1985), shown in Fig. 4, is an active double bearing assembly that is provided with two motors. The design uses a set of two angular contact bearings, one bearing couples the gondola to the moving race, while the other couples the moving race to the balloon. The d-c gear motor is used to drive the bearing housing in constant motion to avoid stiction during flight. The other motor, a torque motor, is used to torque the gondola against the balloon/flight train system. The RCUBE is used primarily to isolate or to decouple the motion of the gondola from the balloon and to provide a desaturation mechanism for the flywheel angular velocity.

2.2 Dynamic Equations of the Azimuth Pointing System. Inherent in the modeling process is the assumption that the pendulating motion experienced by the gondola is small enough not to affect the azimuth dynamics of the gondola significantly. This assumption is certainly true at float altitude (Hazen, 1985 and Nigro, 1985), but is not valid during ascent and descent of the gondola.

For modeling, the following assumptions are made.

(1) It is assumed that the dynamics of the motor electrical systems are negligible. This is a reasonable assumption since the azimuth pointing system of the gondola is a slow responding system, considering that the moment of inertia \( J_g \) of the gondola is quite large, 195 kg-m\(^2\), compared to the available torque to move it, 5.42 N-m maximum. While the moment of inertia, \( J_a \) of the RCUBE's shaft and rotor is small, the RCUBE torque motor and gear motor are expected to be operated with constant or slowly changing command voltages by judicious choice of control.

(2) It is assumed that the timing belt rigidly couples the bearing housing to the gondola frame while at the same time the rotation of the gear motor is transferred without loss to the bearing housing. This assumption is reasonable since the gear motor is expected to be driven with a constant magnitude voltage once the pointing operation begins. While it is true that the bearing housing could experience large fluctuating torques due to oscillations in the command voltage to the RCUBE torque motor, in practice, this command voltage will be computed using a narrow band controller to prevent such rapid response.

(3) Aerodynamic forces including damping on the balloon are negligible. This assumption is reasonable since the balloon...
and the gondola essentially drift with the wind and the atmosphere pressure at float altitude is near vacuum.

With the three preceding assumptions, a bond graph of the azimuth system is shown in Fig. 5.

Identifying

\[ f_4 = \omega_m, \] the angular velocity of the flywheel;

\[ f_7 = \omega_k, \] the angular velocity of the gondola;

\[ f_{18} = \omega_a, \] the angular velocity of the RCUBE shaft/rotor;

\[ f_{21} = \omega_b, \] the angular velocity of the balloon;

\[ f_{16} = \omega_\theta, \] the angular velocity of the bearing housing;

and defining

\[ T_f = e_3 = \text{output torque of the reaction wheel system} \]

\[ T_r = e_13 = \text{output torque of the RCUBE torque motor} \]

The dynamic equations of the azimuth pointing system are derived from the bond graph.

The angular velocity of the bearing housing is written as

\[ \dot{\omega}_b = \omega_a + \omega_m/n_g, \quad \omega_m = k_n u_3 \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where \( \omega_m \) is the gear motor azimuth velocity, rad/s; \( k_n \) is the combined amplifier and velocity gain, \((V/V)/(rad/s/V)\); \( n_g \) is the gear ratio between the housing and the drive pinion; and \( u_3 \) is the D/A command output.

With the gear motor turned off, the housing is mechanically grounded to the gondola through the timing belt.

For the RCUBE, the motor output torque, \( T_a \), is

\[ T_a = (k_s/R_a) \left( k_t \cdot u_2 - B_a \cdot (\omega_a - \omega_b) \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where \( k_t \) is the torque constant, 0.57 N-m/amp; \( R_a \) is the armature resistance, 5.7 ohms; \( k_s \) is the PWM amplifier gain, 2.6 V/V; \( B_a \) is the back emf gain, 0.57 V/rad/s; and \( u_2 \) is the D/A command output.

For the reaction wheel, the motors output torque, \( T_r \), is

\[ T_r = (2 \cdot k_s/R_a) \left( k_t \cdot u_1 - B_a \cdot (\omega_a - \omega_b) \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where \( k_t, R_a, k_s, \) and \( B_a \) are as previously described for the RCUBE since the amplifiers and the motors used are the same. The factor 2 is present to reflect the operation of two torque motors working in parallel for the flywheel system; \( u_1 \) is the D/A command output.

Since the flywheel angular velocity is operated at a much higher rate than any velocity rate the gondola is capable of achieving, equation (3) is simplified to

\[ T_r = (2 \cdot k_s/R_a) \left( k_t \cdot u_1 - B_a \cdot (\omega_a - \omega_b) \right). \]  \hspace{1cm} (4)

Coulomb friction torque is mainly due to the relative velocity between the bearing housing and the RCUBE shaft and is written as

\[ f_{ca} = -\text{sgn} [\omega_a - \omega_b] \cdot f_d \]  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where \( f_{ca} \) is the Coulomb friction torque seen by the RCUBE shaft, \( f_d \) is the Coulomb friction torque seen by the gondola/bearing housing, and \( f_d \) is the magnitude of Coulomb friction.

The dynamic equation for the balloon is written as

\[ J_b \dot{\omega}_b = T_a - k_b \int (\omega_b - \omega_m) \, dt - c_b \cdot (\omega_b - \omega_m) + f_{ca} \]  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where \( J_b \) is the balloon moment of inertia, kg-m^2; \( T_a \) is the torque disturbance from the atmosphere; \( k_b \) is the flight train compliance between the balloon and the RCUBE shaft, N-m/rad; \( c_b \) is the flight train damping between the balloon and the RCUBE shaft, N-m/rad/s; and \( f_{ca} \) is the damping due to the atmosphere.

For the RCUBE shaft:

\[ J_d \dot{\omega}_m = T_a - k_d \int (\omega_m - \omega_b) \, dt - c_d \cdot (\omega_m - \omega_b) + f_{ca} \]  \hspace{1cm} (7)

where \( J_d \) is the RCUBE shaft moment of inertia, kg-m^2.

For the gondola:

\[ J_g \dot{\omega}_a = -T_r - f_{ca} + c_g \cdot (\omega_a - \omega_m) + Lo \]  \hspace{1cm} (8)

where \( J_g \) is the moment of inertia of the gondola, kg-m^2; \( c_g \) is the damping due to the atmosphere, N-m/rad/s; \( Lo \) is an external disturbance torque acting on the gondola.

For the flywheel:

\[ J_f \dot{\omega}_f = T_f \]  \hspace{1cm} (9)

where \( J_f \) is the flywheel moment of inertia, kg-m^2.

Other than the common but oppositely applied torque, \( T_r \), the gondola and the RCUBE shaft are only related dynamically by the viscous term \((k_s \cdot B_a) \cdot (\omega_a - \omega_b)\), and the Coulomb friction terms \( f_{ca} \) or \( f_d \). The viscous friction is usually small in magnitude. While the Coulomb friction term is not necessarily small, it is limited in magnitude.

Another frictional disturbance is stiction. Stiction is manifested when the relative velocity term, \( \omega_a - \omega_m \), is zero. For this model, the stiction is accounted for in the following manner.

For the RCUBE shaft, if \( \omega_a - \omega_m \) is zero, the magnitude of the external torque applied to the RCUBE shaft other than the friction term should be greater than the static friction \( f_{ca} \), i.e., \( f_{ca} < f_{ca} \) then \( f_{ca} \) is then added according to the direction of the impending motion. If the magnitude is not enough to overcome stiction, then the external torque applied to the RCUBE shaft is zeroed out, i.e.,

\[ \text{if } \omega_a - \omega_m > 0, \text{ then } f_{ca} = -f_{ca} \cdot \text{sgn}[\omega_a - \omega_m] \]

else \( f_{ca} = 0.0 \) \hspace{1cm} (10)

where \( f_{ca} \) is the sum of the external torques shown on the right-hand side of equation (8) minus the Coulomb friction term.

The stiction effect on the gondola dynamics is modeled in similar manner.

2.2.1 Constant Rotation Bearing Housing. The RCUBE is designed as an active suspension system (Pelling and Duttwiler, 1985). One of its primary functions is to keep the Coulomb friction acting in one preferred direction and to prevent the occurrence of stiction due to reversal of bearing rotation. This goal is achieved by driving the bearing housing with the gear motor at a rate faster than any possible balloon rotation rate, and therefore keep the bearings rotating under all conditions of gondola rotation. From equation (5) or equation (6), the direction of Coulomb friction is dependent on \( \text{sgn} [\omega_a - \omega_b] \). Therefore, if the magnitude of \( |\omega_a - \omega_b| \) is always greater than zero, i.e.,

\[ \omega_a - (\omega_m/n_g) > \omega_m > 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (12)

or \( \omega_a - (\omega_m/n_g) > \omega_m < 0 \) \hspace{1cm} (13)

then the Coulomb friction torque can indeed be made to act.
only in a preferred direction. Furthermore, stiction can be
avoided provided the magnitude of \( \omega_m/n_g \) is maintained high
enough that any change in \( \omega_a - \omega_k \) becomes inconsequential,
\( \omega_a - \omega_k > \omega_m/n_g \) for \( \omega_m < 0 \)  \( \omega_a - \omega_k < \omega_m/n_g \) for \( \omega_m > 0 \)  
(14)
(15)
Both the gondola and the balloon are expected to be slowly
rotating systems, but it is possible for the RCUBE torque motor
to switch rapidly between positive and negative torques and
thus drive the moment of inertia \( J_f \) into oscillation. Therefore,
it is important that the choice of control scheme to generate
\( u_2 \) should prevent or minimize such occurrence especially during
steady state operations.

2.2.2 RCUBE Compensation for Friction. With the frictional
disturbance set in one direction, equation (9) could be rewritten as
\[
J_d \omega/dt = -(2 * k_e/R_a) \times (k_e \omega_2 - B_e \omega_a)
\]
(16)
\( B_e \) is neglected.

The frictional disturbance torque can be cancelled by \( u_2 \). In
particular, if the viscous friction term \( B_e \) is neglected as
its effect is small, \( u_2 \) can be determined to satisfy
\[
-(k_e \omega_2 - B_e \omega_a)/R_a \pm f_d = 0
\]
(17)
Thus, if the parameters \( R_a, k_e \), and \( B_e \) as well as the Coulomb
friction are known completely, \( u_2 \) can be computed to remove
or to minimize the effect of the Coulomb friction disturbance.

Defining the angular velocities \( \omega_a \) and \( \omega_b \) as
\[
d\theta_a/dt = \omega_a
\]
(18)
\[
d\theta_b/dt = \omega_b
\]
(19)
\[
d\theta_a/dt = \omega_a
\]
(20)
equations (7), (8), (9), (10), (18), (19), and (20) are written in
matrix form as
\[
d[X]/dt = \begin{bmatrix} A11 & A12 \\ A21 & A22 \end{bmatrix} [X] + \begin{bmatrix} B1 \\ B2 \end{bmatrix} [U] + \begin{bmatrix} C1 \\ C2 \end{bmatrix}
\]
(21)
where
\[
[X]^T = [X1]^T, [X2]^T = [\theta_a, \omega_a, \theta_b, \omega_b, \theta_g, \omega_g]
\]
(22)
\[
[X1]^T = [\theta_a, \omega_a, \theta_b, \omega_b]
\]
(23)
\[
[X2]^T = [\theta_g, \omega_g]
\]
(24)
\[
[U]^T = [u1, u2]
\]
(25)
and
\[
[A11] = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -k_{ba} & -c_{ba} & c_{ba} \\ J_a & J_b & J_b \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}
\]
(26)
\[
[A12] = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ k_e B_e & 0 & 0 \\ R_e J_f & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}
\]
(27)
\[
[A21] = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}
\]
(28)
2.2.3 Flight Line Dynamics. Neglecting the small effects
of \([A12] \) and \([A21] \) in the system matrix \([A] \) in equation (21),
eigenvalues of the system matrix can be estimated from \([A11] \) and \([A22] \).
\([A11] \) gives two zero eigenvalues physically corresponding
to in phase azimuth motion of the balloon and the RCUBE
shaft. The other two eigenvalues can be computed from
\[
s^2 + \frac{(\alpha + c_{ba})}{J_a} * s + \frac{k_{ba}}{J_a} = 0
\]
(34)
where
\[
\alpha = (k_e B_e)/R_a.
\]
(35)
The two eigenvalues become
\[
\lambda_3, \lambda_4 = \frac{-\alpha + \sqrt{\alpha^2 + 4k_{ba} \alpha}}{J_a}
\]
(36)
From equation (36) the vibration mode of the flight train
should be asymptotically stable or at least stable.
From \([A22] \), the three remaining system eigenvalues are
located at zero, \(-c_e/B_e\)/\( J_f \) and \(-2(\alpha)\)/\( J_f \).
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3 Design of PID Control With Constant Desaturation of Flywheel Angular Velocity

The primary design objective is to develop a controller capable of azimuth pointing and stabilization of better than 0.1 deg. A secondary objective is to modulate the flywheel angular velocity to prevent it from approaching saturation level.

Pole placement technique with selective feedback gain is used to design a PID controller with constant desaturation of the flywheel angular velocity.

For design purposes, the following truncated system can be used, i.e.,

\[ d[X2]/dt = [A22][X2] + [B2][U] \] (37)

where

\[ [X2]^T = \begin{bmatrix} \theta_g^f, \omega_g, \omega_f, \theta_f \end{bmatrix}, \]

\[ [U]^T = [u1, u2]. \] (39)

It is not unreasonable to use the truncated system for controller design for the following reasons.

1. [A21] has very little cross coupling effect as the only nonzero term is dominated by \( 1/J_f \).
2. [A22] has a potentially high coupling term \( \alpha/J_f \) of \( \omega_g \), but the angular velocity of \( \omega_g \) of the gondola is small especially during steady-state operation. Thus, the effect of [A21] can be neglected.
3. The effect of the nonlinear friction term, \( f_{an} \), can be minimized by keeping the velocity of the bearing housing sufficiently large, while friction compensation is provided with the use of the RCUBE torque motor. Residual disturbance can also be eliminated by having an integral control.

The following control law is considered:

\[ u1 = -kp*ek - kd*d(ek)/dt - ki \int ek \, dt, \] (40)

\[ u2 = kv*(\omega_f - \omega_{ref}), \] (41)

\[ ek = \theta_{ref} - \theta_g, \] (42)

where \( \theta_g \) is the azimuth reference angle; \( \omega_{ref} \) is the reference flywheel velocity, rad/s; \( kp, ki, kd \) are the proportional \( P \), integral \( I \) and derivative \( D \) gains, respectively, and \( kv \) is the desaturation control gain. Time integral of \( ek \) is also needed to bring one of the loci away from the origin. An extremely large \( ki \) could result in an unstable system as shown in Fig. 6. It is important to emphasize that \( ki \) is needed to eliminate any steady state error that may arise in the system. Assuming \( u2 = 0.0 \) and \( \theta_{ref} = 0.0 \), the steady state error due to a constant disturbance \( Lo \) can be shown to be

\[ 1 + \frac{ki*(d*s + e)}{s^2 + a*s^2 + b*s^2 + c*s} = 0 \] (54)

\[ \alpha = (k_f*B_f)/R_a, \] (52)

\[ \beta = (k_i*k_v)/R_a. \] (53)

For the dependence of the eigenvalues of \([A33 + B3*K]\) on \( ki \), equation (51) can be rewritten as

\[ \frac{s^4 + \frac{c_s + \alpha}{J_g} + \frac{2*\beta*B_f}{J_f} + \frac{2*\alpha}{J_f}}{s^2 + \frac{2*\alpha*B_f}{J_f} + \frac{2*\beta^2*B_f*J_k}{J_f} + \frac{2*\beta*B_f}{J_f}} = 0 \] (54)

Having introduced the augmented state, a small amount of \( ki \) is needed to bring one of the loci away from the origin. An extremely large \( ki \) could result in an unstable system as shown in Fig. 6. It is important to emphasize that \( ki \) is needed to eliminate any steady state error that may arise in the system.

Assuming \( u2 = 0.0 \) and \( \theta_{ref} = 0.0 \), the steady state error due to a constant disturbance \( Lo \) can be shown to be
\[ e_{ky} = (-B_r \cdot L_0) / (J_r \cdot k_r \cdot k_t). \] (55)

For dependence of the eigenvalues of \([A33 + B3 \cdot K]\) on \(kv\), equation (51) can be rewritten as
\[ \begin{eqnarray*}
1 + \frac{kv \cdot (c \cdot s^2 + e \cdot s + f)}{s^2 + a \cdot s + b \cdot s^2 + d \cdot s} = 0
\end{eqnarray*} \] (56)

\(kv\) must be nonzero to remove one of the nondecaying modes which physically corresponds to the saturating flywheel. Figure 7 shows, however, that control \(kv\) should not be too large or else the response could become largely oscillatory. This suggests a narrow band control for the desaturation of the flywheel angular velocity.

Note that each root locus is drawn qualitatively based on the number of poles and zeros of equation (54) and equation (56).

Using pole placement method, equation (51) can be used to find the gains \(kp\), \(kd\), \(ki\), and \(kv\). This may involve solving nonlinear equations because of cross terms between some of the gains.

A simpler and easier alternative is to solve for the more dominant gains \(kp\) and \(kd\) by first assuming \(ki\) and \(kv\) to be zero in equation (51). The desired locations of the poles are assigned and the following second-order equation:
\[ s^2 \left( \frac{c + \alpha}{J_s} + \frac{2 \cdot \beta \cdot kd}{J_s} + \frac{2 \cdot \alpha}{J_f} \right) s + \frac{2 \cdot \alpha \cdot ku}{J_s \cdot J_f} + \frac{2 \cdot \beta \cdot kp}{J_s} = 0 \] (57)

is then used to solve for \(kp\) and \(kd\). Once \(kp\) and \(kd\) are computed, values for \(ki\) and \(kv\) can be assigned and equation (51) can be checked for all the four poles of the truncated dynamic system.

This simplification is reasonable and possible for two reasons.

1. From the root locus diagrams, it is inferred that \(ki\) and \(kv\) should be small to avoid large oscillatory behavior.

2. The primary control action would come from the effect of \(kp\) and \(kd\), whereas \(kv\) is supposed to modulate the flywheel angular velocity and \(ki\) is supposed to remove steady-state disturbances.

4 Implementation of Discrete Time PID Control With Constant Desaturation of Flywheel Angular Velocity

The PID control with constant desaturation of the flywheel angular velocity designed in the continuous time domain is implemented by discretizing the controller with a backward rectangular approximation (BRA). A 1/3 second sampling time is found to be sufficient since the azimuth point system is a slow responding system. Several ad hoc schemes are also incorporated into the full implementation of the azimuth pointing system.

A "bang-off" control with the RCUBE is used for coarse azimuth pointing. The objective is to prevent the flywheel from being accelerated to large angular velocity during large initial error. If the bang-on flag is "on" and if the computed error is larger than some preset band, then the RCUBE torque motor is driven with a constant voltage until the azimuth error falls within the preset band. Azimuth control is then switched over to the reaction wheel system.

The desaturation control, eq. (41), is implemented with an offset grbase, i.e.,
\[ u_2 = grbase + kv \cdot (\omega - \omega_{ref}). \] (58)

while a constant voltage gvolt is sent out to the gear motor. The magnitude of gvolt should be sufficient to maintain constant rotation of the bearing housing such that equation (14) or equation (15) is realized.

The polarity of each of the three quantities grbase, gvolt and \(\omega_{ref}\) are also assigned accordingly to insure the following conditions:

a) that the direction of the reference flywheel velocity \(\omega_{ref}\) corresponds to a preferred natural direction of rotation of the flywheel angular velocity;

b) that grbase and gvolt have opposite polarity so that the RCUBE torque motor produces torque to counter the Coulomb friction torque brought about by driving the RCUBE gear motor with a constant gvolt (see equation (17)).

(3) As a slight deviation from normal integral control, sampling time is not multiplied into summed errors. This affects only the effective value of the gain \(ki\). Maximum integrated command is limited in magnitude to 5 V.

(4) The effective command \(u_1\) is limited to 8.5 V absolute. This value is based on the actual hardware saturation level.

An Intel 80186 based computer with 8087 math processor is used to implement the controller. Azimuth angle information is derived from a strapdown inertial navigation unit called the Attitude Reference Unit (ARU).

5 Results of Azimuth Pointing for PID Control With Constant Desaturation of Flywheel Angular Velocity

Opportunities to fly the gondola are limited. Ground test provides verification of the effectiveness of the azimuth pointing. However, ground test conditions cannot duplicate flight conditions. Disturbance due to electrical cables hanging off the gondola, wind shear, type of hanging configurations affects the azimuth response. These disturbances are more significant during the transient part of the response.

The effectiveness of the azimuth controller is judged in terms of the steady state azimuth pointing performance and steady state maintenance of the flywheel angular velocity below saturation. In this regard, simulation, ground test and flight results show that these two criteria have been satisfied.

The following control parameters are used: \(kp = 1174, kd = 894, ki = 10 \cdot 3.0, kv = 0.03 \cdot 9.55, \) lmbangl = 4.0; \(|gvolt| = 2.0 V, |grbase| = 1.6 V, \omega_{ref} = 70 \text{ rpm} \) during ground test and flight; \(\omega_{ref} = 80 \text{ rpm} \) for simulation. The gains \(kp\) and \(kd\) are computed by using the dominant poles \(-1.25 \text{ s}^{-1} \pm 1.25 \text{ s}^{-1}\) for equation (57). \(ki\) and \(kv\) are assigned accordingly.

In the following results, a trapezoidal scan trajectory is superimposed over the azimuth trajectory of a target. Slewing between scan points is conditioned by dividing large steps into many smaller steps. This is done to prevent saturating the azimuth controller which could result in unwanted transients.

Figure 8 shows a simulation result for azimuth tracking with scanning for the PID control. Steady state azimuth pointing rms is better than 0.01 deg. The flywheel velocity is maintained at around \(-56 \text{ rpm} \). Steady-state values for \(u_1\) and \(u_2\) are also of the same polarities indicating assistive production of torques. Coulomb friction settled at one direction except during the initial transients due to large slewing.

For the following two results, the values of control \(u_1\) and \(u_2\) and the flywheel angular velocity are recorded every 30 sampling loop due to limitations in the telemetry channels. Pointing performance in terms of the error average and error rms are quoted for each scan segment.

Figure 9 shows a ground test result for azimuth tracking with scanning for PID control. Steady state azimuth pointing rms is better than 0.02 deg for each scan segment. Flywheel velocity is maintained at around 60 rpm. Again the steady-state values of the control \(u_1\) and \(u_2\) have the same polarities. The magnitude of \(u_2\) is higher than that obtained with simulation indicating larger magnitude of friction disturbance.

Figure 10 shows a flight result for azimuth tracking with scanning for PID control. Steady state azimuth pointing rms is better than 0.02 deg for each scan segment. Flywheel velocity...
is maintained at around -85 rpm. \( u_1 \) and \( u_2 \) again producing assistive torque.

Results from the ground test and first flight show the same characteristic responses as that obtained during simulation.

Conclusions

Modeling of the azimuth pointing system of a balloon borne stabilized platform is presented. This model is successfully used for designing a PID control with constant desaturation of the flywheel angular velocity. Simulation results, ground test results, and actual flight results show that the controller can achieve the two control objectives of the azimuth pointing system, i.e., primary goal of achieving steady-state pointing rms of better than 0.1 deg and secondary goal of maintaining the flywheel angular velocity below saturation to provide for continuous operation of the azimuth pointing system. Azimuth pointing rms is generally better than 0.02 deg and during flight 0.01 deg rms was achieved.

Model Reference Adaptive Control for the same azimuth pointing system has also been successfully developed and implemented. Results will be presented elsewhere.
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