ACTIVE EXHAUST SILENCING SYSTEM FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF AUXILARY POWER UNIT SOUND SIGNATURES

Ryan Helminen
Project Engineer
Great Lakes Sound & Vibration
Houghton, MI

Kevin Nelson
Project Engineer
Great Lakes Sound & Vibration
Houghton, MI

Steve Mattson
President
Great Lakes Sound & Vibration
Houghton, MI

Darin Kowalski
TARDEC

ABSTRACT

We propose a system for the active cancellation of exhaust sound power where the desired outcome is a compact and lightweight solution to reduce exterior noise levels to inaudible operation at 20 meters. We have identified two challenges in developing this solution. The first is the integration of COTS technology to provide the signal processing for the active system, and the second is the development of a novel noise source and sensors which can withstand the extreme environment within a vehicle exhaust.

INTRODUCTION

Auxiliary power units (APU) offer potential to improve operational efficiency and provide significant tactical advantage for surveillance missions conducted from land vehicle platforms. Current installations have resulted in higher than acceptable noise levels, adversely impacting the ability to perform a "silent" watch. In particular, noise created by the combustion process presents a problem due to its relatively low frequency. Low frequency noise propagates efficiently through the atmosphere resulting in audible detectability at unacceptable range. Low frequency noise can be reduced using passive silencing techniques, but these devices are typically large and heavy and present objectionable integration burdens.

In the first section of this paper, the theory of noise cancellation within a duct will be discussed. An ideal noise source will be analyzed, but considerations will be made for different boundary conditions. A series of Finite Element models of an idea system will be presented which help to establish the expected maximum performance capabilities of an active system, as well as identifying significant features of the system, such structural and acoustic resonances. A model for the noise source will also be shown, and the importance of various features in the model will be considered.

In the second section, two separate control algorithms will be analyzed. The two algorithms can be classified as a 'broad band' approach and a 'narrow band' approach, respectively. The relative benefits and problems associated with each method will be discussed, and data will be presented on the relative effectiveness of both. Finally, the performance of the system on an idealized lab source and a small engine will be compared though recorded data.

THEORY OF SOUND CANCELLATION IN A DUCT

The goal of an active noise cancellation system is to find a pressure field to be injected into an exhaust duct which destructively interferes with the downstream traveling source wave. This produces a net quieting effect at the exhaust port. This approach is complicated by the impedance mismatches at the source, injection site, and exhaust port which cause multipath reflections. These reflections superimpose with the primary waves traveling in pipe and must be taken into account by the canceling system.

An ideal model for the system is necessary to develop in order to analyze the system behavior. To develop a model, a similar approach to [1] is taken. Two conceptual mass-less pistons are introduced into the system before and after the injection site, such that they will move exactly with the plane wave particle velocity fluctuations associated with

	Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188

Report Documentation Page

1. REPORT DATE **03 JUL 2014**	2. REPORT TYPE **Journal Article**	3. DATES COVERED **04-02-2014 to 10-06-2014**

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE **ACTIVE EXHAUST SILENCING SYSTEM FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF AUXILARY POWER UNIT SOUND SIGNATURES**	5a. CONTRACT NUMBER
	5b. GRANT NUMBER
	5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER
6. AUTHOR(S) **Ryan Helminen; Kevin Nelson; Steve Mattson; Darin Kowalski**	5d. PROJECT NUMBER
	5e. TASK NUMBER
	5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) **Great Lakes Sound & Vibration,47140 N. Main Street,Houghton,Mi,49931**	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER **; #25262**
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) **U.S. Army TARDEC, 6501 East Eleven Mile Rd, Warren, Mi, 48397-5000**	10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) **TARDEC**
	11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) **#25262**

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT **Approved for public release; distribution unlimited**

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES **For 2014 NDIA GROUND VEHICLE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY SYMPOSIUM POWER & MOBILITY (P&M) TECHNICAL SESSION AUGUST 12-14, 2014 - NOVI, MICHIGAN**

14. ABSTRACT

We propose a system for the active cancellation of exhaust sound power where the desired outcome is a compact and lightweight solution to reduce exterior noise levels to inaudible operation at 20 meters. We have identified two challenges in developing this solution. The first is the integration of COTS technology to provide the signal processing for the active system, and the second is the development of a novel noise source and sensors which can withstand the extreme environment within a vehicle exhaust.

15. SUBJECT TERMS

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT **unclassified**	b. ABSTRACT **unclassified**	c. THIS PAGE **unclassified**	**Public Release**	**7**	

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98)
Prescribed by ANSI Std Z39-18

either the primary source or the injected source. It is assumed that the pistons are 'close' together relative to the wavelength of the wave, that the pipe is anechoicly terminated on either end, and that the injection source has infinite internal acoustic impedance. This model is then analyzed for an understanding of exactly how injecting flow into the middle of a duct affects the pressure and velocity fields within the duct.

The behaviors that are derived in this ideal system are valid in the real system because the additional effects created by the source are (mostly) linear, so superposition holds.

When flow is forced into the left side of the pipe by the primary source, it causes both pistons to move identically. The pressures induced by the flow on the pistons do not affect the flow generated by the injection source because of the infinite impedance of the injection source. This amounts to assuming that when the cancelling is not active, it does not affect the flow or pressures in the duct.

When flow is injected between the pistons, they will move in opposite directions in equal magnitudes. By plotting the pressure and velocity fields from the outside of each piston, it can be seen that the pressure field will always be continuous, but that the velocity field exhibits a discontinuity. The magnitude of the discontinuity is proportional to the flow injected between the pistons.

In the upstream pipe, the pressure p(x) and particle velocity u(x) within the pipe can be written as follows. Let $U(y_+)$ be the movement of the right hand piston, and $U(y_-)$ be the movement of the left hand piston, be the volume velocity of the gas particles in the pipe, and S be the surface area of the injecting source. ρ_0, c_0, and k are the density of air, speed of sound, and wave number.

$$p(x) = \rho_0 c_0 U(y_+)e^{-jk(x-y)}$$
$$u(x) = U(y_+)e^{-jk(x-y)} \qquad (1)$$

and that downstream, the following is true:

$$p(x) = -\rho_0 c_0 U(y_-)e^{jk(x-y)}$$
$$u(x) = U(y_-)e^{jk(x-y)} \qquad (2)$$

and finally, by recognizing that the velocity of the pistons is dependent on the injected flow in the following manner. Let q(y) be the volume velocity injected into the pipe.

$$U(y_+) = -U(y_-) = q(y)/2S \qquad (3)$$

Combining these observations, equations of motion of the particles within the system can be derived. Then, the pressure field in the pipe can be written as follows.

$$p(x) = q(y)\frac{\rho_0 c_0 e^{-jk|x-y|}}{2S} \qquad (4)$$

This important equation describes how the pressure field within the pipe is related to the injected volume velocity. Given a source model and the pressure already within the pipe, it is now possible to understand how the injecting source must act to produce a canceling effect. Note that the factor of 2 in the denominator of equation (4) comes from the injected volume velocity splitting such that half the velocity flow flows upstream, and the other half downstream.

Injecting Source Model

Once the relationship between the injected velocity volume and pressures in pipe is understood, it is necessary to develop a model of how the injecting source produces the velocity volume. The injecting source is assumed to be a second order mass-spring-dampener system with an attached mass-less piston. This is a good model to choose because it correlates well with data at low frequencies and because it lends itself well to analysis. More accurate higher order models would require computer simulation.


Figure 1: Circuit representation of injecting source

The dynamic model of the injecting source can be written in the following equation. Let M be the mass, C be the mechanical damping, and K be the spring constant of the source. F is the applied force on the source, most likely from an electromagnetic coil and x is the position of the mass/spring/damper/piston.

$$M\ddot{x} + C\dot{x} + \frac{1}{2}\rho_0 c_0 S\dot{x} + Kx = F \qquad (5)$$

Active Exhaust Silencing System For The Management Of Auxiliary Power Unit Sound Signatures, Helminen, et al.

Page 2 of 7

In (5), there is an additional term which does not appear in the standard mass spring damper model. This term $(\rho_0 c_0 S\dot{x})$ is called the acoustic coupling term and describes how energy is transferred from the mechanical system into the acoustic domain. Note that it is a damping term, being proportional to $\dot{x}$ and that it depends upon the area of the source, which checks with intuition.

This acoustic coupling term is derived by looking at equations (3) and (4) and knowing that the velocity volume is related to the motion of the source piston by the following equation.

$$\dot{x} = \frac{q(y)}{S} \qquad (6)$$

By combining equations (3), (4), and (6) and evaluating at the point x=y=0 (where the interface to the piston exists), it can be shown that:

$$p(t) = \frac{\dot{x}\rho_0 c_0}{2} \qquad (7)$$

Finally, by using the definition of force $(F = p\,S)$, the acoustic coupling term can be derived (Where F_a is the force due to the acoustics pressures in the duct).

$$F_a(t) = \frac{1}{2}\rho_0 c_0 S\dot{x} \qquad (8)$$

This equation then becomes one of the terms in the dynamic model of the injected source.

CHOOSING AN INJECTING SOURCE

With a functioning injecting source model, it is possible to evaluate different source parameters to find a well behaved source for our expected pressures and frequencies.

There are several considerations to take into account when choosing an injecting source. The largest is that it must survive in exhaust temperature environments. While a loudspeaker would be ideal to use because it is already designed to transfer power from an electrical system into the acoustic domain, we are not aware of any speakers built with materials that could survive in such a hostile environment.

Instead, a mechanical bellows attached to an electro-mechanical shaker was chosen. A bellows has good properties because it can be made of high durability materials like stainless steel, and unlike a piston system, there is no sliding interface which could be a potential source of problems.

Limitations of the bellows/shaker system include the total power which can be produced by the shaker/electrical drive system and the total travel range of the shaker/bellows. Both of these constraints can be evaluated using the source model derived in the previous section.

Power transfer between the electrical and acoustic domains can also be characterized using this model. There are two real power sinks within the injection source, which are mechanical dampening and the acoustic coupling. Either energy will dissipate from the system as heat or acoustic radiation. Our goal is to pick a system such that the acoustic radiation term is dominant over the heat loss term.


Figure 2: Graph is for a 10cm diameter bellows. The green and blue lines represent real power loss in the acoustic and damping terms respectively. The red and gold lines represent the imaginary or reactive power in the spring and mass elements in the injection source model. The model is being excited with a unit force across the spectrum. Notice that approximately the same amount of power is lost to heat as is radiated acoustically.


Figure 3: Graph is for a 50 cm diameter bellows. Note that by increasing the bellows diameter, the acoustic radiated power begins to dwarf the power lost to heat. The system is predicted

Active Exhaust Silencing System For The Management Of Auxiliary Power Unit Sound Signatures, Helminen, et al.

Page 3 of 7

to operate better over a wider frequency range as well. These results are not entirely real, as the only parameter changed in the model was diameter – other parameters like bellows mass or stiffness were unchanged.

Figure 4: Example of mechanical bellows used as injecting source

MODELLING THE SYSTEM DYNAMICS

Once a bellows and shaker are picked out, they must be evaluated for performance. The maximum theoretical performance of the system should also be found, to compare against actual results.

To perform this analysis, a 3D vibro-acoustic finite element simulation is used from within a program named VA One. The physical model is set up in the program and a source representing the engine is attached to the exhaust manifold. The magnitude and phase of the pressure wave in pipe is measured at a sensor downstream of the injecting source, known as the cancelling point or error sensor.

The engine source is then disabled, and the force necessary to create a wave equal in magnitude but with a 180 degrees phase shift at the cancelling point is found. When both sources are active, these wave superimpose at the cancelling point producing a very low sound pressure level.


Figure 5: 3D vibro-acoustic model of canceling setup

Because of reflections occurring at each of the boundaries (engine manifold, injecting source, and outlet) the canceling effect is not constant with location downstream of the injecting source as one would expect. However the effect is still quite pronounced. To evaluate the effects that will be observed by any listeners, VA One is used to take a measurement located at an arbitrary distance away from the exhaust port in free space. This measurement is repeated both when the bellows force is enabled and disabled, and the difference is found. This value represents the maximum potential cancellation possible by the bellows system.


Figure 6: Canceling model results on an undisclosed engine at the canceling point in pipe.


Figure 7: Canceling model results on an undisclosed engine at the far field measurement point in free space.

Using this cancelling model, the forces applied to the bellows and the velocity of the bellows can also be measured. These must be below the rated specifications for the shaker/amplifier maximum force and the shaker/bellows maximum travel.

CANCELING ALGORITHM

There are many variations of adaptive algorithms, but they all center around two different types of iterative processes, which are filtering and adaptation.

Active Exhaust Silencing System For The Management Of Auxiliary Power Unit Sound Signatures, Helminen, et al.

The filtering process consists of a series of multiply and accumulate operations that occur between the discrete values of the incoming reference signal and the set of gains that represent the adaptive filter. There is also another process that compares the output of the filtering process with the desired signal d(k). The subtraction of y(k) from d(k) creates an error term which is then pass into the adaptation process.

The adaptation process uses a minimization function that alters the adaptive filter gains in order to minimize the value of the error term, e(k) such that y(k) approximates d(k). The type of minimization function separates adaptive algorithms into three general categories

- Newton
- Quasi-Newton
- Steepest Descent

Figure 8: Generic form of an adaptive filtering process. X(k) is referred to as the reference signal, d(k) is called the desired signal, y(k) is the output signal, and e(k) is the error signal.

When viewing Figure 8 it is helpful to understand what each of the signals represents. X(k) is called the *reference signal*. In the classic broadband active noise control (ANC) applications the reference signal is usually detected as a pressure wave being emitted from the *primary source* using a microphone. Y(k) is usually called the secondary signal because it gets directly routed to the *secondary source*, which is a noise generation device, usually a speaker.

One of the most popular adaptive algorithms is called the Least Mean Squares (LMS) algorithm. The objective function of the LMS algorithm is written as [2]

$$w(k + 1) = w(k) + \mu e(k)x(k) \qquad (9)$$

where

$$e(k) = d(k) - x(k) * w(k)$$
$$y(k) = x(k) * w(k) \qquad (10)$$

The reasons for the popularity of the LMS algorithm are many, including low computational complexity, stability when working with finite word lengths, and proven ability to converge in stationary environments [1].

In many ANC applications there isn't the ability to directly access the secondary signal, y(k). The diagram in Figure 8 must be modified to include what is known as a secondary path which resides between the output of the adaptive filter and the point where the signal e(k) is detected. Figure 9 shows the updated representation that is used.


Figure 9: Adaptive algorithm with y(k) being observed through secondary path

In order to account for the observation of y(k) through the secondary path the LMS algorithm must be slightly modified. As long as the secondary path is slowly time varying, it is possible to process the reference signal through the secondary path prior to passing it into the adaptive algorithm. In order to support this rearrangement an estimate of the secondary path transfer function must be obtained. The modified algorithm, also known as the Filtered-X Least Mean Squares (FXLMS) algorithm, is represented by the following set of equations:

$$w(k + 1) = w(k) + \mu e(k)x'(k) \qquad (11)$$

where

$$x'(k) = \hat{s}(k) * x(k) \qquad (12)$$

The FXLMS algorithm was chosen for the APU noise control application outlined in this paper.

IMPLEMENTATION

One of the downsides of the standard broadband approach using the FXLMS algorithm is the effects of feedback from the secondary source to the reference microphone. The secondary source emits sound in both the downstream and upstream traveling direction. The downstream traveling wave mixes with the primary wave in order to cancel it, but if the upstream traveling wave is not properly accounted for it can corrupt the signal that gets read at the reference microphone. In order to account for it, a representation of the feedback path must be correctly modeled so that the output of the secondary source can be processed through it

Active Exhaust Silencing System For The Management Of Auxiliary Power Unit Sound Signatures, Helminen, et al.

before being subtracted from the reference signal. This process becomes more difficult to handle in exhaust applications because of the fact that the feedback path is non-stationary and can vary significantly with engine load. The main driver affecting the variability of the feedback path is engine exhaust temperature, which has a significant effect on the speed of sound. If the error in the estimate of the feedback path becomes too large, poles can be introduced into the controller transfer function which can affect system stability [4]. There are several methods that can be used to alleviate this problem.

The problems described above were addressed by modifying the reference signal so that it is synthesized from a non-acoustic sensor. The non-acoustic sensor in our application was in the form of a tachometer signal. Since the reference signal is now synthesized, it adds the capability of only targeting the strong harmonic components that an engine usually emits. This simplifies the adaptive filter structure shown in Figure 9 to a set of two gains per target frequency. Figure 10 shows a pictorial representation of what is known as the adaptive notch algorithm.


Figure 10: The adaptive notch algorithm with FXLMS as the adaptive update mechanism.

In order to target multiple frequencies the adaptive notch algorithm can either be run in parallel or cascade form. Due to resource constraints on the hardware that was being used to implement the adaptive notch algorithm it was decided that the cascaded algorithm would be the best implementation approach. The modified algorithm is shown in Figure 11.


Figure 11: The cascaded adaptive notch algorithm.

Before the FXLMS algorithm can be used an estimate of the secondary path must first be obtained. Prior to attempting cancellation a learning process must first be performed. During this learning process white noise is played out of the secondary source while the LMS algorithm is used to alter the tap values of a 100 tap FIR filter that is used to represent the secondary path. After the learning process is complete the filter taps are saved for later use in the FXLMS algorithm.

The adaptive notch algorithm was implemented on the National Instruments CompactRIO data acquisition hardware. The bulk of the processing was synthesized onto the FPGA chip that is onboard the CompactRIO chassis.

Testing is currently being performed on a 205cc Briggs and Stratton engine with future plans of moving to the Marvin Land Systems Auxiliary Power Unit.

RESULTS

The preliminary engine noise cancellation results look very promising. When targeting the second third and fourth harmonics of the firing frequency an overall sound power level reduction of 12 dB at the targeted frequencies can be achieved. Attempting to include more harmonics for cancellation causes the secondary source to draw past its power limits and the system automatically shuts down.

Active Exhaust Silencing System For The Management Of Auxiliary Power Unit Sound Signatures, Helminen, et al.

Page 6 of 7

Figure 12: Adaptive notch cancellation performance targeting second, third, and fourth harmonics

Target Frequency	SPL Reduction
30 Hz (2nd Harmonic)	14 dB
45 Hz (3rd Harmonic)	12 dB
60 Hz (4th Harmonic)	12 dB

Table 1: Adaptive notch cancellation performance targeting second, third, and fourth harmonics


Figure 13: Adaptive notch phase compensation due to errors in estimate of firing frequency

LESSONS LEARNED

There were many practical aspects of ANC learned throughout the implementation of the adaptive notch algorithm. The biggest hurdle was implementing the full algorithm onto an FPGA chip. LabVIEW eases the process by allowing a graphical approach to the development, but there are still slight nuances that can have a huge effect on the ability of the code to execute correctly. For example, since the majority of the code can execute in parallel it is very important that the arbitration options are set correctly when reading and writing to block memory. If the arbitration is not set correctly it is possible to miss a write cycle due to memory access conflicts. Memory access conflicts do not show up in the simulation environment, so they can be very difficult to track down if one does not know what they are looking for. It was found that memory access was the major source of complications during the algorithm development process.

Some of the aspects of synthesizing a reference signal also caused issues early on in the project. Initially it was thought that in order to create a phase locked reference signal the phase drift between the synthesized reference and the primary signals would need to be reset every time a tachometer pulse was detected. The thought was that this would prevent the drift between the signals from getting too large. In reality the resetting of the phase at each tachometer pulse caused audible discontinuities in the control signal due to rollover effects that couldn't be compensated for using this approach. The final implementation leaves it to the adaptive notch algorithm to compensate for the buildup in phase error. This puts a lower bound on the size of the value of μ which is known as the step size of the algorithm. This phase compensation phenomenon can be seen as a circular pattern when plotting the gains for a specific frequency on a polar plot, this can be seen in Figure 13. If the step size of the algorithm becomes too small the gain polar plot will be noticeably off center.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Nelson , P.and Elliott, Active Control of Sound, Academic Press, 1992

[2] Kuo, S.M. and Morgan , D.R., Active Noise Control Systems Algorithms and DSP Implementations, John Wiley & Sons Inc, 1996

Active Exhaust Silencing System For The Management Of Auxiliary Power Unit Sound Signatures, Helminen, et al.

Page 7 of 7