On path planning for obstacle avoidance: comparison between two finite element approaches
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Abstract: - When an obstacle suddenly appears in the trajectory of a vehicle a path has to be designed in real time to avoid the collision. A vast number of path planning methods for ground vehicles have been proposed until now. A comparative evaluation of the different methods is necessary to illustrate their advantages and disadvantages and ease their selection. In this paper, two different finite element formulations for collision avoidance are presented and compared for a case study, which is used in the literature as a benchmark. Conclusions regarding the performance of the methods are drawn.
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1 Introduction

The main cause of road fatalities is human errors in decision making and handling of the vehicle while driving. Further research and development in Advanced Driver Assistance Systems like Lane Keeping and Collision Avoidance Systems has the potential to bring the total number of road fatalities close to zero [1]. A core module for both systems is the path planner. A path has to be designed in real time to avoid the collision and remain within the road boundaries. The path has to be designed in such a way to satisfy vehicle’s maneuverability requirements. Although many approaches have been proposed until now there is still lack of a flexible methodology which can satisfy all the above requirements ([2]-[7]).

Gray et al investigated the performance of a point mass path planner and concluded that the trajectory generated, although real-time capable, was not always feasible [8]. The lower level tracking controller could not follow the planned path and obstacle collisions were observed in conditions where the obstacle could have been avoided. Thus, they proposed a path planner based on motion primitives that respect a priori the vehicle dynamics constraints. The main drawback is that motion primitives aren’t suitable for complex driving scenarios where arbitrary boundary conditions may hold.

The main reason for which a planned path becomes intractable is because it violates the maneuverability limits of the vehicle. This happens mainly for two reasons (a) the commanded -by the control law- tire forces are too large with respect to the available tire-road friction and/or actuator dynamics and (b) the dynamics of the planned path and the actual vehicle states when path tracking starts have a large discrepancy.

Collision avoidance paths are essentially time optimal two point boundary value problems and thus -from Guidance point of view- should satisfy Pontryagin’s Maximum Principle (PMP) [9]. In order to apply the PMP a tire-road friction estimator like the one in [10] is necessary.

Reference [11] has developed, based on PMP, a flexible methodology that could plan obstacle avoidance paths for any vehicle model, however nonlinear it is. The main disadvantage of the method was the computational cost and thus the hardness to meet the real time requirements. In an effort to reduce the computational effort a neural network methodology has been proposed [12]. The neural network was able to plan collision avoidance paths and was real time capable. However, it performed well only in cases for which it has been trained. It was lacking the flexibility to address complex driving scenarios, as one may experience in real life.

In this context, a finite element path planning method which can cope with complex scenarios and arbitrary boundary conditions has been developed.
and proposed in [13]. The method decomposes the path in finite standardized segments which are then glued to each other in the same sense as in the direct finite element method. The method can handle complex scenarios and is real time capable.

In this paper, two different formulations of the finite element path planning method are presented and compared. The main driver for it is to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of each method and thus ease the selection. This work is – to our knowledge- performed for the first time. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Sections 2 and 3 the vehicle model used and the finite element formulation which recasts the dynamic optimization problem into a nonlinear algebraic one are discussed respectively. In Section 4 the two finite element formulations are evaluated and compared for different driving scenarios. In Section 5 conclusions and future research directions are drawn.

2 Mathematical model

2.1 Vehicle model and model based constraints

Since a very detailed vehicle model can be difficult to obtain and use, the method described in this paper makes use of a model that approximates vehicle motion. Furthermore, it is assumed that the vehicle is equipped with an Electronic Stability Control (ESC) system, such as the one described in [14]. Furthermore, we assume that the ESC system utilizes the same limit $r_{max}$ as the path tracking system. This effectively means that any commanded yaw rate $r_{des} > r_{max}$ will cause ESC’s system activation and thus bring the vehicle from a path tracking to a stability mode.

The two track vehicle model (TTVM), shown in Figure 1, is employed to derive the equations of motion described by forward velocity $u_f$, lateral velocity $v$ and yaw rate $r$ [15].

For simplification reasons shock absorbers and suspension springs are neglected. Also neglected are roll angle, steer angle and roll axis inclination which are assumed small enough. Effects of additional steer angles due to suspension kinematics and steer compliance are ignored [15]. The equations of motion, Eq. (1)-(3), are:

$$m \cdot (v + r \cdot u_f) = \sum F_x = F_{x_1} \cdot \delta + F_{x_2}$$

(1)

$$I \cdot \dot{r} = \sum M = a \cdot F_{x_1} - b \cdot F_{x_2}$$

(2)

$$m \cdot (v + r \cdot u_f) = \sum F_x = F_{x_1} \cdot \delta + F_{x_2}$$

(3)

Vehicle velocities and in the global coordinate system O(X,Y) are a function of local velocities and (expressed in the vehicle coordinate system o(x,y) and angle (shown in Figure 1). The vehicle’s trajectory $(X, Y)$, expressed in the global coordinate system, is:

$$X = \int \dot{X} \cdot \cos \psi \cdot dt$$

(4)

$$Y = \int \dot{Y} \cdot \sin \psi \cdot dt$$

(5)

where $T$ is the maneuvering time.

Vehicle’s yaw rate $r$ is limited either because of the available tire-road friction or because of stability reasons. In the first case, the yaw rate limit $r_{max}$ results from Equation (2):

$$a_y = \dot{v} + u_f \cdot r \leq a_{y,max} = \mu \cdot m \cdot g \Rightarrow$$

$$r_{max} = \frac{c_0 \cdot \mu \cdot m \cdot g}{u_f}$$

(6)

where $g$ is the gravitational acceleration and $c_0 \in [0.85, 0.95]$ a coefficient compensating the influence of vehicle slip angle $\beta$ which is omitted in calculations [16]. In Table 1 the vehicle parameters used in the study are listed.

Table 1 Vehicle parameters.
2.1 Tire model and yaw rate limit

Tire forces are mathematically described using the well-known Magic Formula model. For pure side slip \( \alpha_s \), the tire’s lateral force \( F_y \) is:

\[
F_y(\alpha_s) = D \cdot \sin \left( C \cdot \tan \left( B \cdot \alpha_s - E \cdot (B \cdot \alpha_s - \arctan(B \cdot \alpha_s)) \right) \right)
\]

where \( \alpha_s = \tan(\alpha) \) is the slip angle, \( D = \mu \cdot F_z \) the peak value, \( C \) the shape factor, \( B = \frac{F_{ez}}{C \cdot D} \) the stiffness factor and \( E \) the curvature factor. A graphical illustration of lateral force \( F_y \) versus slip angle \( \alpha \) for four different normal loads is shown in Figure 2. We denote with \( \alpha_{max}(\mu, F_z) \) the tire slip angle for which the lateral force is maximized \( F_{y_{\text{max}}} \). In Table 2 the tire parameters used in the study are listed.

Tire slip angles \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \) on front and rear wheels are considered small (\( \sin \alpha_i \approx \alpha_i \)) and expressed as:

\[
\alpha_1 = \delta - \frac{1}{u_f} \cdot (v + a \cdot r)
\]

\[
\alpha_2 = -\frac{1}{u_f} \cdot (v - b \cdot r)
\]

where \( \delta \) is the steer angle. We assume equal slip angles at both left and right wheels (\( \alpha_{l_i} = \alpha_{r_i} = \alpha_i \) and \( \alpha_{l_2} = \alpha_{r_2} = \alpha_2 \)) which is a valid assumption when \( l \cdot |r| \ll u_f \).

### Table 2 Tire parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle mass</td>
<td>( m ) [kg]</td>
<td>1727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from ground to CG</td>
<td>( h ) [m]</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moment of inertia - to x axis</td>
<td>( I_z ) [kgm²]</td>
<td>2877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halflength of the wheel axle</td>
<td>( l ) [m]</td>
<td>0.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance of front axle from cog</td>
<td>( a ) [m]</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Equation (8) and (9) and assuming -for simplification reasons - that velocity \( v \) is negligible we get respectively:

\[
\delta_{\text{max}} = \alpha_{\text{max}} + \frac{1}{u_f} \cdot a \cdot r
\]

\[
\alpha_{\text{max}} = -\frac{1}{u_f} \cdot \left( v - b \cdot r_{\text{max}} \right) \Rightarrow r_{\text{max}} = \frac{\alpha_{\text{max}} \cdot u_f}{b}
\]

The minimum of yaw rate limits \( r_{\text{max},0} \), and \( r_{\text{max},2} \) is denoted as \( r_{\text{max}} = \min(r_{\text{max},1}, r_{\text{max},0}) \). By implementing a constraint on the maximum yaw rate and maximum tire slip angle we indirectly define a maximum value for the vehicle slip angle.

3 Finite Element Formulation

In this study, two finite element formulations – a third and a second order - are compared. Due to the fact that the first one has been discussed in detail in [13], only the second is presented, in this paper.

3.1 Second order Finite Element Formulation

A schematic of the approach is shown in Figure 3. The total path is decomposed in \( N \) finite elements/segments. Each finite element is denoted with a number \( n=1 \ldots N \), and has two nodes: the start node \( \mathbf{n}_a \) and end node \( \mathbf{n}_b \). The EP is constructed by joining end node \( \mathbf{n}_b \) and start node \( (\mathbf{n+1})_a \) of two consecutive finite elements \( \mathbf{n} \) and \( \mathbf{n+1} \), for \( n=1 \ldots N-1 \).
Each finite element is parameterized using two variables: time span $t_{n,\text{span}}$ and the highest order constrained state variable. Time span $t_{n,\text{span}}$ may be uniformly chosen by decomposing the total maneuvering time in $n$ segments or by considering other parameters such as change of tire-road friction coefficient $\mu$ and road curvature. In this formulation, angular acceleration is the highest order constrained state variable and assumed constant in each segment for $t_n \in [0, t_{n,\text{span}}]$. In this context, angular velocity $\dot{\theta}_n$ and position $\theta_n$ are:

\begin{align}
\dot{r}_n &= a_{2n} \quad (12) \\
r_n &= \int_0^{t_{n,\text{span}}} \dot{r}_n \cdot dt = a_{2n} \cdot t + a_{1n} \quad (13) \\
\theta_n &= \int_0^{t_{n,\text{span}}} r_n \cdot dt = 0.5 \cdot a_{2n} \cdot t^2 + a_{1n} \cdot t + a_{0n} \quad (14)
\end{align}

where $t_n \in [0, t_{n,\text{span}}]$.

The finite element matrix $A_n$ constitutes the basis for joining subsequent elements and deriving the system’s solution. For a detailed description the reader is referred to [13].

3.2 Solution methodology

The path is decomposed in $N=3$ uniform finite elements with the same time span $t_{n,\text{span}}$. The EP is computed by solving the following linear system of equations:

\begin{align}
y_{bc} &= A \cdot x_u \\
y_{bc} &= [r_{1,\text{ades}}, \theta_{1,\text{ades}}, \ldots, r_{n,\text{ades}}, \theta_{n,\text{ades}}] \\
x_u &= [a_{21}, a_{11}, a_{01}, \ldots, a_{2n}, a_{1n}, a_{0n}] \\
\sum_{i=1}^{N} t_{i,\text{span}} &= T
\end{align}

where $y_{bc}$ is the vector of boundary conditions, $x_u$ is the vector of unknown coefficients and $A$ the system’s matrix.

Vectors $x_u$ and $y_{bc}$, as well as system matrix $A$, are formed by joining subsequent elements. In particular, we use the desired conditions at beginning ($t=0$) and end ($t=T$) of the EP:

- $r(t=0) = r_{1,\text{ades}}$ and $\theta(t=0) = \theta_{1,\text{ades}}$
- $r(t=T) = r_{N,\text{ades}}$ and $\theta(t=T) = \theta_{N,\text{ades}}$

To assemble system matrix $A$ we use the continuity equations between subsequent elements

\begin{align}
r_{n,b} &= r_{n+1,a} \quad \theta_{n,b} = \theta_{n+1,a}
\end{align}

and the desired lateral displacement $y_{\text{des}}$ at the end ($t=T$) of the EP:

\begin{align}
\sum \delta Y_n &= y_{\text{des}}
\end{align}

where $\delta Y_n$ is the lateral displacement of a finite element:

\begin{align}
\delta Y_n &= \int_0^{t_{n,\text{span}}} u_f \cdot \sin(\theta_n) \cdot dt \approx u_f \cdot \int_0^{t_{n,\text{span}}} \theta_n \cdot dt
\end{align}

\begin{align}
\delta Y_n &= \left( \frac{1}{6} \cdot a_{2n} \cdot t_n^3 + \frac{1}{2} \cdot a_{1n} \cdot t_n^2 + a_{0n} \cdot t_n \right) \cdot u_f
\end{align}
In Equation (22) the incremental lateral displacement $\delta Y_n$ is linearized by assuming $\sin(\theta_n) \approx \theta_n$. The proposition is valid only for small angles $\theta_n \leq 5^\circ$. For larger angular displacement $\theta_n$ the path has to be decomposed into a greater number of finite elements.

It is obvious that different path decomposition would lead to a different system matrix $A$ and subsequently a different solution. Actually, there are infinite EPs that satisfy the boundary conditions and that can be computed using the FE method. This is exactly the reason why we are interested in comparing the two different formulations.

4 Numerical results

The finite element formulations have been tested for an extensive number of driving scenarios in Matlab simulation environment. The numerical examples are based on the vehicle data listed in Table 1 and tire parameters listed in Table 2. One driving scenario which highlights their features is presented and discussed.

In the scenario considered it is assumed that the vehicle moves in a straight line road segment with a speed $u_f = 30 \text{ m/s}$. The road surface is dry $\mu = 1$ and an obstacle at distance $d = 54 \text{ m}$ suddenly appears in its direction of travel. To avoid the collision the vehicle has to displace laterally by $Y_{des} = 3 \text{ m}$.

We solve the problem by decomposing the path in uniform road segments and apply the solution methodology described in the previous section and in [13]. The numerical results using the second order finite element methods are shown in Figs 4-6, while those with the 3rd order method in Figs 7-9.

5 Conclusions

When an obstacle suddenly appears in the trajectory of a vehicle a path has to be designed in real time to avoid the collision. A vast number of path planning methods for ground vehicles have been proposed until now. A comparative evaluation of the different methods is necessary to illustrate their advantages and disadvantages and ease their selection. In this paper, two different finite element formulations for collision avoidance are presented and compared for a case study.
A finite element (FE) method has been developed based on a reformulation of Pontryagin’s Maximum Principle to plan collision avoidance-time optimal paths. Two different formulations, which differ in the order of approximation, have been presented and evaluated in this study for a typical collision avoidance scenario.

From the numerical results it becomes clear that both methods a) improve the path dynamics compared to the solution obtained with a uniform time mesh and b) satisfy the maneuverability requirements of the vehicle with respect to the maximum admissible yaw rate. However, the methods differ in the achievable maximum acceleration and maximum jerk. In the 2nd order method the maximum acceleration is smaller (44%) compared to the one obtained with the 3rd order method. However, the angular jerk is infinite which is negative in terms of comfort. Furthermore, if an active steering system is used to guide the vehicle it is a wrong assumption since the steering dynamics isn’t negligible. In case a differential braking system is used then it is an acceptable solution.

In the future the design of collision avoidance paths should become standard and available through the communication protocols between vehicles. The development of a simple but powerful method like the one presented in this paper is considered to be a contribution in this direction.
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