Yong Hoon Lee¹

Member of ASME Department of Mechanical Engineering, The University of Memphis, Memphis, TN 38152 USA email: yhlee@memphis.edu

Saeid Bayat

Department of Naval Architecture & Marine Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109 USA email: saeidb@umich.edu

James T. Allison

Member of ASME Department of Industrial and Enterprise Systems Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801 USA email: jtalliso@illinois.edu

Md Sanower Hossain

Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, TX 75080 USA email: mdsanower.hossain@utdallas.edu

D. Todd Griffith

Member of ASME Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, TX 75080 USA email: tgriffith@utdallas.edu

Multidisciplinary Modeling and Control Co-Design of a Floating Offshore Vertical-Axis Wind Turbine System

This study investigates the modeling and design of a floating vertical-axis wind turbine (FloatVAWT) system with multidisciplinary design optimization (MDO) and control codesign (CCD) approaches. By integrating various associated disciplinary models, the study aims to holistically optimize the physical and control designs of the FloatVAWT system. Through the identification of impactful design elements and capitalizing on synergistic interactions, the study aims to provide insights to subsystem designers and aid their detailed decisions. The model developed for this CCD framework utilizes automated geometric manipulation and mesh generation to explore various FloatVAWT configurations during the early design stages. Surrogate models facilitate efficient design studies within limited computing resources by exchanging model information between disciplinary models and subsystems without requiring extensive simulations during the optimization loop. The model incorporates an aero-hydro-servo dynamic representation of the FloatVAWT system, considering physical and control constraints. Additionally, the study investigates the potential benefits of varying both the average and intracycle rotational speeds of the vertical-axis wind turbine (VAWT) rotor to enhance energy production and minimize adverse platform motions, thus reducing the levelized cost of energy (LCOE). System-level design solutions are analyzed to identify design trade-offs and propose mitigation strategies for potential mechanical failures of the rotor. In conclusion, this study provides modeling strategies for the FloatVAWT system and analyzes the system design solutions through MDO and CCD approaches. The outcomes of the study offer insights into systemoptimal solutions for subsystem-level decisions considering multidisciplinary couplings.

Keywords: floating offshore wind turbine (FOWT), vertical-axis wind turbine (VAWT), control co-design (CCD), intracycle RPM control, energy systems design, systems design, wind energy, multidisciplinary design analysis and optimization (MDAO)

1 Introduction

The untapped potential for offshore wind energy in the deepwater regions within the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) of the United States is substantial [1]. Tapping this potential demands the use of floating platforms, as fixed foundations are not viable with the water depths in these locations. The main obstacle to the economic deployment of floating offshore wind turbines (FOWTs) is the cost of a floating platform, which typically takes the most considerable portion of the total levelized cost of energy (LCOE) for FOWT designs [2]. Therefore, it is crucial to focus on developing cost-effective FOWTs, such as the floating vertical-axis wind turbine (FloatVAWT) concept [3], to address and overcome these challenges.

In recent years, there has been significant development in various general simulation and design codes for FOWTs, such as Open-FAST [4], QBlade [5], and WEIS [6]. In addition, aero-hydroservo models tailored for specific FOWT configurations have been developed and applied in various design studies [7–11]. However, only a limited number of codes have the capability for aero-hydroservo simulation and optimization with vertical-axis wind turbine (VAWT) configurations [12,13].

The inherent limited control authority of typical VAWT rotors has resulted in relatively few control studies in the literature [14,15]. These studies often introduce additional control degrees of freedom (DOFs), such as individual pitch control [16] or supplementary flapping wings behind the main rotor blades [17], which may not be universally applicable to all VAWT designs. Moreover, prior research on optimizing rotational speed of VAWT rotors has primarily focused on (1) providing structural damping to mitigate vibrations [18] or (2) finding optimal rated tip speed ratio (TSR) for blade designs with varied solidity values [19]. However, these studies do not account for continuous variations in rotational speed under transient wind conditions to maximize energy production.

Until recently, VAWTs have gained little attention as candidates for commercial-scale land-based wind turbines due to inherent disadvantages such as relatively lower efficiency, cyclic torque ripple, and dynamic stall characteristics [20,21]. However, when integrated into FOWT systems, VAWTs offer a notable advantage due to their lower vertical center of gravity (COG) [12]. This advantage makes VAWT particularly suitable for FOWT applications, and overall cost efficiency can be enhanced by minimizing the expenses associated with the floating platform.

In this paper, a tension-leg platform (TLP) design with three outer columns and one center column connected by three underwater pontoons is considered. The size and mass distribution of this configuration are optimized, along with control of the VAWT generator torque. With this framework, we solve the system-level control co-design (CCD) problem to achieve minimized LCOE and inform system-optimal solutions for subsystem-level decisions while maintaining hydrostatic stability for wet towing (without mooring system) and in-place hydrodynamic stability (with moor-

¹Corresponding Author.

This work was presented in part at the 50th ASME Design Automation Conference, Washington, DC, Aug. 26–28, 2024.



Fig. 1 Layout of the floating vertical-axis wind turbine.

ing system), considering multidisciplinary system couplings using multidisciplinary design optimization (MDO) approach [22]. This design optimization framework accommodates various system configurations through automated geometric manipulation and mesh generation of the TLP configuration and utilizes surrogate models in exchanging model information between subsystems to efficiently support design studies within limited computing resources.

Additionally, employing variable rotational speed within a single revolution of the VAWT rotor, known as intracycle RPM control, offers further enhancements in VAWT efficiency [14]. This previous research laid the groundwork for this study. Moreover, by considering intracycle RPM with continuous variations in average rotational speed under transient wind conditions, further efficiency improvement could be achieved. Our research demonstrates that optimizing both the intracycle RPM and the average rotational speed varying across a range of wind speeds can concurrently improve overall annual energy production (AEP) while reducing the potential mechanical failure of the rotor system through optimization. The system is optimized to minimize the LCOE, with the LCOE reduction in this study driven by optimized control, increased AEP, and minimized capital expenses of the floating system.

The novelty and innovation that this study contributes involve several key elements. First, the study presents the development of a highly efficient MDO-based CCD framework specifically tailored for TLP configuration VAWTs. This new CCD framework allows integration of holistic design exploration for VAWTs, which has been highly limited with existing aero-hydro-servo simulation codes. Furthermore, the simplified method developed to estimate time-averaged platform pitch motions, presented in Sect. 2.3, is the efficient proxy for platform motion approximation that is validated with simulation results and that is first-principles based. This novel approach simplifies computation in highly demanding design load case (DLC) explorations during early design stages. In addition, the study optimizes both the size and mass distribution of the TLP design along with the control scheme of the VAWT rotor, maintaining hydrostatic and hydrodynamic stabilities. Although CCD has been applied previously to various renewable energy systems, its application to VAWTs on floating platforms introduces unique challenges and opportunities because of the inherent dynamics of VAWTs and their interaction with floating platforms. The study highlights the integration of rotor control (intracycle RPM) with platform design, providing new insights into the coupling of plant and control variables for such configurations.

2 Methods

2.1 Structure of the Design Optimization Framework. The design framework for the FloatVAWT system, as an outcome of the FloatVAWT project [3] depicted in Fig. 1, is constructed to optimize the variables associated with both the floating platform plant and the rotor generator control. The optimization problem aims to achieve the lowest possible LCOE while satisfying all physical and control constraints. Figure 2 provides an extended design structure matrix (XDSM) [23] of the FloatVAWT system design problem structure.

The system optimizer drives the entire design problem by providing plant and control design candidates ($\mathbf{d}_{\text{plant}}$ and α_{ctrl}) to all disciplinary models. In this study, we used the COBYLA algorithm as the system optimizer [24]. This gradient-free algorithm is particularly advantageous for the system-level solution, as the platform solver illustrated in Fig. 2 involves an iterative process, which can sometimes produce non-smooth responses. The objective function, LCOE, is derived by dividing the estimated overall cost by the calculated AEP. Cost models for FOWT systems are typically complex, enompassing both capital and operating expenses, while also accounting for market prices and financial costs. However, in this study, the cost model is simplified by using the platform mass as a proxy to the cost. The AEP is calculated by the turbine energy production subsystem, based on steady state power production from the optimal rotor control solution, incorporating a probabilistic wind speed distribution. The optimal rotor control solutions provided to the system design problem is based on the intracycle RPM control surrogate model, trained separately to obtain the average power and the vector of thrust and lateral forces (Favg) for each wind speed among wind speed bins between cut-in and cut-out wind speeds. The training process of this surrogate model, presented in Fig. 3, uses the solutions for the intracycle RPM control problems.

The TLP design models are solved using a multidisciplinary analysis (MDA) solver. Particularly, achieving hydrostatic stability involves an iterative solution process where intermediate solutions do not provide insights for rotor and control disciplines. Consequently, the platform design segment is isolated using MDA structure, to solely deliver feasible platform design solutions to the system optimizer. The cost associated with the platform is assumed to vary linearly with the system mass, using a proprietary TLP design as a reference point. The hydrodynamic effect of the floating platform system provides the time-averaged platform pitch angle, which is used to calculate the effective wind speed perpendicular to the rotational axis of the VAWT rotor. This coupling implies that both the floating platform plant and rotor control designs impact the calculation of a proxy LCOE objective function. This proxy LCOE primarily accounts for capital expense related to the floating system and the annual energy production, rather than a comprehensive LCOE that encompasses all capital and operating expenses.

The subsystem modules depicted in Figs. 2 and 3 utilize turbine, platform, and metocean data as fixed inputs to define the specifications of the FloatVAWT system configuration. These predefined design specifications are outlined in YAML, a standardized data serialization format. This approach enhances the flexibility of the optimization framework, enabling it to accommodate diverse turbine scales, design configurations, and metocean conditions. By separating the input data into modular YAML files, users can easily modify specific components, such as turbine specifications or control strategies, without affecting other parts of the framework. For example, this structure allows users to swap turbine designs or compare CCD results of cases with varied control schemes by simply updating the relevant YAML files. Within exhaustive list of parameters provided by these YAML files, a subset of TLP plant parameters and control parameters can be chosen for design optimization.

The TLP design consists of three parts: geometry, hydrostatics, and hydrodynamics. The geometry model computes mass,



Fig. 2 Extended design structure matrix (XDSM) for system design problem structure of the floating vertical-axis wind turbine (FloatVAWT) optimization framework. The XDSM presented here is simplified representation and may not encompass all variables or connections.

vertical and radial centers of gravity, and mass moment of inertia (MOI) in roll, pitch, and yaw directions for each system component. This model uses platform design variables and fixed parameters, including dimensions, ballast design, mooring design, and platform draught configurations, along with turbine specification parameters. Hydrostatic simulations are performed for both inplace and wet tow conditions and provide hydrostatic stiffness matrix, metacentric height, and mooring line stiffness matrix. System dynamic simulation is performed using the aero-servo-hydro simulation model for the reference platform and turbine design [12]. Then, the time-averaged platform pitch motions for varied platform designs are estimated relatively using the variance of the floating platform hydrodynamic added mass matrix, assuming that the variances of hydrodynamic forces have linearly proportional correlations with the added mass variance for simplicity in computation.

2.2 Tension-Leg Platform Geometry and Mesh. The system cost model for FOWT primarily depends on the overall platform mass. Additionally, the hydrostatic and hydrodynamic coefficients are heavily influenced by the submerged platform shape, freeboard shape, and the distribution of mass within the system. Therefore, accurate representation of the system geometry and mass distribution is crucial for conducting CCD studies. Geometry and boundary element panel meshes of the TLP design used in this study are illustrated in Fig. 4. The structural components primarily consist of a cylindrical center column, cylindrical outer columns, and pontoons with rectangular cross-sections connecting the outer columns to the center column positioned at the bottom (keel) of the TLP structure. For computing hydrostatics and hydrodynamics of the system, meshes for the submerged portion of the platform for inplace and wet tow conditions need to be created. However, the freeboard (above the water line) portion of the platform must also be considered when computing mass, vertical and radial centers of gravity, and MOI for three rotational DOFs. Detailed methods for calculating these quantities are given in Appx. A.

2.3 Hydrostatics and Hydrodynamics. The hydrostatic stiffness matrix for a floating body is computed by integrating the

following equation over the immersed surface elements [25]:

$$C_{ij} = \rho g \iint_{S} \left(\hat{n} \cdot \text{DOF}_{j} \right) \left(w_{i} + z \nabla \cdot \text{DOF}_{i} \right) dS \tag{1}$$

where $DOF_i = u_i \hat{n}_x + v_i \hat{n}_y + w_i \hat{n}_z$ is DOF vector, u, v, w are DOF displacements in x, y, z directions, and \hat{n} is surface normal unit vector. The hydrostatic stiffness for in-place condition, given in Fig. 4(*b*), is directly used as a part of system stiffness to provide hydrostatic recovering force in the system dynamic equation.

The main purpose of computing hydrostatic stiffness matrix for wet tow condition, given in Fig. 4(c), is to ascertain if the Float-VAWT structure can be safely towed to the installation site without support of mooring line tension. As the system undergoes optimization, hydrostatic stability is assessed in terms of the metacentric height (GM), provided as a physical constraint in the systemlevel optimization formulation. GM is calculated as:

$$GM = \min(GM_x, GM_y)$$
(2*a*)

$$GM_x = -\frac{1}{V_{sm}} \int_S x^2 \, dS - \left(COG_{sys} - COB_{sys}\right) \tag{2b}$$

$$GM_y = -\frac{1}{V_{sm}} \int_S y^2 \, dS - \left(COG_{sys} - COB_{sys} \right), \qquad (2c)$$

where COB_{sys} is center of buoyancy of the system.

(

The hydrodynamic response of the baseline system design is calculated using the model developed and validated in Ref. [12] and serves as a reference point for determining the average platform pitching motion. The hydrodynamic responses of the perturbed designs are estimated through a combination of factors: (1) linear variation relative to the aerodynamic thrust and lateral forces and (2) a simplified estimation of amplitude difference using a massspring system with a combined system stiffness matrix, given as:



Fig. 3 XDSM for training the surrogate model for the intracycle RPM control component of the FloatVAWT optimization framework.



Fig. 4 Geometry and boundary element (panel) meshes of the TLP designed for the FloatVAWT system. (a) TLP geometry shown with in-place draught. (b) Panel mesh representing the in-place condition of the submerged portion of the TLP. (c) Panel mesh representing the submerged portion of the TLP in wet tow condition.

$$\Xi_{\text{avg,pitch}} = \Xi_{\text{avg,pitch}} \cdot \frac{F_{\text{thrust}}}{K_{\text{sys,pitch}}} \cdot \frac{K_{\text{sys,pitch}}}{E_{\text{thrust}}}, \qquad (3a)$$

$$\Xi_{\text{avg,roll}} = \Xi_{\text{avg,roll}}, \quad \frac{F_{\text{lateral}}}{K_{\text{sys,roll}}}, \quad \frac{K_{\text{sys,roll}}}{\frac{baseline}{F_{\text{lateral}}}}, \quad (3b)$$

where Ξ_{avg} is the average amplitude of the system motion, F_{thrust} and $F_{lateral}$ are aerodynamic thrust and lateral forces applied to the turbine, and K_{sys} is the combined system stiffness. This assumption disregards hydrodynamic damping and only considers hydrostatic stiffness and mooring line stiffness. This approach is validated against two system-optimal designs and three additional perturbed designs with full time-domain system dynamic simulations, as given in Fig. 5.

Mooring line stiffness, K_{moor} (6×6 matrix) is calculated as [26]:

$$K_{11} = K_{22} = \frac{\eta_{\text{leg}} F_{\text{pre}}}{L_{\text{leg}}} \tag{4a}$$

$$K_{33} = \frac{n_{\text{leg}}K_{\text{leg}}}{L_{\text{leg}}} \tag{4b}$$



Fig. 5 Validation of averaged hydrodynamic response prediction in platform pitch DOF.

$$K_{44} = K_{55} = n_{\text{leg}} \left(\frac{F_{\text{pre}} H_{\text{fair}}^2}{L_{\text{leg}}} + \frac{K_{\text{leg}} R_{\text{fair}}^2}{2L_{\text{leg}}} + F_{\text{pre}} H_{\text{fair}} \right)$$
(4c)

$$K_{66} = \frac{n_{\rm leg} F_{\rm pre} R_{\rm fair}^2}{L_{\rm leg}} \tag{4d}$$

Transactions of the ASME

4 / PREPRINT

$$K_{24} = K_{42} = \frac{n_{\text{leg}} F_{\text{pre}} H_{\text{fair}}}{L_{\text{leg}}} = -K_{15} = -K_{51},$$
(4e)

where n_{leg} is the number of tension legs, F_{pre} is the pretension force applied to each tension leg, L_{leg} is the length of the tension legs, K_{leg} is the lengthwise line stiffness of the tension legs, H_{fair} is the depth of the fairlead location under the platform DOF center, and R_{fair} is the offset radial distance of the fairlead from the center axis of the platform DOF center. Here, fairlead and tension leg dimensions are dependent on the TLP design by the following relationships, assuming that the system DOF center is located at the water surface:

$$L_{\rm leg} = H_{\rm water} - H_{\rm dr} \tag{5a}$$

$$H_{\text{fair}} = H_{\text{dr}} \tag{5b}$$

$$R_{\text{fair}} = L_{\text{pont}} + D_{\text{oc}} + \frac{D_{\text{cc}}}{2}$$
(5c)

where H_{water} is the water depth. As we did not change the rotor (tower and blade) design, the pressure center of the rotor remains the same and canceled out from this equation.

As the purpose of the system-level design problem is to provide design guidelines for detailed subsystem design decisions, detailed time-domain system dynamic simulations are not conducted during system-level optimization. The system dynamics of the candidate design is roughly estimated with the variances in hydrodynamic coefficients of the platform, system mass distribution, and aerodynamic loadings. Consequently, if the design solution is intended for later-stage practical applications, a thorough safety assessment must be additionally conducted, including the system dynamic simulations for international electrotechnical commission (IEC) design load cases (DLCs) for FOWT systems [27].

2.4 Intracycle RPM Control. The VAWT rotor system considered in this study has rotor rotational DOF about the axis perpendicular to the wind stream and also perpendicular to the water surface, as shown in the top part of Fig. 1. The aerodynamic characteristics of the VAWT rotor are obtained by using the CACTUS code [28] for varied wind speeds between cut-in and cut-out wind speeds.

Control over the rotational motion is achieved by regulating the generator torque. The aerodynamic properties of the VAWT rotor are analyzed using the CACTUS code over one revolution and across a range of wind speeds from cut-in to cut-out thresholds, i.e., 5 to 25 m/s. The aerodynamic properties obtained are in functions of the azimuth angle of the rotor (θ) . Surrogate models for these aerodynamic properties are constructed using two-dimensional cubic splines with full factorial sample points, similarly to Ref. [14]. The use of this surrogate model is to expedite the optimization process, rather than relying on direct access to the CACTUS code by the optimizer. The surrogate model was constructed following the procedure outlined in Ref. [14], and this approach was validated through comparisons with the actuator cylinder (AC2D) method. The list of aerodynamic properties used for solving the intracycle RPM control problem includes azimuth rate or rotational speed (ω) of the rotor, aerodynamic torque (T), aerodynamic thrust (F_{thrust}) and lateral (F_{lateral}) forces, and power (P). The VAWT rotor system optimal control problem formulation for a combination of given wind speed, α , and β values is given as:

$$\begin{array}{l} \underset{t_{f},\,\xi,\,u}{\text{minimize}} & -P_{\text{obj}} = -\int_{t_{0}}^{t_{f}} \frac{\left(\xi_{3}\left(t\right)\xi_{2}\left(t\right) - c_{1}\xi_{3}^{2}\left(t\right) - c_{2}u^{2}\left(t\right)\right)}{t_{f} - t_{0}}dt\\ \text{subject to} & \dot{\xi}\left(t\right) = \left[\xi_{2}\left(t\right), \ \frac{T\left(\xi_{2}\left(t\right),\xi_{1}\left(t\right)\right) - \xi_{3}\left(t\right)}{I_{zz,\text{rotor}}}, \ u\left(t\right)\right]\\ & \xi_{1}\left(t_{0}\right) = 0 \end{array}$$

$$\xi_{1}(t_{f}) - 2\pi = 0$$

$$\xi_{2}(t_{f}) - \xi_{2}(t_{0}) = 0$$

$$\xi_{3}(t_{f}) - \xi_{3}(t_{0}) = 0$$

$$F_{\text{lateral}}(\xi_{2}(t), \xi_{1}(t)) - \alpha F_{\text{lateral,max,}} \leq 0$$

$$F_{\text{thrust}}(\xi_{2}(t), \xi_{1}(t)) - \beta F_{\text{thrust,max,}} \leq 0$$

$$B_{\text{baseline}}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\xi} = [\xi_1(t), \xi_2(t), \xi_3(t)] = [\theta(t), \omega(t), T_{gen}(t)]$

$$= \dot{T}_{\text{gen}}(t) . \tag{6}$$

Here, t_0 and t_f are starting and ending time for a single rotor revolution, $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is the state vector containing rotor azimuth angle, rotational speed, and generator torque (T_{gen}), \boldsymbol{u} is the control signal, representing the time rate of change of the generator torque (\dot{T}_{gen}). As we optimize the average rotor rotational speed, terminal time, t_f , is included in the set of design variables, and maximizing power as our objective function (P_{obj}) instead of maximizing the energy production used in Ref. [14]. This optimal control problem corresponds to the "Optimal control" and "Rotor ODE" blocks of the XDSM provided in Fig. 3. It is discretized by the Radau pseudospectral method using Dymos optimal control code [29,30], and we used the IPOPT algorithm [31] for solving this optimal control problem.

2.5 System Design Optimization Formulation. The systemlevel design problem is formulated by integrating the subsystem components discussed in the preceding sections and given as:

$$\underset{\mathbf{d}_{\text{offm}}, \alpha}{\text{minimize}} \text{ LCOE} = \frac{\text{Cost}_{\text{sys}}}{\text{AEP}_{\text{sys}}}$$

subject to $Cost_{sys} - fac_{cost}m_{sys} = 0$

$$AEP_{sys} - AEP_{aero} \cos \left(\Xi_{avg,pitch}\right) = 0$$

$$\rho_{water} V_{disp} - \left(m_{sys} + \frac{F_{pre}}{g}\right) = 0$$

$$\rho_{water} V_{disp,tow} - \left(m_{sys} - m_{bal}\right) = 0$$

$$GM_{min} - GM \le 0$$

$$L_{yard} - L_{yard,max} \le 0$$
where
$$fac_{cost} = \frac{Cost}{m_{sys}} \frac{Cost}{baseline}$$

$$AEP_{aero} = t_{yr} \int_{V_{wind}} PDF(V_{wind}) P(V_{wind}, \alpha_{V_{wind}})$$
$$L_{yard} = \left(1 + \cos\frac{\pi}{3}\right) \left(D_{oc} + L_{pont} + \frac{D_{cc}}{2}\right)$$
$$\mathbf{d}_{ptfm} = \left[D_{oc}, H_{dr}, L_{pont}, m_{bal}, H_{dr,tow}, F_{pre}\right]$$

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \left[\alpha_{V_{\text{cut-in}}}, \cdots, \alpha_{V_{\text{cut-out}}}\right] \tag{7}$$

Here, V_{disp} and $V_{\text{disp,tow}}$ are the water volume displaced by the submerged structure at in-place and wet tow conditions, respectively. These quantities are calculated by the submerged structure panel mesh given in Fig. 4(*b*), which should match the value of

Journal of Mechanical Design



Fig. 6 Wind speed probabilistic distribution and optimal energy production results with respect to the wind probability. Fixed and variable average rotor velocity cases are compared. (a) Wind speed probability density function (PDF) employing Weibull distribution. Vertical dotted lines represent cut-in and cut-out speeds. (b) Annual energy production (AEP) for varied peak load factor values. (c) Energy production per wind speed for varied peak load factor values. Variable refers to the variable average RPM cases and fixed refers to the fixed average RPM cases.



Fig. 7 Intracycle RPM control result for fixed average rotor velocity case. Lines with color gradation are optimal control results, and black lines are baseline design results. (a)–(c) Aerodynamic overturning moment for wind speeds 10, 15, and 20 m/s. (d)–(f) Generator power for wind speeds 10, 15, and 20 m/s.

the analytical submerged volume, $V_{\rm sm}$. The minimum metacentric height, GM_{min}, is established at 2.0 m for this study. This particular value needs to be adjusted depending on the overall scale of the turbine. Lyard, max represents the length dimension of the shipyard wet dock where manufacturing will take place. The cost factor, faccost, is based on the cost analysis data for the baseline design, while Cost_{sys} that appears in the constraint set is the cost of the candidate design in the optimization loop. The number of hours in one year, t_{vr} , is 8,760 hours. PDF is the probability density function for wind speed, calculated using the Weibull distribution, and is shown in Fig. 6(a). For this study, we assumed a hypothetical offshore location with relatively high wind speeds, using a shape parameter k = 2.0 and a scale parameter c = 11.19 m/s. The TLP plant design parameters are represented in \mathbf{d}_{ptfm} , and the control design variables defining the peak load factors (α and β) for each wind speed bins are represented in α .

3 Results and Discussions

This section presents the results of both the intracycle RPM control optimization and the system-level CCD optimization studies. The intracycle RPM control problems are solved using the pseudospectral optimal control method, with aerodynamic properties modeled through cubic spline surrogate models, as described in Sect. 2.4. The result from the first part (Sect. 3.1, intracycle RPM control) include time-dependent trajectories of power outputs and aerodynamic forces across varied wind speed bins. This dataset is then utilized to construct a Kriging surrogate model, which forms the control model for the second part of the study (Sect. 3.2, system-level CCD) focusing on system-level CCD optimization.

3.1 Fixed and Variable Average Rotor Velocity. The intracycle RPM control study is performed for varied constraints on peak thrust and lateral loads (by varying load factors, α and β), following Ref. [14], and for varied wind speeds between cut-in and cut-out thresholds, as shown in Fig. 6(α).

Two distinctive cases are studied: (1) one with fixed average rotor velocities and (2) another with variable average rotor velocities. Figure 6(b) illustrates the AEP results for these cases across varying peak load values. In this figure, darker (purple) square markers denote AEP results with variable average rotor rotational speed, while lighter (orange) square markers represent those with fixed average rotor rotational speed. Compared to the baseline design, the AEP of the variable average RPM case with peak thrust and lateral load factors of 1.0 improved by 24.34%, while the fixed average RPM case with the same load factors showed an improvement of 4.62%. Additionally, if the peak thrust and lateral load factors are relaxed to 1.2, improvements of 8.01% and 40.12% can be expected for the fixed and variable average RPM cases, respectively.

Figure 6(c) displays the distribution of energy production contributions across varied wind speeds for each peak load case. Significant AEP improvements from adjusting peak load factors are primarily observed in cases with wind speeds exceeding 9 m/s. Results shown here account for the wind probabilistic density variations, shown in Fig. 6(a). For both fixed and variable average rotor rotational speed cases, energy extraction is improved for higher wind speeds when the peak load constraint is relaxed by increasing α and β values. Notably, the variable rotor rotational speed case gives higher power output, as it allows the rotational speed as another design freedom for optimal energy production. Thus, this



Fig. 8 Intracycle RPM control result for variable average rotor velocity case. Lines with color gradation are optimal control results, and black lines are baseline design results. (a)–(c) Aerodynamic overturning moment for wind speeds 10, 15, and 20 m/s. (d)–(f) Generator power for wind speeds 10, 15, and 20 m/s.



Fig. 9 Lower wind speed generator power from intracycle RPM control result for variable average rotor velocity case. Lines with color gradation are optimal control results, and black lines are baseline design results. Since the peak load constraints are not active for lower wind speed cases, varying α and β values do not change the result. (a)–(c) corresponds to wind speeds 5, 6, and 7 m/s, respectively.

case is further used for the overall system-level design problem, presented in Sect. 3.2.

Figures 7 and 8 shows overturning moment and power trajectories at relatively higher wind speeds (10, 15, and 20 m/s), while Fig. 9 shows power trajectories at lower wind speeds (5, 6, and 7 m/s). Based on the probabilistic density given in Fig. 6(a), lower wind speeds dominate over the lifetime of the wind turbine, influencing overall accumulation of number of rotor revolutions. However, higher wind speed creates higher overturning moment, making constraints on peak thrust and lateral loads active. Thus, higher wind speeds are main driver limiting the overall design of the floating platform and control parameters.

Figure 7 presents the representative optimal control results solved for the fixed average rotor rotational speed scenario. In Figs. 7(a)-(c), aerodynamic overturning moment trajectories are depicted for wind speeds of 10, 15, and 20 m/s. Similarly, Figs. 7(d)-(f) illustrates generator power trajectories corresponding to the same wind speeds. In this scenario, the rotor rotational speed is regulated within a single revolution to maximize power extraction. However, the time required for a single revolution remains constrained to match that of the baseline case, thereby ensuring a fixed average rotational speed.

For lower wind speeds, as shown in Figs. 7(a) and (d), the overturning moment trajectories of the optimal designs were kept closely to the baseline design, regardless of the load factor values. However, power fluctuation amplitude over a single rotation is significantly reduced due to intracycle RPM control, and overall power output is slightly improved. For higher wind speeds, as shown in Figs. 7(b) and (e) for 15 m/s and Figs. 7(c) and (f) for 20 m/s, the peak overturning moments reach to constrained maximum value depending on the corresponding load factors. For lower

load factors (lighter blue trajectories) each half revolution gets two peaks in the overturning moment due to tighter constraint, and power production trajectory also becomes multi-modal shape due to regulation efforts that limit the loads. Power output trajectories are significantly improved in higher wind speed regimes compared to the baseline design case.

Figure 8 presents the representative optimal control results solved for the variable average rotor rotational speed scenario. In Figs. 8(a)-(c), aerodynamic overturning moment trajectories are depicted for wind speeds of 10, 15, and 20 m/s. Similarly, Figs. 8(d)-(f) illustrates generator power trajectories corresponding to the same wind speeds. Notably, for all plots in Figs. 8(a)-(f), the time required for a single revolution varies as the rotor rotational speed is regulated to maximize power extraction. Allowing higher aerodynamic loads by relaxing peak load constraint (α and β) accelerates the overall rotor rotational speed to extract larger energy, while tighter peak load constraint keeps the average rotor rotational speed closer or even slower than that of the baseline case.

The results depicted in Figs. 7 and 8 selectively showcase the optimal control results of wind speeds 10, 15, and 20 m/s. These results highlight significant variations across different peak load constraint values. However, considering the probabilistic wind speed distribution presented in Fig. 6(a), it becomes evident that the FloatVAWT system is expected to experience wind speeds ranging from 5 to 10 m/s for a significant portion of its operational lifetime.

Figure 9 presents the power trajectories of the lower wind speed optimal control results for the variable average rotor rotational speed scenario. Energy production is significantly lower than in higher wind speed cases, and the optimal average rotor rotational velocities are found to be significantly slower. These results emphasize that it is not always optimal to run at faster rotational speed,

Journal of Mechanical Design

 Table 1
 System design solutions for fixed average rotor rotational RPM cases.

Variable	Unit	Cases with fixed average ω			
$\alpha_{\rm max}$	-	baseline	1.0	1.1	1.2
Doc	m	7.0000	6.7306	6.6451	6.7195
$H_{\rm dr}$	m	15.000	14.501	14.500	14.504
Lpont	m	26.000	28.246	28.662	28.280
$\dot{m}_{\rm bal}$	tonne	87.000	87.000	86.999	86.999
$H_{\rm dr.tow}$	m	4.0569	5.9607	5.9311	5.9571
$\overline{F}_{\text{pre}}$	tonne	1300.3	1185.7	1162.6	1183.1
$\bar{\alpha}$	-	1.0000	0.9497	0.9959	1.1209
L _{vard}	m	46.000	49.099	49.638	49.140
Ćost	M\$	2.6464	2.6181	2.6184	2.6178
AEP	GWh	19.800	20.925	21.476	21.698
LCOE	\$/kWh	0.13359	0.12512	0.12192	0.12065

 Table 2
 System design solutions for variable average rotor rotational RPM cases.

Variable	Unit	Cases with variable average ω			
$\alpha_{\rm max}$	-	baseline	1.0	1.1	1.2
Doc	m	7.0000	6.7269	6.6069	6.5451
H _{dr}	m	15.000	14.501	14.500	14.500
Lpont	m	26.000	28.251	28.821	29.093
$m_{\rm bal}$	tonne	87.000	86.998	86.998	86.999
H _{dr.tow}	m	4.0569	5.9590	5.9179	5.8935
Fpre	tonne	1300.3	1184.4	1154.3	1141.5
$\bar{\alpha}$	-	1.0000	0.9733	1.0675	1.1717
Lvard	m	46.000	49.103	49.838	50.185
Ćost	M\$	2.6464	2.6177	2.6182	2.6182
AEP	GWh	19.800	24.590	26.244	27.706
LCOE	\$/kWh	0.13359	0.10646	0.09976	0.09450

and for certain low wind speed conditions, the lower rotational velocities may produce more energy. Furthermore, the lower average rotational velocities at lower wind speeds contribute to keeping the accumulated number of annual rotor revolution values similar to the baseline case, keeping less chance for mechanical failures.

While variable average RPM control demonstrates significant performance benefits, it introduces several trade-offs. These include increased control complexity, necessitating sophisticated and potentially more expensive generator controllers, as well as the potential for reduced fatigue life due to multimodal peaks in cyclic loads, particularly at high wind speeds.

3.2 System-Level Control Co-Design Solution. Systemlevel CCD solutions for varied load factors (α , β) are summarized in Tabs. 1 and 2, respectively. Particularly, the LCOE values for each load factor values with fixed and variable RPM cases are also compared in Fig. 10. As anticipated from the intracycle RPM control solutions detailed in Sect. 3.1, the CCD solution achieved for the variable average rotor rotational speed scenario yields an improved LCOE primarily due to a significantly increased AEP value compared to the CCD solution obtained for the fixed average rotor rotational speed scenario. Furthermore, the rate of LCOE improvement from relaxing the load factor constraint is higher in the variable average RPM cases compared to the fixed average RPM cases.

The system-level CCD solutions presented in Tabs. 1 and 2 do not constrain the manufacturing yard footprint length (L_{yard}) because it is assumed that a large dry dock facility will be utilized for manufacturing the TLP structure. However, if the dry dock facility size is limited, the overall length must be constrained. Fig-



Fig. 10 Comparison of LCOE for fixed and variable average RPM cases.



Fig. 11 LCOE and tow condition metacentric height (GM) values of system-optimal solutions in varied manufacturing yard footprint length constraints. Hollow symbols indicate infeasible solutions that violate one or more constraints.

ure 11 illustrates the impact of limiting the manufacturing yard footprint length. The rightmost symbol for each of the fixed and variable average RPM cases represents the unconstrained solution. For both cases, designs with L_{yard} value of 47.75 m or greater satisfy all constraints. However, if an L_{yard} value smaller than 47.75 m is required, the tow metacentric height constraint is consistently violated, rendering the obtained LCOE values invalid.

The design solutions given in Tabs. 1 and 2 show that the change in control schemes dominates the performance change, while differences in plant design variables remain very close to each other. Two factors described in the subsequent paragraphs are responsible for this result.

At first glance, as shown in each column of Tabs. 1 and 2, the inherent stability of TLPs, primarily due to their substantial pretension force limiting platform motions, suggests only minimal direct coupling between TLP plant design variables and rotor control variables. Nonetheless, the optimal solutions indicate that different control limits lead to slight yet discernible differences in the resulting optimal plant configurations. Notably, the significant improvement in LCOE observed with a variable rotor rotational speed can be attributed largely to the control design flexibility. Thus, based on our CCD study, the optimal FloatVAWT design presented here with the TLP foundation is predominantly driven by the optimal control subsystem.

However, a closer inspection reveals that control constraints on thrust and side-to-side forces, which define the maximum allowable aerodynamic loads, do indeed influence platform motions, thereby affecting plant design variables. While the peak load constraint α_{max} does not substantially alter plant designs for the fixed-average rotational speed case (Tab. 1), more notable and consistently trending plant design variations appear in the variable-average rotational speed case (Tab. 2). Consequently, we observe stronger plant-control coupling in cases with greater design flexibility, such as when employing variable-average rotational speed control.

It is worth emphasizing that these constraints on allowable aero-

Table 3Comparison of CCD solutions to sequential so-
lutions.

Variable	Unit	Case			
design avg. ω	-	Seq. fixed	CCD fixed	Seq. variable	CCD variable
	m	6.7366	6.7306	6.7366	6.7269
$H_{\rm dr}$ $L_{\rm pont}$	m m	14.500 28.205	14.501 28.246	14.500 28.205	14.501 28.251
$m_{\rm bal}$	tonne	86.565 5.0631	87.000 5.9607	86.565	86.998 5.9590
$F_{\rm pre}$	tonne	1186.8	1185.7	1186.8	1184.4
$\bar{\alpha}$	-	0.9418	0.9497	0.9416	0.9733
L_{yard}	m	49.044	49.099	49.044	49.103
Cost	M\$	2.6172	2.6181	2.6172	2.6177
AEP	GWh	20.644	20.925	24.422	24.590
LCOE	\$/kWh	0.12678	0.12512	0.10716	0.10646

dynamic loadings provide critical references for rotor designers in the detailed design phase. Therefore, connecting the constraint values to attainable performance (optimal solution) using CCD optimization is of considerable importance.

In addition, more intricate interactions between control and plant designs might emerge if these constraints are replaced by constraints based on detailed structural models for rotor directly implemented in the optimal control problems. Specifically, if accurate models for predicting rotor blade stress and fatigue damage were available, then rather than simply constraining thrust and side to side forces, varying profiles of aerodynamic forces from different control strategies could influence variations in plant design variables. This potential impact demand further investigation in future research.

3.3 Comparison to Sequential Solution. A comparison of the CCD solutions to the design solutions obtained using the traditional "sequential" design approach is presented in Tab. 3. As we discussed in the earlier section, the results illustrate that the largest design driver is the control design approach. However, the results also highlight the advantages of the CCD approach in leveraging the couplings between plant and control design variables to achieve improved solutions. CCD solutions consistently converge to slightly lower LCOE values compared to the sequential approach for both fixed and variable rotor rotational speed cases. This indicates that the CCD framework effectively captures and exploits the coupling between plant and control design disciplines, which the sequential approach may overlook.

However, as we discussed earlier, the most significant design driver remains the control design. While the differences between sequential and CCD methods are evident in the resulting design solutions, the magnitude of these differences may grow with more detailed models and constraints. Such enhancements could further highlight the benefits of the CCD approach.

4 Conclusion

In this study, we have presented MDO modeling and CCD optimization of a TLP-based FloatVAWT system. The model integrated an aero-hydro-servo dynamic representation of the FOWT system with FloatVAWT concept [3], considering various physical and control constraints. By integrating various disciplinary domain models, we aimed to achieve an optimal system design by capitalizing on synergistic interactions between different physical and control design elements. We explored the possibilities of variable average rotational speed of the VAWT rotor with the intracycle RPM control for enhanced energy production and minimized platform motions, ultimately reducing the LCOE.

Journal of Mechanical Design

The system design solutions were analyzed for minimized LCOE, design trade-off considerations, and potential mitigation strategies for potential mechanical failure of the rotor. The TLPs offer a highly stable foundation for the FOWT systems, minimizing the couplings between physical and control systems. Optimal solutions revealed that optimal control strategies affect significantly to the overall LCOE results, primarily due to the AEP differences. However, differences in the optimal platform designs are minimal, suggesting that the couplings between control and plant might be negligible in the presented FloatVAWT configuration and modeling strategy. This partially suggests that sequential design might be potentially cost-effective design process if floating platform provides highly stable foundation for turbine structure. However, this finding must be limited to highly stable TLP cases and design strategy constraining thrust and side to side forces.

Overall, our study provides valuable insights into the modeling and optimization of FloatVAWT systems and highlights the potential for VAWTs to be a cost-effective solution for FOWTs. However, as our system-level modeling approach assumes various simplifications, further research is required to investigate the feasibility and practicality of implementing the proposed design in the later-stage design process.

In addition, the weak coupling observed between plant and control design in this study raises the question of whether the added complexity of a fully coupled CCD analysis is worth the additional investment of human and computational resources. However, a definitive answer to this question goes beyond simply measuring the extent of coupling. It must also consider organizational and economic contexts. Addressing all these factors requires a more holistic evaluation, which is outside of the scope of this article.

Furthermore, application of the proposed floating VAWT CCD framework to other types of floating platforms, such as semisubmersible and spar-buoy platforms, is an important direction for future research. These platforms, characterized by larger motion amplitudes due to the slackness of their mooring systems, are expected to exhibit stronger coupling between plant and control design variables. Extending this framework to account for the dynamic behaviors of these platforms could uncover more profound design insights.

Acknowledgments

The research presented herein was funded by the U. S. Department of Energy Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy (ARPA-E) under the ATLANTIS program with project title "A Low-cost Floating Offshore Vertical Axis Wind System" with Award No. DE-AR0001179. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of ARPA-E. The authors gratefully acknowledge the use of BigBlue high performance computing (HPC) resources provided by the University of Memphis, which were essential for the computational aspects of this research.

References

- Lopez, Anthony, Green, Rebecca, Williams, Travis et al. "Offshore Wind Energy Technical Potential for the Contiguous United States." Technical Report No. NREL/PR-6A20-83650. National Renewable Energy Laboratory. 2022. URL https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy22osti/83650.pdf.
- [2] Stehly, Tyler, Duffy, Patrick and Hernando, Daniel Mulas. "2022 Cost of Wind Energy Review." Technical Report No. NREL/PR-5000-88335. National Renewable Energy Laboratory. 2023. doi: 10.2172/2278805.
- [3] "A Low-Cost Floating Offshore Vertical Axis Wind System." U. S. Department of Energy Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy (2020). Accessed March 12, 2024, URL https://arpa-e.energy.gov/technologies/projects/ low-cost-floating-offshore-vertical-axis-wind-system.
- [4] Jonkman, Jason. "The New Modularization Framework for the FAST Wind Turbine CAE Tool." AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting. AIAA 2013-0202. Grapevine, TX, Jan 7–10, 2013. doi: 10.2514/6.2013-202.
- [5] Marten, David. "QBlade: A Modern Tool for the Aeroelastic Simulation of Wind Turbines." Ph.D. Thesis, Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany. 2019. doi: 10.14279/depositonce-10646.

- [6] Jonkman, Jason, Wright, Alan, Barter, Garrett, Hall, Matthew, Allison, James and Herber, Daniel R. "Functional Requirements for the WEIS Toolset to Enable Controls Co-Design of Floating Offshore Wind Turbines." ASME International Offshore Wind Technical Conference. IOWTC2021-3533: p. V001T01A007. Virtual, Online, Feb 16–17, 2021. doi: 10.1115/IOWTC2021-3533.
- [7] Lemmer, Frank, Yu, Wei, Luhmann, Birger, Schlipf, David and Cheng, Po Wen. "Multibody Modeling for Concept-Level Floating Offshore Wind Turbine Design." *Multibody System Dynamics* Vol. 49 (2020): pp. 203–236. doi: 10.1007/s11044-020-09729-x.
- [8] Al-Solihat, Mohammed Khair and Nahon, Meyer. "Flexible Multibody Dynamic Modeling of a Floating Wind Turbine." *International Journal of Mechanical Sciences* Vol. 142–143 (2018): pp. 518–529. doi: 10.1016/j.ijmecsci.2018.05.018.
- [9] Sundarrajan, Athul K., Lee, Yong Hoon, Allison, James T., Zalkind, Daniel S. and Herber, Daniel R. "Open-Loop Control Co-Design of Semisubmersible Floating Offshore Wind Turbines Using Linear Parameter-Varying Models." *Journal of Mechanical Design* Vol. 146 No. 4 (2024): p. 041704. doi: 10.1115/1.4063969.
- [10] Lee, Yong Hoon, Bayat, Saeid and Allison, James T. "Control Co-Design Using a Nonlinear Wind Turbine Dynamic Model Based on OpenFAST Linearization." *Applied Energy Symposium: MIT A+B.* Cambridge, MA, Jul 5–8, 2022.
 [11] Bayat, Saeid, Lee, Yong Hoon and Allison, James T. "Nested Control Co-design
- [11] Bayat, Saeid, Lee, Yong Hoon and Allison, James T. "Nested Control Co-design of a Spar Buoy Horizontal-axis Floating Offshore Wind Turbine." ArXiv e-prints (2023). URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.15463.
- [12] Gao, Ju, Griffith, D. Todd, Sakib, Mohammad Sadman and Boo, Sung Youn. "A Semi-Coupled Aero-Servo-Hydro Numerical Model for Floating Vertical Axis Wind Turbines Operating on TLPs." *Renewable Energy* Vol. 181 (2022): pp. 692–713. doi: 10.1016/j.renene.2021.09.076.
- [13] Fowler, Matthew J., Owens, Brian, Bull, Diana, Goupee, Andrew J., Hurtado, John, Griffith, D. Todd and Alves, Marco. "Hydrodynamic Module Coupling in the Offshore Wind Energy Simulation (OWENS) Toolkit." *International Conference on Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering*. OMAE2014-24175: p. V09BT09A027. San Francisco, CA, Jun 8–13, 2014. doi: 10.1115/OMAE2014-24175.
- [14] Sakib, Mohammad Sadman, Griffith, D. Todd, Hossain, Sanower, Bayat, Saeid and Allison, James T. "Intracycle RPM Control for Vertical Axis Wind Turbines." Wind Energy Vol. 27 No. 3 (2024): pp. 202–224. doi: 10.1002/we.2885.
- [15] Lao, Yejun, Rotea, Mario A., Koeln, Justin P., Sakib, Mohammad S. and Griffith, D. Todd. "Economic Nonlinear Model Predictive Control of Offshore Vertical-Axis Wind Turbines." *American Control Conference*: pp. 3518–3525. Atlanta, GA, June 8–10, 2022. doi: 10.23919/ACC53348.2022.9867846.
- [16] Le Fouest, Sébastien and Mulleners, Karen. "Optimal Blade Pitch Control For Enhanced Vertical-Axis Wind Turbine Performance." *Nature Communications* Vol. 15 No. 2770 (2024): pp. 1–13. doi: 10.1038/s41467-024-46988-0.
- [17] Bouzaher, Mohamed Taher and Hadid, Mohamed. "Active Control of the Vertical Axis Wind Turbine by the Association of Flapping Wings to Their Blades." *Procedia Computer Science* Vol. 52 (2015): pp. 714–722. doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2015.05.083.
- [18] Ahsan, Faraz, Griffith, D. Todd and Gao, Ju. "Modal Dynamics And Flutter Analysis Of Floating Offshore Vertical Axis Wind Turbines." *Renewable Energy* Vol. 185 (2022): pp. 1284–1300. doi: 10.1016/j.renene.2021.12.041.
 [19] Gao, Ju, Griffith, D. Todd, Jafari, Mohammad, Yao, Shulong and Ahsan, Faraz.
- [19] Gao, Ju, Griffith, D. Todd, Jafari, Mohammad, Yao, Shulong and Ahsan, Faraz. "Impact of Rotor Solidity on the Design Optimization of Floating Vertical Axis Wind Turbines." *International Conference on Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering*. OMAE2022-78715: p. V008T09A019. Hamburg, Germany, June 5–10, 2022. doi: 10.1115/OMAE2022-78715.
- [20] Buchner, Abel-John, Soria, Julio, Honnery, Damon and Smits, Alexander J. "Dynamic Stall in Vertical Axis Wind Turbines: Scaling and Topological Considerations." *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* Vol. 841 (2018): pp. 746–766. doi: 10.1017/jfm.2018.112.
- [21] Tjiu, Willy, Marnoto, Tjukup, Mat, Sohif, Ruslan, Mohd Hafidz and Sopian, Kamaruzzaman. "Darrieus Vertical Axis Wind Turbine for Power Generation II: Challenges in HAWT and the Opportunity of Multi-Megawatt Darrieus VAWT Development." *Renewable Energy* Vol. 75 (2015): pp. 560–571. doi: 10.1016/j.renene.2014.10.039.
- [22] Lee, Yong Hoon, Boo, Sung Youn and Allison, James T. "A Framework for Integrating Hydrostatics, Hydrodynamics, and Rigid-Body Dynamics for the Control Co-Design of Floating Offshore Vertical-Axis Wind Turbine Systems." *Wind Energy Science Conference*. 1345. Hannover, Germany, May 25–28, 2021.
- [23] Lambe, Andrew B. and Martins, Joaquim R. R. A. "Extensions to the Design Structure Matrix for the Description of Multidisciplinary Design, Analysis, and Optimization Processes." *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization* Vol. 46 No. 2 (2012): pp. 273–284. doi: 10.1007/s00158-012-0763-y.
- [24] Powell, Mike J. D. "A Direct Search Optimization Method That Models the Objective and Constraint Functions by Linear Interpolation." Gomez, S. and Hennart, J. P. (eds.). Advances in Optimization and Numerical Analysis. Springer, Dordrecht (1994): pp. 51–67. doi: 10.1007/978-94-015-8330-5_4.
- [25] Newman, J. N. "Wave Effects on Deformable Bodies." *Applied Ocean Research* Vol. 16 No. 1 (1994): pp. 47–59. doi: 10.1016/0141-1187(94)90013-2.
- [26] Al-Solihat, Mohammed Khair and Nahon, Meyer. "Stiffness of Slack and Taut Moorings." *Ships and Offshore Structures* Vol. 11 No. 8 (2016): pp. 890–904. doi: 10.1080/17445302.2015.1089052.
- [27] "Wind Energy Generation Systems Part 3-2: Design Requirements for Floating Offshore Wind Turbines." Technical Report No. IEC TS 61400-3-2. International Electrotechnical Commission. 2019. URL https://webstore.iec.ch/ publication/29244.
- [28] Murray, Jonathan and Barone, Matthew. "The Development of CACTUS, a Wind and Marine Turbine Performance Simulation Code." AIAA Aerospace

Sciences Meeting. AIAA 2011-147: pp. 1–21. Reston, VA, Jan 4–7, 2011. doi: 10.2514/6.2011-147.

- [29] Garg, Divya, Patterson, Michael A., Francolin, Camila, Darby, Christopher L., Huntington, Geoffrey T., Hager, William W. and Rao, Anil V. "Direct Trajectory Optimization and Costate Estimation of Finite-Horizon and Infinite-Horizon Optimal Control Problems Using a Radau Pseudospectral Method." *Computational Optimization and Applications* Vol. 49 No. 2 (2011): pp. 335–358. doi: 10.1007/s10589-009-9291-0.
- [30] Falck, Robert, Gray, Justin S., Ponnapalli, Kaushik and Wright, Ted. "Dymos: A Python Package for Optimal Control of Multidisciplinary Systems." *Journal of Open Source Software* Vol. 6 No. 59 (2021): p. 2809. doi: 10.21105/joss.02809.
- [31] Wächter, Andreas and Biegler, Lorenz T. "On the implementation of an interiorpoint filter line-search algorithm for large-scale nonlinear programming." *Mathematical Programming* Vol. 106 No. 1 (2006): pp. 25–57. doi: 10.1007/s10107-004-0559-y.

Appendix A: Geometry, Masses, Vertical Centers of Graivity, and Moments of Inertia

The submerged portion of the TLP components' cross-sectional areas, volumes, and masses are given as:

$$A_{\rm sm,\#c} = \frac{\pi D_{\rm sm,\#c}^2}{4},$$
 (A1*a*)

$$A_{\text{pont}} = \left(L_{\text{pont}} - \frac{D_{\text{cc}} + D_{\text{oc}}}{2}\right) W_{\text{pont}},\tag{A1b}$$

$$V_{\rm sm} = H_{\rm dr} \left(A_{\rm sm,cc} + 3A_{\rm sm,oc} \right) + 3H_{\rm sm,pont} A_{\rm sm,pont}, \qquad (A1c)$$

$$m_{\rm sm,\#c} = \int_{-H_{\rm dr}}^{0} \mathbb{R}_{\rm sm,\#c} (A_{\rm \#c}, h) \ dh, \tag{A1d}$$

$$m_{\text{pont}} = \int_{-H_{\text{dr}}}^{-H_{\text{dr}}+H_{\text{pont}}} \mathbb{R}_{\text{pont}} \left(A_{\text{pont}}, h\right) \ dh, \tag{A1e}$$

where D, W, H, L, A, V, m represent diameter, width, height, length, area, volume, and mass, respectively. Subscript sm denotes submerged portion, cc denotes center column, oc denotes outer column, #c denotes any column (either cc or oc), pont denotes pontoon, and dr denotes draught. Functions \mathbb{R} are the empirical mass density regression function. They are created based on a proprietary TLP design database. The buoyancy force created by the submerged portion of the TLP is given as:

$$F_{\text{buoy}} = \rho_{\text{water}} V_{\text{sm}} g, \qquad (A2)$$

where ρ_{water} is ocean water density at sea surface and g is gravitational acceleration at ocean surface level. The freeboard (above water level) portion of the quantities are given as:

$$A_{\rm fb,\#c} = \frac{\pi D_{\rm fb,\#c}^2}{4},$$
 (A3*a*)

$$V_{\rm fb} = (H_{\rm cc} - H_{\rm dr}) A_{\rm fb,cc} + 3 (H_{\rm oc} - H_{\rm dr}) A_{\rm fb,oc}, \qquad (A3b)$$

$$m_{\rm fb,\#c} = (H_{\rm \#c} - H_{\rm dr}) \,\mathbb{R}_{\rm fb,\#c} \,(A_{\rm \#c}) \,, \tag{A3c}$$

where subscript fb denotes freeboard. The regression function used for the freeboard portion does not vary over vertical location, so the function only takes the cross-sectional area as the parameter. The overall TLP mass and in-place system mass are:

$$m_{\text{ptfm}} = m_{\text{sm,cc}} + m_{\text{fb,cc}} + 3 \left(m_{\text{sm,oc}} + m_{\text{fb,oc}} + m_{\text{pont}} \right)$$
(A4*a*)

$$m_{\rm sys} = m_{\rm ptfm} + m_{\rm turb} + m_{\rm bal},\tag{A4b}$$

where subscript ptfm denotes floating platform, sys denotes system at in-place condition, turb denotes turbine system (tower, rotor, and generator), and bal denotes ballast water.

Transactions of the ASME

Vertical COGs (VCGs) are calculated as:

$$\text{VCG}_{\text{sm},\#\text{c}} = \frac{1}{m_{\text{sm},\#\text{c}}} \int_{-H_{\text{dr}}}^{0} h \cdot \mathbb{R}_{\text{sm},\#\text{c}} (A_{\#\text{c}}, h) \ dh, \tag{A5a}$$

$$VCG_{fb,\#c} = \frac{1}{m_{fb,\#c}} \frac{(H_{\#c} - H_{dr})^2}{2} \mathbb{R}_{fb,\#c} (A_{\#c}), \qquad (A5b)$$

$$\text{VCG}_{\text{pont}} = \frac{1}{m_{\text{pont}}} \int_{-H_{\text{dr}}}^{-H_{\text{dr}}+H_{\text{pont}}} h \cdot \mathbb{R}_{\text{pont}} \left(A_{\text{pont}}, h\right) \ dh, \quad (A5c)$$

$$VCG_{sys} = \frac{\begin{bmatrix} m_{sm,cc} VCG_{sm,cc} + m_{fb,cc} VCG_{fb,cc} \\ +3 (m_{sm,oc} VCG_{sm,oc} + m_{fb,oc} VCG_{fb,oc} \\ +m_{pont} VCG_{pont}) + m_{turb} VCG_{turb} \end{bmatrix}}{m_{sys}}.$$
 (A5d)

The system MOIs with respect to the system COG for roll (xx), pitch (yy), and yaw (zz) DOFs are calculated based on MOIs and radii of gyration of all the components of TLP, given as:

$$I_{xx,sys} = m_{sys} R_{xx,sys}^2, \tag{A6a}$$

$$I_{yy,sys} = m_{sys} R_{yy,sys}^2, \tag{A6b}$$

$$I_{zz,sys} = m_{sys} R_{zz,sys}^2.$$
 (A6c)

Here, radii of gyration (R) for these DOFs are calculated as:

$$R_{ii,sys} = \sqrt{\frac{\begin{bmatrix} I_{ii,cc} + I_{ii,oc,fr} + 2I_{ii,oc,si} \\ +I_{ii,pont,fr} + 2I_{ii,pont,si} + I_{ii,turb} \end{bmatrix}}{m_{sys}}}, \ ii = \begin{cases} xx \\ yy \\ (A7a) \end{cases}$$

$$R_{zz,\text{sys}} = \sqrt{\frac{I_{zz,\text{cc}} + 3 \left(I_{zz,\text{oc}} + I_{zz,\text{pont}}\right) + I_{zz,\text{turb}}}{m_{\text{sys}}}}, \qquad (A7b)$$

where subscript fr denotes front and si denotes side. Since the TLP has three outer columns with 60° apart from each other, their radii of gyration need to be translated in the Cartesian coordinates view. Front location refers to -x direction, while side locations refer to $\pm y$ directions. MOIs for each TLP component are calculated by integrating the distance squared value multiplied by the mass density functions. Distances used for integration are calculated using the Euclidean distance between the system COG and the location of the integrand, and details are omitted for brevity.

Finally, the overall mass matrix of the system, M_{sys} is given as:

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} m & 0 & 0 & 0 & mVCG & 0 \\ 0 & m & 0 & -mVCG & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -mVCG & 0 & I_{XX} & 0 & 0 \\ mVCG & 0 & 0 & 0 & I_{yy} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I_{zz} \end{bmatrix}$$
(A8)

where subscript sys is omitted for brevity from all variables used in Eq. (A8). The system COG is located at the exact center in x - ydirections. Thus, terms related to COG_y and COG_z in Eq. (A8) could be kept zeros.

List of Figures

1	Layout of the floating vertical-axis wind turbine.	2
2	Extended design structure matrix (XDSM) for system design problem structure of the floating vertical-axis wind turbine	
	(FloatVAWT) optimization framework. The XDSM presented here is simplified representation and may not encompass	
	all variables or connections.	3
3	XDSM for training the surrogate model for the intracycle RPM control component of the FloatVAWT optimization	
	framework.	4
4	Geometry and boundary element (panel) meshes of the TLP designed for the FloatVAWT system. (a) TLP geometry	
	shown with in-place draught, (b) Panel mesh representing the in-place condition of the submerged portion of the TLP.	4
-	(c) Panel mesh representing the submerged portion of the 1LP in wet tow condition.	4
5	Vandation of averaged nydrodynamic response prediction in platform pich DOP.	4
0	and variable average rotor velocity cases are compared. (a) Wind speed probability density function (PDE) employing	
	and variable average food velocity closes are compared. (a) will speed probability density function $(1DT)$ employing Weibulion Vertical dated lines represent cut-in and cut-out speeds. (b) Annual energy production (AEP) for	
	varied neak had factor values. (c) Energy production per wind speed for varied neak had factor values. Variable refers	
	to the variable average RPM cases and fixed refers to the fixed average RPM cases.	6
7	Intracycle RPM control result for fixed average rotor velocity case. Lines with color gradation are optimal control results,	
	and black lines are baseline design results. (a) - (c) Aerodynamic overturning moment for wind speeds 10, 15, and 20	
	m/s. (d) – (f) Generator power for wind speeds 10, 15, and 20 m/s	6
8	Intracycle RPM control result for variable average rotor velocity case. Lines with color gradation are optimal control	
	results, and black lines are baseline design results. (a)-(c) Aerodynamic overturning moment for wind speeds 10, 15,	
	and 20 m/s. (d) – (f) Generator power for wind speeds 10, 15, and 20 m/s	7
9	Lower wind speed generator power from intracycle RPM control result for variable average rotor velocity case. Lines with	
	color gradation are optimal control results, and black lines are baseline design results. Since the peak load constraints	
	are not active for lower wind speed cases, varying α and β values do not change the result. (a)–(c) corresponds to wind	7
10	speeds 5, 6, and 7 m/s, respectively.	/
10	Comparison of LCOE for fixed and variable average KPM cases.	ð
11	footnaint length constraints. Hollow symbols indicate infassible solutions that violate one or more constraints	8
	Toteprine length constraints. Tonow symbols indicate inclusive solutions that violate one of more constraints	0
T int of	Tables	
LIST OI	Tables	
1	System design solutions for fixed average rotor rotational RPM cases.	8
2	System design solutions for variable average rotor rotational RPM cases.	8
- 3	Comparison of CCD solutions to sequential solutions.	9