

**REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE**

*Form Approved*  
OMB No. 0704-0188

The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to the Department of Defense, Executive Service Directorate (0704-0188). Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

**PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ORGANIZATION.**

<b>1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY)</b> 21-03-2017		<b>2. REPORT TYPE</b> Final Technical Report		<b>3. DATES COVERED (From - To)</b> From 22-06-2015 To 22-12-2016	
<b>4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE</b> Fabrication Development and Flow Testing of Underwater Superhydrophobic Films for Drag Reduction				<b>5a. CONTRACT NUMBER</b>	
				<b>5b. GRANT NUMBER</b> HR0011-15-2-0021	
				<b>5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER</b>	
<b>6. AUTHOR(S)</b> Kim, Chang-Jin				<b>5d. PROJECT NUMBER</b>	
				<b>5e. TASK NUMBER</b>	
				<b>5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER</b>	
<b>7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b> University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) 420 Westwood Plaza Los Angeles, CA 90095				<b>8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER</b>	
<b>9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b> Defense Advanced Research Program Agency 675 North Randolph Street Arlington VA 22203-2114				<b>10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)</b> DARPA	
				<b>11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)</b>	
<b>12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT</b> DARPA expects the work performed under this Cooperative Agreement to be fundamental research, and it is, therefore, not subject to publication restrictions.					
<b>13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</b>					
<b>14. ABSTRACT</b> By developing appropriate superhydrophobic (SHPo) films we have obtained a significant (> 20%) drag reduction for all flow conditions tested: in high speed water tunnel, in high speed tow tank, and with a motor boat on ocean water.					
<b>15. SUBJECT TERMS</b>					
<b>16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:</b>			<b>17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT</b>	<b>18. NUMBER OF PAGES</b> 27	<b>19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON</b> Kim, Chang-Jin
<b>a. REPORT</b>	<b>b. ABSTRACT</b>	<b>c. THIS PAGE</b>			<b>19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code)</b> 310 825 0267

**Approved for public release. Distribution is unlimited**

Performed by:

University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA)  
420 Westwood Plaza  
Los Angeles, CA 90095

Sponsored by:

Defense Advanced Research Program Agency (DARPA)  
675 North Randolph Street  
Arlington VA 22203-2114

HR0011-15-2-0021



## Fabrication Development and Flow Testing of Underwater Superhydrophobic (SHPo) Films for Drag Reduction

### Final Report June. 23, 2015 – Dec. 22, 2016

Reported to: PM (John Kamp); AOR (Bob Kuklinski); TTO ADPM

PI: CJ Kim

Grad Students: Muchen Xu  
Gintare Kerezyte  
Shashank Gowda  
Ning Yu

Unpaid contributors: Naichao Chen (visiting scholar)  
Hao Tong (visiting scholar)  
Jeong-Won Lee (undergrad)  
Andrew Grabowski (undergrad)



1/52

## The Proposed



### Task 1: Improve SHPo microstructures to enhance gas entrapment

- 1.1 Optimize trenches for maximum effective lifetime of trapped gas
- 1.2 Optimize trenches for stable gas replenishing mechanism
- 1.3 Develop self-regulated and self-powered gas replenishing mechanism

### Task 2: Develop scalable fabrication of self-sustainable SHPo film

- 2.1 Develop whole-Teflon hot embossing for optimized passive surface
- 2.2 Develop whole-Teflon hot embossing for self-sustainable surface
- 2.3 Develop mechanized processing for scale-up manufacturing

### Task 3: Flow testing and characterization

- 3.1 Develop shear sensor for direct measurement of skin friction
- 3.2 Characterize developed surfaces using in-house water tunnel
- 3.3 Prepare surfaces and help testing them at DoD flow facilities
- 3.4 Develop and perform field tests in real marine conditions



2/52




## Task 1: Improve SHPo microstructures to enhance gas entrapment



### Task 1.1 Trench geometries to prolong gas trapping

Gas Fraction:  $GF = (P-w)/P$



- Decide pitch  $P$  and gas fraction  $GF$  to use:


Gas retaining ability  
 $\propto 1/(P-w)$

Tradeoff

Drag reducing ability  
 $\propto GF$  and  $P$

Desired:  
small  $P$  with high  $GF$


**Our main choice:**  
 $P = 50 \mu\text{m}$  and  $GF = 90\%$ ,  
considering theory and  
fabrication constraints



A typical silicon SHPo surface

- Silicon SHPo surfaces are mostly used because the geometry can be precisely controlled.
- After molding is developed, Teflon SHPo films are also used to show scalability.

Task 1.1 completed.




## Task 1.2 Trench geometries for stable gas replenishment


---

### Visualization of gas replenishing process

Sample and visualization direction: Gas recovery under 5 atm pressure:





(a)





(b)

#### High pressure chamber:








5/52




- SHPo surface whose trenches have SHPo bottom spreads gas much better
- We have developed fabrication process to obtain such a SHPo surface by changing the mold instead of adding more steps to the molding process




(a)




(b)




(c)




(d)




(e)




(f)




- The tapered sidewall greatly facilitated demolding
- The nanoholes on mold top creates “nanograss” at trench bottom, making it SHPo



6/52




### Robust self-limiting gas replenishing with hierarchical SHPo surfaces:

Video: 

FEP SHPo surface




100 μm



10 μm


\* Trenches appear bright when filled with air and dark when wetted by water

The bottom surface of the trenches desired to be SHPo for stable gas replenishment.



Task 1.2 completed.


7/52




### Task 1.3 Self-regulated and self-powered gas replenishing mechanism

Self-powered self-regulating gas restoration mechanism:


(a) Dewetted (no consumption)




(b) Partially wetted




(c) Dewetting (material consumption)




(a) Dewetted (no material consumption)



(b) Partially wetted



(c) Dewetting (material consumption)




Cathode:  $2H^+ + 2e^- \Rightarrow H_2 \uparrow$

Anode:  $M - e^- \Rightarrow M^+$

- Self-powered electrochemical process
- Easy application w/o wiring

- The mechanism has been evaluated after developing fabrication process
- Differences and advantages have been studied and clarified.
- Choices of the material pairs have been investigated for performances.



8/52




The concept and fabrication verified with 1 cm x 1 cm sample


- No external power used
- When trenches are intentionally wetted, gas is generated
- When dewetted, gas generation stops, confirming the self-limiting ability

Videos played at 4x

Type I



5 mm



Type II

Self-regulated and -powered gas replenishment has been studied for its mechanism, material choices, and limitation and experimentally verified.



## Task 2: Develop scalable fabrication of self-sustainable SHPo film

DARPA

## Task 2.1 Develop whole-Teflon hot embossing for passive SHPo surface

Overall processing sequence:

Legend: ■ Teflon® ■ Silicon

**Hot embossing**

**Demolding**

Press  
Mold and sample  
Hot plate

Hot embossing setup with manual press

P = 50 μm; GF = 90%

Typical result.  
Adequate for small samples (2 cm x 2 cm)

- Numerous improvements and optimization made
- Temperature, heating time and ramping rate of hot plate, Si mold, and Teflon film
- Material type and thickness of Teflon film
- Custom-made press head for uniform pressure

Whole-Teflon hot embossing process to fabricate SHPo films verified.

Task 2.1 completed.

11/52

DARPA

## Task 2.2 Develop whole-Teflon® hot embossing for semi-active SHPo surface

Hot embossing setup showing the hot embossing of semi-active SHPo surface

Electrode wire  
Air Spring  
Glass  
FEP  
Al plate  
Mold  
Hot plate  
Frame


Al plate  
Hotplate

- Air spring improved the pressure uniformity
- After hot embossing, aluminum (Al) plate would be removed from hot plate for fast cooling


12/52




One-step hot embossing process proposed and developed.



Video: animation of the above process



By making only the top of the silicon mold roughened, we succeeded to fabricate SHPo trenches with SHPo bottom surface, realizing the conclusion of Task 1.2.




13/52



We have successfully developed one-step hot embossing process for semi-active SHPo surface samples. However, it is limited to 2 cm x 2 cm samples if the trench bottom needs to have nanogross (found useful in Task 1.2). For SHPo films with smooth trench bottom, the current setup can fabricate 4 cm x 4 cm samples.

- Most of the area of the SHPo surface got dewetted (dark to bright color)
- This sample is large enough to fill the floating plate on some of the drag sensors in Task 3.1




Whole Teflon hot embossing process developed for semi-active SHPo films.

Task 2.2 completed.





14/52




## Task 2.3 Develop mechanized process for scale-up manufacturing



- Press frame custom-ordered to manufacture SHPo surface samples with a relatively large area (e.g., > 4 cm x 4 cm) with hot embossing.
- Note the improved quality of the microstructures compared with those in Task 2.1.
- The holder is computer-controlled to load, mold, demold, and release a Teflon film










Teflon® FEP  
50 µm






15/52




- Developed apparatus to cut whole Teflon samples
- Obtained well-defined edges with vertical sidewall, which minimize dead zone between SHPo samples
- Multiple samples can be tiled to form a large area






Sidewall improved by using a chisel-edge blade



Mechanized process to make whole Teflon films developed.


Task 2.3 completed.
16/52



## Task 3: Flow testing and characterization



### Task 3.1 Develop shear sensor for direct measurement of skin friction

- In development stage, many different SHPo surfaces need to be evaluated
- Manufacturing of the many SHPo samples each in meters is unreasonable
- We hope to sense the drag of a surface sample ~5 cm in size (made from 4" wafer) placed on a desired location of the flow test without affecting the flow

**Common friction drag measurement methods:**


	Methods	Pros	Cons
Indirect	Pressure drop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple setup</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only channel flow</li> <li>• Low accuracy</li> </ul>
	Particle image velocimetry (PIV)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TBL flow capability</li> <li>• Visualization of velocity profile</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bulky and complex</li> <li>• Not for open water</li> <li>• Large uncertainty</li> </ul>
Direct	Rheometer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple setup</li> <li>• High accuracy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only Taylor-Couette flow</li> </ul>
	MEMS floating element (optical)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High accuracy</li> <li>• TBL flow capability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bulky optical setup</li> <li>• Fragile structure</li> <li>• Size limit</li> <li>• Fabrication challenge</li> </ul>
	Pivot sensor (piezoelectric)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High accuracy</li> <li>• TBL flow capability</li> <li>• Robust structure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assembly difficulty</li> <li>• Temperature &amp; pressure sensitivity</li> </ul>



**Our previous MEMS shear stress sensor:**

- Relative drag by two plates was proven useful
- MEMS fabrication: expensive but accurate
- Too fragile to attach&detach samples
- Reading with high-speed camera too bulky

Our previous MEMS shear sensor with double floating plates made of silicon



Park, Sun, Kim, *JFM*, (2014)

**An ideal shear sensor would be:**

- **Size range:** accept SHPo samples from 1 cm to 10 cm
- **Low profile:** fit into towing plate or ship hull
- **High resolution:** read with minimal floating plate displacement to reduce error
- **Robust:** functional in different environments
- **Sample attachment:** allow repeated sample attachment and detachment
- **Cost:** need to be economical for customization and mass manufacturing

**Our approach**



Low profile: keep the flexure design of MEMS sensor but use small encoder  
 Use a metal to provide the size range and allow sample attachment  
 A thin optical encoder may provide high resolution, robustness, and low profile



**Goal: low-profile monolithic metal shear sensor with optical encoder**

- Monolithic metal shear sensor requires machining extremely flexible (sub-millimeter wide and centimeters long) beams that suspend a floating plate.
- We have developed a new wire-EDM process to accomplish this goal.

- Metal beams that are narrow (0.25-0.5 mm) and long (50-100 mm) but thick (5-10 mm)
- Robust enough for sample change
- Economical for customization and mass manufacturing





- Linear optical encoder:**
- Resolution as high as 2 nm
  - Robust against environmental parameter change
  - Compact and low-profile: only ~18 mm thick





**For floating plates, we have developed a new wire-EDM process:**

- Special wire EDM process designed and proven using a commercial service (Wire Cut Company)
- Use of a right material and cutting sequence was the key to the success



Narrow (0.25-0.5 mm) and long (50-100 mm) beams carved out of a thick (5-10 mm) plate




21/52



**To read the floating plate displacement, we identified a small optical encoder**

- Mercury 1000 model (resolution up to 78 nm) from Celera Motion
- Optical system of the shear sensor shown below
- One sensor system for each floating plate



(a) Bottom view of the encoder holder; the encoder head's laser is shining into the page. (b) Picture showing how the encoder is ultimately connected to the computer (USB).



22/52

**DARPA**

---

**Structural characterization of the floating plate:**

Natural frequency measurement

Noise frequency during testing

Transform function

Most of the noise (~90%) would be filtered

23/52

**DARPA**

---

We have developed a software that displays the shear sensor output in real time, i.e., reading live drag reduction data during flow tests

### QSB Real Time

Device	Serial Number	Encoder Count	Time Stamp
QSB-D on COM5	77991	25	34659
QSB-D on COM7	78049	9	34187

Control Panel

Max. Count Number (100%):   Use Device Time Stamp   Live Monitor

Interval (1.95 ms / interval):   Use Windows Time Stamp   Save Plot

Save Path:


Found 2 QSB devices.

24/52



**The shear sensing system**

- Floating plate is carved out of the frame plate made of corrosion resistant aluminum (Al 5083 & Al 6061) or titanium (grade 2)
- Sample (SHPo or smooth film) is bonded on the sample holder, which is reversibly affixed on the floating plate
- Surfaces of sample and cover plate are flush
- Encoder is sealed in the encoder holder, which is affixed on bottom of the frame plate
- Newest design: a 4 cm x 7 cm sample displaces by 3-10  $\mu\text{m}$  at  $Re = 1 \times 10^6 - 1 \times 10^7$



The idea of metallic shear sensor verified and a low-profile system developed.

As its role has greatly expanded during our program, we have developed this sensor to a much more advanced level than originally planned. Recognizing its utility, we have filed a patent.

Task 3.1 completed.






25/52

**Task 3.2 Characterize developed surfaces using in-house water tunnel**



**The developed sensor verified using silicon passive SHPo surfaces**


Schematic side-view (not to scale):



26/52



- The in-house water tunnel has been modified to accommodate the shear sensing unit. The test section of the in-house water tunnel was replaced to allow for testing of semi-active SHPo surfaces.
- Using passive a SHPo surface of  $P = 50 \mu\text{m}$  and  $\text{GF} = 75\%$ , we have obtained drag ratio to smooth surface. It varied between 8% and 18%.



In-house water channel modified to accommodate 4 cm x 4 cm samples and confirmed to measure drag reduction




Task 3.2 completed.

27/52

### Task 3.3 Prepare surfaces and help testing them at DoD flow facilities



- Early on, it was decided we would perform the flow tests at NUWC water tunnel
- Developed a window panel with our drag sensing system to fit the water tunnel
- We have visited NUWC a total of 8 times to develop the tests and obtain data
- NUWC provided personnel and performed experiments with UCLA student
- The window panel has gone through several improvements and modifications. The latest is shown schematically below.




28/52




- The bottom window panel of test section 2 (or 3 for a few intermediate tests) was replaced with our window panel housing the drag sensing unit.
- The bottom position was chosen so that the testing window panel would hold the sample surfaces right-side up, avoiding any interaction with air bubbles floating along the top of the water tunnel.

NUWC water tunnel



Testing window panel



29/52





The 1<sup>st</sup> water tunnel experiment (December 15, 2015)

- Encountered gross water leakage
- Ran up to 2 m/s and confirmed the sensing accuracy when measured

The 2<sup>nd</sup> water tunnel experiment (March 10-11, 2016)

- Packaging modified to place the encoder outside water tunnel
- The state of plastron successfully monitored and found persistent (a surprise)



- Encountered water leakage at high flow speeds
- Drag data of smooth surface did not match theory well




30/52



### The 3<sup>rd</sup> water tunnel experiment (June 13-15, 2016)

- All the problems encountered in the 2<sup>nd</sup> visit were fixed.
- Drag reduction was found enhanced as Re increased. This is the first experimental results showing the trend predicted by some numerical studies.
- Wetting dynamics of passive SHPo surfaces observed up to  $Re > 1.59 \times 10^7$
- At high speeds, the floating plate was found vibrating excessively and bumping into the surrounding frame.
- At high speeds, numerous bubbles were found accumulating underneath the floating plate, compromising the optical encoder reading and making the measurement unreliable at  $> \sim 5$  m/s . We believe these bubbles were “generated” (not introduced from outside the tunnel) by the water pressure lower than the surrounding air at high speeds, as supported the NUWC data.



Hrubes and Henoch, Dec. 17, 2015



### The 4<sup>th</sup> water tunnel experiment (Aug. 11, 2016)

- Tested high viscosity oil to prevent bubble accumulation and dampen excessive floating plate vibration. It slowed down but did not eliminate bubble accumulation, while causing many other problems. We decided not to use oil.

### The 5<sup>th</sup> water tunnel experiment (Sep. 21, 2016)

- By placing the encoder inside the water tunnel (see the latest package), we successfully prevented excessive vibration. However, it made the sealing of the encoder more challenging.
- We filled the space between the floating plate and the encoder to with undersaturated water, preventing bubble generation in the space. The supersaturated water in the water tunnel is calculated to take hours to diffuse to the encoder region. This approach was found successful.
- We were able to collect data for three more (higher) speeds than ever before.
- Concluding all the major problems solved, we decided to make minor improvements in the next visit before starting full experiments.



**The test procedure are now established as follows.**

1. Boil a full cooking pot of water on an induction heater
2. Cool the cooking pot in a tub of ice water until warm to the touch
3. Place the cooking pot full of cooled under-saturated water in the water tunnel
6. Put floating plate into the cooking pot at a slant (back side facing up at an angle)
7. Remove bubbles in the beams, screw holes, and near the ruler of the floating plate with a pipette
8. Put the encoder holder into the cooking pot at a slant (encoder lenses facing the rulers on the back of the floating plate)
9. Remove the bubbles in the screw holes and around the lip of the encoder holder with a pipette
10. Align the floating plate and encoder holes and screw together inside the cooking pot while still submerged underwater
11. Plug the holes meant for attaching the floating plate+encoder holder unit to the window with rubber plugs
12. Fill the water tunnel with water so that the cooking pot is submerged in water
13. Tilt the cooking pot enough so that the floating plate+encoder holder unit can be removed without exposing it to air (under-saturated water should be trapped in the gap)



The 6<sup>th</sup> water tunnel experiment (Oct. 27, 2016)

- Covering encoders completely with silicone sealant in holder prevented leaks
- Structural modifications made on floating plate and encoder holder did not prevent data shifts. We suspect the occasional bubbles passing the laser path. However, data can still be extracted before and after the shift.
- Two encoders used to allow a side-by-side collection of Smooth vs. SHPo data
- We have obtained drag data for all flow speeds. However, the data were irregular especially at low speeds. We concluded the SHPo surface was wetted while transferring the sample into the water tunnel in the undersaturated water.


The 7<sup>th</sup> water tunnel experiment (Nov. 17-18, 2016)

- Sample was kept flush with cover plate over time by making sample holder with aluminum (stronger threads), using one layer of tape (insoluble in water) for spacers, and using a metal feeler gauge
- Before data collection for each run, the water tunnel was run at  $Re = 1.45 \times 10^7$  for a 3-5 minutes to de-wet SHPo sample, but improvement was not noticeable.
- Bubble problem again, probably because of the higher speed than before.



The 8<sup>th</sup> water tunnel experiment (Dec. 13-16, 2016)

- Avoid the highest speed ( $Re = 1.62 \times 10^7$ ) and shorten the data collection time to reduce the bubble problem. This prevented the previous irregular data.
- Re-measured the spring constant of each floating plate as it drifted over time.
- Finally, we obtained full data, using the following 4 different SHPo samples.




GF = Gas fraction =  $(P-W)/P$

Sample Name	Material	Pitch	GF	Height
Si (P50G90H50)	silicon	50 $\mu\text{m}$	90%	50 $\mu\text{m}$
Si (P50G90H30)	silicon	50 $\mu\text{m}$	90%	30 $\mu\text{m}$
Si (P25G90H30)	silicon	25 $\mu\text{m}$	90%	30 $\mu\text{m}$
FEP (P50G90H50)	Teflon	50 $\mu\text{m}$	90%	50 $\mu\text{m}$




- For a baseline test, we tested two plates both with a smooth surface
- The results show very close displacement values over all speeds



- We can conclude that the two plates experience the same flow condition, supporting our double-plate approach that measures drag ratio of two different surfaces right next to each other.





- DARPA**
1. Drag reduction up to 34% ( $Re = 2.3 - 9.7 \times 10^6$ ) obtained in NUWC water tunnel
  2. For a given SHPo surface, drag reduction increased with Reynolds number. This trend is the first experimental confirmation of some numerical predictions.
  3. Si (P50G90H30) with 50  $\mu\text{m}$  pitch produced larger drag reduction than Si (P25G90H30) with 25  $\mu\text{m}$  pitch. This is the first confirmation in turbulent flows.
  4. Si (P50G90H30) with 30  $\mu\text{m}$  deep trench depth had larger drag reduction than Si (P50G90H50) with 50  $\mu\text{m}$  deep trench. This trend may be because shallower trenches *start to get wet later* than deeper channels.
  5. FEP (P50G90H50) had larger drag reduction than Si (P50G90H50). The whole Teflon surface of FEP (P50G90H50) may have retained thicker *plastron* than the Teflon-coated Si (P50G90H30), providing larger drag reduction.
  6. Errors are apparent at slow speeds ( $Re = 2.3 \times 10^6$  and  $3.5 \times 10^6$ ). This could be due to pre-wetting by the undersaturated water.
  7. While 2 and 3 above are conclusive, 4 and 5 are somewhat speculative.
- Task 3.3 completed.
- 38/52
- Micro Nano**  
UCLA Manufacturing Laboratory



### Task 3.4 Develop and perform field tests in real marine conditions

#### 1: Towing tank test at Stevens Institute of Technology

Motivation:

- Towing tank is the experimental facility that is most similar to real marine vessel (e.g., turbulent boundary layer flow, wave generation, etc.)
- Reynolds number and flow conditions could be well-controlled

Towing tank at Stevens Institute of Technology:

- 313 ft long and 16 ft wide, and can support water depths as high as 8 ft
- Speeds up to 100 ft/s with speed control of .01 ft/s



<https://www.stevens.edu/research-entrepreneurship/research-centers-labs/davidson-laboratory/facilities-centers/design-evaluation>

Attractive to our project:


- Open in air, this water does not lead to the false positive result (i.e., sustained plastron) obtained in the forced flows usually supersaturated with air.
- Our sensing plate avoids the main drawback of the towing tank test (i.e., drag affected by the attack angle of the towing plate).



39/52



- We developed a towing plate using aluminum honeycomb panel with streamlined edges to reduce weight and splashing at high-speed flows, respectively.
- We developed an underwater camera system to observe SHPo surface during tests
- We visited them 3 times for tests: Nov. 1, Nov. 21-22, and Dec. 19-22, 2016





- Honeycomb panel by Kerr Panel Manufacturing
- Streamlined edge machined by American Best Engineering



40/52



### Shear sensor assembly and miniature underwater camera




41/52



### Development of miniature underwater video camera system

- Monitoring the plastron during flow tests is critical to interpret the drag reduction data. For open water tests, the camera should travel with the surface under water.
- An undergrad student Ms. Jeong Lee (stipend by the NSF REU) has developed a miniature underwater camera system
- RaspberryPi 3 and its camera module adopted for their small size and low price

- The camera is placed inside a Nano Cache of Cachebox, whose cap is machined open and sealed with a glass piece for viewing. The twist-open cap allows adjustment of focus. We obtained an IP 48 level waterproof camera unit.



Camera unit  
19 mm high  
15 mm diameter

- During flow tests, a camera unit is placed in an streamlined housing (CAM)



42/52

**DARPA**

**SHPo films fabricated and tested**

Micro-grating

Silicon      Silicon      Teflon® FEP

Random

NeverWet®

(a)

(b)

(c)

(d)

**Micro Nano**  
UCLA Manufacturing Laboratory

43/52

**DARPA**

**The state of plastron on SHPo films during flow tests.**

SHPo-1: Silicon,  $P = 50\mu\text{m}$ ,  $W = 5\mu\text{m}$ ,  $H = 60\mu\text{m}$ ,  $GF = 90\%$

Wetted areas would appear dark.

(a)  $U=2.1\text{ m/s}$

(b)  $U=3.1\text{ m/s}$

(c)  $U=4.0\text{ m/s}$

(d)  $U=5.2\text{ m/s}$

(e)  $U=6.1\text{ m/s}$

(f)  $U=7.0\text{ m/s}$

(g)  $U=8.2\text{ m/s}$

(h)  $U=9.1\text{ m/s}$

(i)  $U=10.1\text{ m/s}$

SHPo-2: Silicon,  $P = 25\mu\text{m}$ ,  $W = 2.5\mu\text{m}$ ,  $H = 25\mu\text{m}$ ,  $GF=90\%$

(a)  $U=2.1\text{ m/s}$

(b)  $U=3.1\text{ m/s}$

(c)  $U=4.0\text{ m/s}$

(d)  $U=5.2\text{ m/s}$

(e)  $U=6.1\text{ m/s}$

(f)  $U=7.0\text{ m/s}$


(g)  $U=8.2\text{ m/s}$

(h)  $U=9.1\text{ m/s}$

(i)  $U=10.1\text{ m/s}$


**Micro Nano**  
UCLA Manufacturing Laboratory

44/52




SHPo-3: Teflon, P = 50 μm, W = 8 μm, H = 40 μm, GF = 90%

(a) U=2.1 m/s




Flow →

(b) U=3.1 m/s




Flow →

(c) U=4.0 m/s




Flow →

(d) U=5.2 m/s




Flow →

(e) U=6.1 m/s




Flow →

(f) U=7.0 m/s




Flow →

(g) U=8.2 m/s




Flow →

(h) U=9.1 m/s



Flow →


(i) U=10.1 m/s



Flow →


SHPo-4: Random surface spay-coated with NeverWet®

(a) U=0 m/s




Flow →

(b) U=2.1 m/s




Flow →

(d) U=4.0 m/s




Flow →

(e) U=6.1 m/s




Flow →

(g) U=8.2 m/s



Flow →


(h) U=10.1 m/s




Flow →

Wetting not observed for NeverWet surface. The surface was dry when taken out of water

While all our SHPo surfaces were partially wetted at high speeds, NeverWet surface did not appear getting wetted.



45/52




**Results:**

- All our SHPo surfaces produced a drag reduction in tow tank tests
- We confirmed rough SHPo surfaces (used by most others) do not provide drag reduction in tow tank unless at very low speeds

Sample	Material	P (μm)	W (μm)	H (μm)	GF	Reentrant
SHPo-1	Si	50	5	60	90%	Yes
SHPo-2	Si	25	2.5	25	90%	No
SHPo-3	FEP	50	8	40	85%	No
SHPo-4	Random (NeverWet®)					


Drag ratio of SHPo to smooth surface



Partially wet if no wetting

Anticipated if no wetting


Drag reduction as much as 25% has been obtained. This is the first report of successful SHPo drag reduction for high-speed tow tank tests.



46/52



## 2: Boat test at Los Angeles coast



### Motivation:

- Boat on seawater is a real application
- After the summer research by an undergrad Mr. Andrew Grabowski (funded by the NSF REU), we concluded a real boat is feasible
- Flow tests near UCLA would accelerate the research progress

### The boat:

- 1979 13' Boston Whaler with 20 hp engine
- Safety: hull material of closed cells assures flotation at any adverse condition
- Purchased a used unit from the UCLA Aquatic Center at a discounted price
- It was deemed feasible to install our drag sensor through the boat hull

### Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, California:




- Calm salt water environment in close proximity
- Easy access to ocean level turbulent conditions



47/52



- We have prepared an open tank inside the boat. Our sensor plate is installed at the bottom of the tank so that its wet surface is flush with the hull surface. The onboard tank allows us to test multiple samples on one trip.



Boat moving

Shear sensor





48/52



Confirm the utility of the double floating plates approach

- Smooth surface samples were attached on both of the floating plates
- The trend of shear stress vs. speed showed uncertain flow condition
- Despite the uncertainties, the two smooth surfaces on the double floating plates always reported the same drag. If tested separately, a given surface would report different drag value each time at the same Reynolds number.



- The double floating plates ensure they experience the same flow conditions, so that the displacement difference is only by the sample surfaces on them. This approach is verified here for boat tests, too.



49/52



**Results**


SHPo surface with  $P = 50 \mu\text{m}$ ,  $W = 5 \mu\text{m}$ ,  $H = 60 \mu\text{m}$ , and  $GF = 90\%$

SHPo surface at  $\sim 3 \text{ m/s}$  (video played at x4)



- Bubbles initially trapped on surface
- Flows were found bubbly, keeping the passive SHPo surface dewetted

Drag ratio of SHPo vs. smooth surface



- Confirms Reynolds number effect

Drag reduction as much as 20% has been obtained\*. This is the first report of successful SHPo drag reduction for boat tests.

\*After the project ended, now we are obtaining drag reduction over 30%



Task 3.4 completed.

50/52



## Summary

- The microstructure geometry for prolonged gas trapping has been designed for SHPo surfaces and implemented
- Molding process for whole-Teflon samples has been developed for passive and semi-active SHPo films
- Low-profile shear sensor with double floating plates has been developed to measure the drag ratio of SHPo-to-smooth surface accurately and conveniently under varying flow conditions
- SHPo surfaces were tested in high-speed water tunnel (NUWC) and produced drag reduction as large as 34%
- SHPo surfaces were tested in high-speed tow tank and produced drag reduction as large as 25%
- SHPo surfaces were tested under a motor boat on seawater and produced drag reduction as large as 20%
- All the proposed tasks have been completed



## Discussions

- Our SHPo surfaces consist of parallel trenches with a high void fraction, unlike the random roughness most other groups use
- We were able to show how important the micro- and nano-scale details of the microstructures on the SHPo surfaces are for successful drag reduction
- The low-profile shear sensor developed is expected to be a major tool for experimental studies of skin friction drag in the future
- While obtaining drag reductions up to 34% in a high-speed water tunnel, we have found why it misrepresents the flow condition of boats. This explains why the success with water tunnel has never been duplicated in open water
- Our successful drag reduction in high-speed tow tank is the first ever reported
- Our drag reduction in high-speed boat is the first ever reported
- Surprisingly, the semi-active SHPo surface was not needed for the boat tests. While very encouraging for applications, it did not give us the chance to study the semi-active SHPo surfaces as much as we had planned.