#### Feature

## **Adhered Veneers and Inward** Vapor Drives: Significance, Problems and Solutions

By Dr. John Straube, P.Eng., Chris Schumacher, Jonathan Smegal and Marcus Jablonka

ADHERED VENEERS, IN WHICH MA-SONRY units are directly attached to a substrate via mortar and ties without a drainage or ventilation gap, have become a very popular finish in residential and light commercial construction. Typical applications apply thin masonry units over a bed of lath-reinforced mortar over a drainage plane (often a single layer of building paper, felt or housewrap).

When used over wood- or steelframed walls, numerous reports of moisture problems and failures have been reported (Rymell 2007). The lack



Figure 1. Typical wall construction and sensor layout for full scale wall testing. The opening in the test facility was lined with a wood frame wrapped in a self-adhered flashing to help isolate the test panel from any other moisture sources. All of the instrumentation is located in the centre third of the wall over the entire height. This helps minimize edge effects and simulates accurate field performance of the enclosure system. Monitoring began on July 16, 2007 and is on-going.

of a well-defined drainage space, and warm-weather inward vapor drives have been implicated as the reasons for these moisture problems.

Drainage can easily be provided by installing a second layer of building paper, particularly if one layer is a creped housewrap, and ensuring that flashing and weep holes are included. However, controlling inward vapor drives is more problematic, as building papers and housewraps are highly vapor permeable, and both the mortar and the masonry unit can store a significant amount of rain water via capillary absorption. During sunny weather following rain, water vapor stored in the masonry can be driven into the sheathing and into the stud bay, resulting in wood decay and condensation on air-conditioned interior surfaces. Air-conditioned buildings with low-permeance vapor retarders (such as polyethylene, vinyl wall paper, and aluminum foil) exacerbate this problem.

One proposed solution to avoiding the risk of these problems is the use of a vapor-impermeable air gap membrane behind the adhered veneer. A rigid plastic membrane will control inward vapor drives, but will not allow water vapor in the studspace or framing to dry to the exterior. Previous research suggests that a ventilated air space may allow the required drying (Karagiozis et al 2005, Straube et al 2004), but this has not been demonstrated in the field for an impermeable air gap membrane.

#### **EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM**

An experimental program was developed to measure and compare the performance of adhered veneer cladding side-by-side with an alternative method that uses a vapor-impermeable rigid polymer-based air-gap membrane. The objective of the study was to compare adhered veneer walls using a rigid plastic dimple sheet in place of asphalt impregnated paper as the sheathing membrane. These walls were installed in a natural exposure field testing facility in Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.

To collect field measurements for over a year of monitoring two types of wood-framed walls, one with an air gap membrane and another installed following standard practice. No penetrations through the test assembly were installed to eliminate the potential of bulk rain penetration problems. Each type of wall was faced either north or south in a test hut located in Water Ontario. Waterloo has an average of approximately 4300°C (7772°F) heating degree days (7800 HDD F). The hut is in an exposed location, free from obstruction by other buildings.

All of the test panels were 8 ft (2.4 m) in height, and 4 ft (1.2 mm) in width and shared construction of 2 x 6 wood framing on approximately 16 inch (0.4 m) centers with OSB sheathing, a poly interior vapor barrier, drywall finish and air barrier, and R19 (RSI3.5) fiberglass batt insulation.

Instrumentation included a temperature and relative humidity sensor in the drain space, as well as the stud space, moisture content sensors in the sheathing and framing, and temperature sensors on the cladding and drywall. All of the monitored framing is clear eastern white pine (EWP), and the remaining framing is generic SPF framing. Details of the instrumentation, data conversion and other details can be found in Straube et al (2002). The data was measured at five minute intervals and the average recorded on an hourly basis. The sensor layout is shown in **FIGURE 1**.

#### **BOUNDARY CONDITIONS**

The exterior and interior conditions were both recorded during testing. The exterior temperatures and relative humidity are shown below in **FIGURE 2.** 

The thirty-year average for monthly average temperatures in Waterloo region are indicated by the black lines.

The intentional wetting event is shown on some of the analysis graphs as a dashed red vertical line at the time of the first water injection. Following the analysis of performance under normal conditions, the intentional wetting event is analyzed in detail using the moisture content sensor located in the sheathing at the water storage media location (as can seen in **FIGURE 4**).

#### **ANALYSIS RESULTS**

To compare the performance of engineered stone veneer with and without an air gap membrane, the moisture content of the sheathing, moisture content of the framing and the relative humidity of the stud space were analyzed.

The first comparison, shown in **FIGURE 5**, are the sheathing moisture contents of the north orientation of both test walls. There are three moisture content measurement locations in the sheathing on each wall: 16 inches from the bottom, mid height, and 16 inches from the top. The data shows that the sheathing moisture content was higher in all three locations in the standard construction wall



Figure 2. Exterior temperature and RH during testing. The interior temperature and relative humidity were controlled for most of the testing period. The relative humidity was kept between 40 percent and 50 percent for most of the testing period. As the test walls have sealed drywall air barriers and continuous polyethylene vapor barriers, interior moisture loads do not affect the test wall hygrothermal conditions.

than in the wall with the air gap membrane. Generally, a moisture content of 16 to 20 percent correlates to a surrounding relative humidity of 80 to 90 percent (FPL 1999) and is considered the highest moisture content with no risk for moisture-related problems (Morris 1998). Relative humidities well above 80 percent, and wood moisture contents above 20 percent, may cause moisture-related problems, especially if sustained for long periods of time without drying. Wood rot and decay does not commence until at least 28 percent moisture content.

The sheathing moisture content at all three locations in the standard



Figure 3. Interior temperature and RH during testing. One of the performance criteria for analysis and comparison of the two different wall design approaches is the drying potential. The drying potential was evaluated using a wetting apparatus to inject a known volume of water into a known location in the test wall. The wetting apparatus is shown in Figure 4.

wall was greater than 16 percent, and approached 20 percent, from approximately October 2007 to May 2008.

**FIGURE 7** shows a detailed analysis of the intentional wetting event that started on September 16, 2008. The only sensors included in this analysis are the moisture content sensors located in the lower sheathing, in the middle of the water storage media. The pins are electrically insulated along the shaft so that any only moisture in the sheathing will affect the moisture content readings. The vertical scale in **FIGURE 7** has been changed from the other moisture content analysis to more clearly show the drying rates.

All of the sensors show a response to the increased moisture content within 24 hours of the first water injection. On the north orientation both of the test walls reach a maximum of 33 percent moisture content approximately one week following the first injection. On the south orientation both of the walls reach 25 percent moisture content approximately 3 days following the first injection.

The drying performance differences are evident from this analysis. On the north orientation the standard construction wall is still above 26 percent moisture content four weeks following the initial wetting. The air gap wall on the north orientation quickly dried



Figure 4. Installed wetting apparatus in a test wall. The wetting apparatus consists of a water storage and redistribution media (blue material), and an injection tube to inject water without opening the wall, and thereby disturbing the stud space conditions. Only the first intentional wetting event is included in this paper. The wetting event began on the morning of September 16. Each morning and evening 42.5 grams (1.5 ounces) of water was injected for 4 days for a total of 340 grams (12 ounces). This was intended to simulate a small but steady leak into the enclosure from, for example, a small leaky window, or a failed flashing, during a particularly severe storm.

down to 22 percent moisture content in approximately two weeks following the intentional wetting event, but the drying rate then changes and it dries more slowly.

On the south orientation the results are similar. The standard construction wall on the south orientation dries from 25 percent to 20 percent moisture content in one and a half weeks, but then fluctuates around 20 percent for approximately three weeks, until the end of the data collection. The air gap membrane wall on the south orientation dries to approximately 13 percent moisture content in the first week and a half very quickly. Similarly to the north orientation, the drying rate changes following the initial drying phase to a slower drying rate and reaches 9 percent four weeks following initial wetting.



Figure 5. Sheathing moisture content comparison on the north orientation. On the south orientation, the air gap test wall exhibited lower sheathing moisture contents than the standard construction wall (Figure 6). The performance difference is not as great as the north orientation, but there is still evidence of improved performance due to the air gap.

The forgoing analysis convincingly demonstrates that the small gap produced by the air gap membrane provides sufficient ventilation to allow outward drying at a faster rate than traditional adhered veneers. Adhered veneers appear to have relatively little outward drying potential, and rain leaks or condensation within the studbay will dry at a slower rate than other types of walls previously measured (e.g., Straube et al 2004).

The moisture content of the framing lumber was measured at approximately 3/8 inch from the inside surface of the framing at mid-height. This testing location was specifically included to capture inward vapor driven condensation on a vapor barrier. Vapor pressure is proportional (in a non-linear manner) to the temperature and moisture load. Generally, the south orientation has the greatest solar exposure and also the highest cladding temperatures that often result in the highest inward vapor drives in the summer months. Ventilation and vapor impermeable materials are both strategies to limit inward vapor drives.

FIGURE 8 shows the framing moisture content for all four test walls. During the summer months of both 2007 and 2008, the standard wall on the south orientation had elevated moisture content levels. The moisture content exceeded 16 percent on the south standard wall in the first week of June, and had not returned to 16 percent as of mid October. In 2007, the south standard wall did not return to 16 percent until the end of October. The moisture content of the standard wall on the north orientation is also elevated, but does not exceed 16 percent moisture content. The moisture content in the framing of



Figure 7. Lower sheathing moisture content comparison during an intentional wetting event.



Figure 8. Framing moisture content comparison of all test walls.



Figure 6: Sheathing moisture content comparison of the south orientation. event.



Figure 9. Relative humidity comparison of the stud cavities.

the north standard construction wall is approximately 15 percent moisture content for the entire summer. These elevated moisture content levels indicate that the relative humidity is also likely elevated inside the test wall. The air gap membrane walls on the north and south orientation show no significant increase in moisture content in the summer months caused by inward vapor drives.

In the winter months no readings

are plotted because the framing is too dry for the equipment to accurately measure (ie, the moisture content is below 7 to 8 percent).

The relative humidities of the stud spaces are compared in **FIG-URE 9** for all four test walls. The south-facing standard wall has the highest relative humidity of all four walls, greater than 90 percent, which is also expected given the framing moisture content readings in Figure 8. The relative humidity in the south-facing standard wall began to exceed the other test walls as early as March and was still elevated in mid October at the end of the testing period.

The recorded hourly temperatures of the studspace was measured in the order of 15 to over 30°C (59 to over 86°F) during warm and especially sunny weather. Given the daily average center-of-batt RH of 90 percent in the South standard wall and the 21 to 25°C (69 to 77°F) temperature of the polyethylene vapor barrier, condensation is predicted to occur on the polyethylene vapor barrier for hundreds, perhaps as much as a thousand hours, during the summer. The only source of the water vapor for this condensation is the exterior masonry, as the vapor impermeable and airtight interior polyethylenedrywall layer eliminates the interior as a source.

The standard wall on the north orientation also experiences elevated relative humidities in the summer months, but generally stays at approximately 80 percent. This corresponds to the previously analyzed 15 percent moisture content in the sheathing.

Both of the air gap membrane walls are generally between 60 percent and 70 percent relative humidity for the entire summer.

#### **CONCLUSIONS**

After monitoring the test walls for approximately one year, the following conclusions can be drawn.

• The air gap membrane walls experienced lower sheathing moisture content on both orientations at all times than the comparison standard construction walls.

- During normal operation (ie. not during the intentional wetting event), the standard construction-practice walls on both the south and north orientation did cross the generally accepted moisture content threshold where moisture related problems may occur, but the sheathing of the air gap membrane walls was significantly drier (below 12 percent) at all times under normal operating conditions.
- The air gap membranes walls exhibited faster outward drying following the intentional wetting of the OSB than the standard wall. The air gap, albeit small, allowed significant drying to occur.
- Warm weather inward vapor drives caused elevated moisture content levels in the framing of the standard construction walls. Summer condensation on the vapor barrier likely occurred. The vapor impermeable membrane appeared to decouple the wood framing and sheathing from the moisture in the masonry and transported by inward vapor drives.
- The relative humidities were elevated in both the standard construction walls in the summer months due to inward vapor drives. The elevated humidity levels were high enough (>80 percent) to cause some moisture related durability problems over time. The air gap membrane walls did not experience relative humidities that would cause moisture related durability problems.

Dr. John Straube, P.Eng. is an Associate Professor at the University of Waterloo. Chris Schumacher is a Principal at Building Science Consulting. Jonathan Smegal is an Associate at Building Science Consulting. Marcus Jablonka is Vice President, Research, Development and Production at Cosella-Doerken Products, Inc.

**EDITOR'S NOTE:** For a full list of references for this article email shannonl@matrixgroupinc.net.

# A Healthier Interior Starts At The Skin.

### LUCKILY, TODAY'S BEST PROTECTION IS ALSO THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE.

Brick exterior walls are a building's first defense. When moisture becomes trapped in wall-cavities it cannot only shorten the building's life, it can also foster hazardous mold-growth.

With new TOTALFLASH, **all** of today's most effective drainage methods arrive ingeniously **pre-assembled** onto handy, 5-1/2-foot panels of 40-mil flexible flashing. So it's **TOTAL** protection.

Yet it installs in a *FLASH*, **saving 50% or more in Time-&-Labor costs** versus installing the usual array of separate components! It all adds up to a sweeter bottom line.

#### Supreme wall-drainage. Quicker completion. Serious savings. 1 5-1/2-ft. Panels of PRE-CUT FLEXIBLE FLASHING' All main components 2 Built-In Built-In are factory-assembled NO-CLOG TERMINATION onto easy-to-mount 4 Built-In DRAINAGE BARS flashing panels. EDGE DAM MATTE with pre-drilled directs lets water pass, holes, allow moisture unobstructed, quick, one-man to Weep Tabs. out of installation. building. Built-In NO-CLOG WEEP TABS **5** Clearly 6 Built-In Specified ormed CORNER BOOTS, STAINLESS STAINLESS LAP JOINTS STEEL **DRIP EDGE** moisture away from building. All Screws & Adhesive Tubes included in each box of TOTALFLASH™ Uses 40-mil polymeric, reinforced, UV stable flashing membrane, incorporating DuPont's Elvaloy\* KEE polyme 800-664-6638 MortarNet.com CAVITY-WALL **DRAINAGE SYSTEM** Mortar Net USA, Ltd. Sweets ARCN