Building America Case Study

Monitoring of Double-Stud Wall Moisture Conditions in the Northeast

Devens, Massachusetts

PROJECT INFORMATION

Construction: New construction

Partners:

Building Science Corporation, *buildingscience.com*

Transformations, Inc., *transformations-inc.com*

Size: 1100-ft² to 2300-ft² houses

Climate Zone: Cold (5A)



Building AMERICA SM
U.S. Department of Energy

Double-stud walls insulated with cellulose or low-density spray foam can have R-values of 40 or higher; they have been used in high performance housing since the 1970s. Their advantages include trade familiarity with construction detailing (especially at the exterior) and the use of commonly available construction materials. However, double-stud walls have a higher risk of interior-sourced condensation moisture damage compared to high-R approaches using exterior insulating sheathing.

The U.S. Department of Energy Building America team, Building Science Corporation (BSC), monitored moisture conditions in double-stud walls from 2011 through 2014 at a new production house located in Devens, Massachusetts. The builder, Transformations, Inc., has been using double-stud walls insulated with 12 in. of open cell polyurethane spray foam (ocSPF); however, the company has been considering a change to netted and blown cellulose insulation for cost reasons. Cellulose is a common choice for double-stud walls because of its lower cost (in most markets). However, cellulose is an air-permeable insulation, unlike spray foams, which increases interior moisture risks.

The team compared three double-stud assemblies: 12 in. of ocSPF, 12 in. of cellulose, and 5-½ in. of ocSPF at the exterior of a double-stud wall (to approximate conventional 2×6 wall construction and insulation levels, acting as a control wall). These assemblies were repeated on the north and south orientations, for a total of six assemblies.

BSC collected data from December 2011 through July 2014, capturing three winters of operation in various states. Winter 2011–2012 was very mild, and had very low interior relative humidity (RH) because it was unoccupied. Winter 2012–2013 was colder, and had very high (40%–50%) interior RH until the ventilation system was put into operation (mid-February 2013). Winter 2013–2014 was very cold, but the ventilation system was operated, resulting in moderate interior RHs.

Construction Recommendations

Based on the monitoring, both ocSPF and cellulose double-stud walls will probably experience alarmingly high moisture levels during high interior wintertime RH loadings (40%–50% RH). However, disassembly demonstrated that the walls appear to be largely unaffected by this wetting. Nevertheless, the team recommends a more conservative approach because these specific test walls were apparently protected by some mechanisms of the cavity fill insulation (cellulose/ocSPF) or sheathing.

The cellulose walls clearly showed the highest moisture accumulation. BSC recommends using interior vapor control more restrictive than Class III (latex paint). A Class II vapor retarder (e.g., variable permeability membrane or vapor retarder paint) reduces moisture risks to more reasonable levels; however, double-stud walls insulated with cellulose with only Class III vapor control likely provide fine service. A Class I vapor retarder (polyethylene) is not recommended because it completely eliminates inward drying.

The ocSPF walls had less moisture accumulation than the cellulose walls; it is a marginal judgment call whether a Class II vapor retarder is needed or warranted. The ocSPF material used provides reasonable vapor control at the thicknesses applied (2.0 to 2.5 perms in 12 in.). The use of a Class II vapor retarder would definitely be conservative, but the double-stud walls insulated with ocSPF have a history of providing excellent performance in this builder's houses.

This project shows that a functional mechanical ventilation system is critical for enclosure durability in modern high performance construction in cold climates.

For more information, see the Building America report, *Monitoring of Double-Stud Wall Moisture Conditions in the Northeast,* at *buildingamerica.gov*.

Image credit: All images were created by the BSC team.



North side sheathing moisture contents with exterior temperature

Under "normal" interior conditions (functioning ventilation system, wintertime RH 10%–30%), ocSPF walls (both 12 in. and 5-½ in.) with latex paint as interior vapor control (Class III) showed low risk; all sheathing moisture contents (MCs) remained below 20%. However, the 12-in. cellulose wall had MCs that exceeded 20% on the north side.

Under high interior humidity loading (nonfunctional ventilation system, 40%–50% interior RH), all test walls showed MCs and sheathing-insulation interface RHs well into the high risk range. The cellulose walls showed particularly high MCs (sheathing that exceeded 30%), while the ocSPF walls showed MCs in the 18%–25% range. In addition, the monitoring showed evidence of liquid water condensation (which can result in quick degradation) in all walls, with substantial condensation in the cellulose walls.

BSC found that in all walls, during each summer after a winter of wetting, moisture levels fell well into the safe range. When the walls were disassembled at the conclusion of the experiment, the sheathing and framing showed remarkably little evidence of wetting damage or mold growth. No visible mold growth, staining, or water rundown was found. The damage was limited to some grain raise of the interior surface of the oriented strand board at the cellulose wall, and slight corrosion of fasteners and staples.

DOE/GO-102015-4590 • March 2015