

Thermal Bridging in Cold-Formed Steel Wall Assemblies

RESEARCH REPORT RP19-2

June 2019



American Iron and Steel Institute

DISCLAIMER

The material contained herein has been developed by researchers based on their research findings and is for general information only. The information in it should not be used without first securing competent advice with respect to its suitability for any given application. The publication of the information is not intended as a representation or warranty on the part of the American Iron and Steel Institute or of any other person named herein, that the information is suitable for any general or particular use or of freedom from infringement of any patent or patents. Anyone making use of the information assumes all liability arising from such use.

AISI Standards Council Small Project Fellowship: Thermal Bridging in Cold-Formed Steel Wall Assemblies

Submitted to

Jonathan Humble, Regional Director – Northeast Regional Office

American Iron and Steel Institute
45 South Main Street, Suite 312
West Hartford, CT 06107

Jay W. Larson, Managing Director – Construction Technical

American Iron and Steel Institute
3425 Drigton Court
Bethlehem, PA 18020

Pat Ford, Senior Project Manager
raSmith
16745 West Bluemound Road
Brookfield, WI 53005

Prepared by

Divyansh Kapoor, MS Student Researcher

Dr. Kara D. Peterman, Assistant Professor

University of Massachusetts at Amherst
Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
130 Natural Resources Road
Amherst, MA 01003

Divyansh Kapoor

Kara D. Peterman

Date: June 28th, 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	3
LIST OF TABLES	4
1.0 INTRODUCTION	5
1.1 Key Concepts	5
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW	6
2.1 Thermal Analysis of Cold-Formed Steel Wall Assemblies (Research Report RP18-1)	6
2.2 Lightweight steel-framed thermal bridges mitigation strategies: A parametric study.....	9
2.3 The effectiveness of Thermal Insulation in Lightweight Steel-Framed Walls with Respect to Its position.....	11
2.4 Steel vs. Wood: Long-Term Thermal Performance Comparison	13
3.0 THERMAL MODELLING, ANALYSIS, AND VALIDATION	16
3.1 Geometric Properties	16
3.2 Material Properties.....	17
3.3 Boundary Conditions	17
3.4 Validation.....	18
3.5 Parametric Evaluation and Modelling Matrix.....	21
3.6 Estimation of Thermal Transmittance Coefficients.....	22
4.0 RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS.....	23
4.1 Effect of Increasing Stud and Track Thickness	23
4.2 Effect of Increasing Stud and Track Depth.....	24
4.3 Effect of Stud Spacing	26
4.4 Effect of Increasing External Insulation	29
4.5 Effect of Increasing Fastener Diameter and Penetration	30
4.6 Conclusions.....	32
5.0 FUTURE WORK.....	33
6.0 REFERENCES AND CITED WORKS	34
APPENDIX A – MATERIAL PROPERTIES USED FOR VALIDATION AND PROJECT ASSEMBLIES	35
APPENDIX B – MODELLING MATRIX FOR PROJECT ASSEMBLIES	38
APPENDIX B.1 – Summary of 362S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (24” on center)	38
APPENDIX B.2 – Summary of 362S162 - 68 Mil Assemblies (24” on center)	39
APPENDIX B.3 – Summary of 362S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (16” on center)	40
APPENDIX B.4 – Summary of 362S162 - 68 Mil Assemblies (16” on center)	41
APPENDIX B.5 – Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (16” on center)	42
APPENDIX B.6 – Summary of 600S162 - 68 Mil Assemblies (16” on center)	43
APPENDIX B.7 – Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (24” on center)	44
APPENDIX B.8 – Summary of 600S162 - 68 Mil Assemblies (24” on center)	45
APPENDIX B.9 – Summary of 600S162 - 33 Mil Assemblies (16” on center) with #6 Fasteners	46

APPENDIX B.10 – Summary of 600S162 - 54 Mil Assemblies (16” on center) with #6 Fasteners	47
APPENDIX B.11 – Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (24” on center) with #8 1-15/16 inch Fasteners.....	48
APPENDIX B.12 – Summary of 600S162 - 97 Mil Assemblies (16” on center) with #6 Fasteners	49
APPENDIX B.13 – Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (24” on center) with #10 2-1/2 inch Fasteners.....	50
APPENDIX B.14 – Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (16” on center) with #10 3-00 inch Fasteners.....	51
APPENDIX B.15 – Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (24” on center) with #10 3-00 inch Fasteners.....	52
APPENDIX B.16 – Summary of 600S162 - 68 Mil Assemblies (24" on center) with #10 3-00 inch Fasteners.....	53
APPENDIX C – SUMMARY OF RESULTS	54
APPENDIX C.1 – Summary of PA-01 to PA-30	54
APPENDIX C.2 – Summary of PA-31 to PA-60	55
APPENDIX C.3 – Summary of PA-61 to PA-80	56
APPENDIX D – Fastener Modelling.....	57

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Basic configuration of the project assemblies (RP18-1)	6
Figure 2: Description of CFS Wall Assembly and Components used by Santos et al	9
Figure 3: Roque and Santos Facade Wall Assemblies, (a) Warm, (b) Cold, and (c) hybrid frame construction. Materials: 1—Gypsum board; 2—OSB; 3—RW; 4—Air; 5—ETICS finish; 6—LSF; 7—EPS.....	11
Figure 4: Results of the Cold Frame Construction Parametric Study (Roque and Santos)	12
Figure 5: Results of the Hybrid Frame Construction Parametric Study (Roque and Santos).....	12
Figure 6: CFS Demonstration House (NAHB Report)	13
Figure 7: Wood Framed Demonstration House (NAHB Report)	14
Figure 8: Comparison of Summer Electric Usage (NAHB Report)	15
Figure 9: Comparison of Winter Gas Usage (NAHB) Report.....	15
Figure 10: Representative Wall Assembly Components: 1—Gypsum board (Sheathing); 2—Cavity Insulation; 3—Fasteners; 4—CFS Studs and Tracks (Bottom track not shown for clarity); 5—XPS; 6—Stucco.	16
Figure 11: 2-D Section Cut through Wall Assembly at Fastener Locations (Left – Fastener length modelled and Right – Fastener modelled from start of sheathing to interior of Flange).....	17
Figure 12: Left to Right, Heat3 Model of Wall Assembly with CFS Studs & Heat3 Model of Wall Assembly without CFS Studs.....	22
Figure 13: Heat Flow vs Steel Thickness for Different Climate Zones.....	23
Figure 14: Comparison of Heat Flow through 362S162 - 43 Mil 24 in. on center and 600S162 - 43 mil 24 in. on center Assemblies.....	24
Figure 15: Comparison of Heat Flow through 362S162 - 43 Mil 16 in. on center and 600S162 - 43 mil 16 in. on center Assemblies.....	25
Figure 16: Comparison of Heat Flow through 362S162 - 68 Mil 24 in. on center and 600S162 - 68 mil 24 in. on center Assemblies.....	25
Figure 17: Comparison of Heat Flow through 362S162 - 68 Mil 16 in. on center and 600S162 - 68 mil 16 in. on center Assemblies.....	26
Figure 18: Comparison of Heat Flow through 362S162 - 43 Mil 24 in. on center and 362S162 - 43 Mil 16 in. on center Assemblies	27
Figure 19: Comparison of Heat Flow through 600S162 - 43 Mil 24 in. on center and 600S162 - 43 Mil 16 in. on center Assemblies	27
Figure 20: Comparison of Heat Flow through 362S162 - 68 Mil 24 in. on center and 362S162 - 68 Mil 16 in. on center Assemblies	28
Figure 21: Comparison of Heat Flow through 600S162 - 68 Mil 24 in. on center and 600S162 - 68 Mil 16 in. on center Assemblies	28
Figure 22: Heat Flow through 600S162 - 54 Mil 16 in. on center and 600S162 - 97 mil 16 in. on center Assemblies	29
Figure 23: Heat Flow vs Fastener Diameter and Penetration for Different Climate Zones	30
Figure 24: Typical Fasteners as modelled in Heat3 for project assemblies.....	57

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Summary of material properties and modelling matrix (RP18-1).....	7
Table 2: Summary of Results for 1000S162 – 43 mil Steel Stud Wall Assemblies (RP18-1).....	8
Table 3: Summary of results for different single and combination based thermal break mitigation strategies (Santos et al.)	10
Table 4: Summary of Parametric Study for U-value improvement (Santos et al).....	10
Table 5: Roque and Santos Parametric Study on Insulation Location.....	11
Table 6: Comparison of Framing Details for the Wood Framed and CFS Framed Demonstration Homes (NAHB Report)	14
Table 7: Summary of Boundary Conditions	17
Table 8: Summary of Validation Models.....	18
Table 9: Material Properties for Validation Models	19
Table 10: Summary of Validation Results.....	20
Table 11: Summary of Variable Parameters	21
Table 12: Insulation Combinations and their Representative Climate Zones.....	21
Table 13: Summary of Coefficient of Determination for Linear Trend between Overall Heat flow and Member Thickness	24
Table 14: Summary of Coefficient of Determination for Heat flow and Fastener Diameter and Penetration	31
Table 15: Summary of Material Properties used for Validation Assemblies	35
Table 16: Summary of Material Properties used for the Project Assemblies	36
Table 17: Summary of 362S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (24” on center)	38
Table 18: Summary of 362S162 - 68 Mil Assemblies (24” on center)	39
Table 19: Summary of 362S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (16” on center)	40
Table 20: Summary of 362S162 - 68 Mil Assemblies (16” on center)	41
Table 21: Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (16”on center)	42
Table 22: Summary of 600S162 - 68 Mil Assemblies (16”on center)	43
Table 23: Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (24” on center)	44
Table 24: Summary of 600S162 - 68 Mil Assemblies (24” on center)	45
Table 25: Summary of 600S162 - 33 Mil Assemblies (16” on center) - #6 Fastener.....	46
Table 26: Summary of 600S162 - 54 Mil Assemblies (16” on center) - #6 Fastener.....	47
Table 27: Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (24” on center) - #8 1-15/16" Fastener ...	48
Table 28: Summary of 600S162 - 97 Mil Assemblies (16” on center) - #6 Fastener.....	49
Table 29: Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (24” on center) - #10 2-1/2” Fastener	50
Table 30: Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (16” on center) - #10 3-00” Fastener	51
Table 31: Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (24” on center) - #10 3-00” Fastener	52
Table 32: Summary of 600S162 - 68 Mil Assemblies (24” on center) - #10 3-00” Fastener	53
Table 33: Summary of Results of the Parametric Evaluation (PA-01 to PA-30)	54
Table 34: Summary of Results of the Parametric Evaluation (PA-31 to PA-60)	55
Table 35: Summary of Results of the Parametric Evaluation (PA-61 to PA-80)	56
Table 36: Summary of Geometric and Material Properties used for the assembly used to verify fastener modelling assumptions.....	57

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The objective of this research project was to quantify the magnitude of energy loss through cold-formed steel (CFS) stud wall assemblies and to lay the groundwork for future works that promote sustainable, energy efficient, and improved building design recommendations. This work considers the impact of typical components of a CFS wall assembly on the thermal performance of the wall assembly due to the presence of point and linear thermal bridges. Three-dimensional finite element models of the wall assemblies were analyzed using ISO 10211:2007, Annex A, conforming specialty heat transfer software Blocon Heat3. The Project Monitoring Committee (PMC), comprising of Jonathan Humble (AISI), Jay Larson (AISI), and Pat Ford (raSmith), provided guidance, oversaw the progress, and helped with the selection of key parameters, material properties, and reviewed the results of this project.

The scope of this research project included the following –

- Parametric evaluation comprising of 80 wall assemblies with key variables being steel thickness, stud depth, stud spacing, cavity insulation R-value, external insulation thickness, fastener diameter and length
- Estimation of overall U-value, R-value, and linear and point thermal bridging coefficients due to the variation of these parameters
- Predicting and verifying trends in overall U-value, R-value, and thermal transmittance coefficients
- Thermal imaging of existing cold-formed steel structures in the New England region

1.1 Key Concepts

To estimate the contribution of thermal bridging to overall energy loss through the wall assembly, linear and point transmittance of CFS studs/tracks and fasteners respectively were estimated from the three-dimensional steady-state analysis of the wall assemblies. The following terms and concepts used throughout the report have been defined below –

Thermal Bridge –

A thermal bridge is a structural element that spans the building envelope and creates a path of least resistance for heat transfer

Clear Field Transmittance (U_o , measured in Btu/hr·ft²·°F or W/m²·K) –

Heat flow through the opaque part (Planar wall) of the building envelope without the presence of thermal anomalies (Planar wall – stucco, external insulation, cavity insulation, sheathing)

Linear Transmittance (Ψ , measured in Btu/hr·ft·°F or W/m·K) –

Classifies thermal anomalies into linear anomalies that can be represented by an equivalent linear transmittance (Used for Studs and Tracks)

Point Transmittance (χ , measured in Btu/hr·°F or W/K) –

Classifies thermal anomalies into point anomalies that can be represented by an equivalent point transmittance (Used for Fasteners)

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

This section provides a summary of some of the most recent or relevant works that served as a background to this project. Extensive work has been done in this field by Morrison Hershfield Ltd. and Santos et al. who have performed parametric studies to assess the overall heat flow and impact of mitigation strategies respectively. Additionally, a study conducted by NAHB Research Center, which compares the annual performance of identical steel framed and wood framed construction houses has also been included to serve as a comparison between the two construction materials.

2.1 Thermal Analysis of Cold-Formed Steel Wall Assemblies (Research Report RP18-1)

To assist with the development of a simplified calculation methodology for determining the thermal performance of generic CFS wall assemblies, Morrison Hershfield Ltd. was contracted by the American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI) to perform this study. The thermal performance of 27 steel stud assemblies, which resulted in an overall 90 project models, was analyzed using Siemens NX modelling software and TMG thermal Solver. The key variables were insulation thickness, insulation placement, steel stud depth, and varying fastener patterns. The project assemblies comprised of stucco, exterior rigid board insulation, gypsum sheathing layers, cavity insulation, CFS member, and fasteners and can be seen in Figure 1 below.




Figure 1: Basic configuration of the project assemblies (RP18-1)

The modeling procedure and material properties were validated against ASHRAE 1365-RP, ASHRAE 785-RP, and ORNL Hotbox Compilation study. The modelling approach provided simulated assembly surface to surface R-values that were within -1.4% to +2.5% and -7.1% and +8.4% to surface to surface R-values obtained from ASHRAE 785-RP and ORNL Compilation study respectively.

Table 1 on the next page summarizes the modelling matrix and material properties used for this study. Three different 43 mil CFS studs were utilized, namely 350S162, 1000S162, and 1200S162.

The results of the parametric evaluation and detailed results for the 1000S162 - 43 mil wall assemblies have been summarized in Table 2 on the next page.

Table 1: Summary of material properties and modelling matrix (RP18-1)

ID	Material	Validation Assembly	Thickness (In)	Conductivity K-Value (BTU-In/hr ft ² °F)	R-Value (hr ft ² °F/BTU)
1	Stucco	All	3/4"	9.375	0.08
2	1.5" XPS	2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 16, 20, 23, 26	1.5"	0.200	7.5
	3" XPS	3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, 24, 27	3"	0.200	15.0
3	Fasteners 6" or 12" o.c.	All	#6	346	-
4	Gypsum Sheathing	All	5/8"	1.11	0.56
5	3 5/8" x 1 5/8" Steel Stud	1-9	0.0428" (43 Mil)	495	-
	10" x 1 5/8" Steel Stud	10-18	0.0428" (43 Mil)	495	-
	12" x 1 5/8" Steel Stud	19-27	0.0428" (43 Mil)	495	-
6	3 5/8" x 1 1/4" Steel Tracks	1-9	0.0428" (43 Mil)	495	-
	10" x 1 1/4" Steel Tracks	10-18	0.0428" (43 Mil)	495	-
	12" x 1 1/4" Steel Tracks	19-27	0.0428" (43 Mil)	495	-
7	1 1/2" x 1 1/2" C-Channel	All	0.0428" (43 Mil)	495	-
8	Air Cavity	1-3	3 5/8"	4.0	0.9
	R-19 Insulation	4-6	3 5/8"	0.191	19
	R-38 Insulation	7-9	3 5/8"	0.095	38
	Air Cavity	10-12	10"	11.1	0.9
	R-19 Insulation	13-15	10"	0.526	19
	R-38 Insulation	16-18	10"	0.263	38
	Air Cavity	19-21	12"	13.3	0.9
	R-19 Insulation	22-24	12"	0.632	19
	R-38 Insulation	25-27	12"	0.316	38
9	Gypsum Drywall	All	5/8"	1.11	0.56

The effect of increasing cavity insulation was most noticeable when comparing wall assemblies with air cavity with wall assemblies with R-19 insulation and resulted in an increase of 221% to 245% in the simulated R-value when no external insulation was present. However, diminishing returns were observed when cavity insulation was further increased from R-19 to R38, and the reduction was about 23% to 27%. When external insulation of R-7.5 (1.5-inch XPS) was present, the addition of R-19 insulation in the cavity increased the simulated R-value by about 72-79%. Diminishing returns were again observed when R-19 insulation was replaced with R-38 insulation, and the increase in R-value was 20% to 23% with. Similar results were observed when the assemblies with XPS thickness of 3.00 inches were compared.

It was also observed that stud depth had modest impact on the overall R-value of the wall assembly when comparing 350S162, 1000S162, and 1200S162 models. Varying fastener patterns only impacted the R-value of the assembly when fasteners were present that penetrated the XPS.

However, the impact was constant even when comparing assemblies with 6.00 inches on center interior and no exterior wall assemblies with both 6.00 inches on center and 12 inches on center exterior patterns.

Due to the continuous nature of the external insulation, the increase in overall R-value was almost equal to the R-value of the XPS being added. This trend was observed for all air cavity wall assemblies. Interestingly, when cavity insulation was present, the overall increase in R-value was greater than the value of XPS being added. For example, this trend can be seen in the table below when comparing assemblies 13,14,15 and 16,17,18. When R-19 cavity insulation is present, adding R-7.5 XPS increases the R-value from 9.8 to 18.4 (an increase of R-8.6).

Similarly, when R-15 XPS is added, the overall R-value increases by R-16.2 (Assembly 13 vs 15). This net gain increases when cavity insulation is R-38 and can be seen when comparing assemblies 16,17, and 18.

Table 2: Summary of Results for 1000S162 – 43 mil Steel Stud Wall Assemblies (RP18-1)

Assembly Ref.	Fastener Pattern	Gypsum Fastener Spacing	Ext. Insul. Fastener Spacing	Framing 16"o.c.	Component R-values hr-ft ² °F/BTU (m ² K/W)							Simulated R-Value	Simulated U-value
					Interior Air Film	Interior Gypsum	Cavity Insulation	Exterior Sheathing	Exterior Insulation	Stucco	Exterior Air Film		
10	1	6" oc	N/A	1000S162	0.68	0.56	0.9	0.56	0	0.08	0.17	2.9	0.344
	3	12" oc	N/A	1000S162	0.68	0.56	0.9	0.56	0	0.08	0.17	2.9	0.344
11	1	6" oc	None	1000S162	0.68	0.56	0.9	0.56	7.5	0.08	0.17	10.5	0.096
	2	6" oc	12" oc	1000S162	0.68	0.56	0.9	0.56	7.5	0.08	0.17	10.3	0.097
	3	12" oc	None	1000S162	0.68	0.56	0.9	0.56	7.5	0.08	0.17	10.5	0.096
	4	12" oc	12" oc	1000S162	0.68	0.56	0.9	0.56	7.5	0.08	0.17	10.3	0.097
12	1	6" oc	None	1000S162	0.68	0.56	0.9	0.56	15	0.08	0.17	18.0	0.056
	2	6" oc	12" oc	1000S162	0.68	0.56	0.9	0.56	15	0.08	0.17	17.5	0.057
	3	12" oc	None	1000S162	0.68	0.56	0.9	0.56	15	0.08	0.17	18.1	0.055
	4	12" oc	12" oc	1000S162	0.68	0.56	0.9	0.56	15	0.08	0.17	17.5	0.057
13	1	6" oc	N/A	1000S162	0.68	0.56	19	0.56	0	0.08	0.17	9.8	0.102
	3	12" oc	N/A	1000S162	0.68	0.56	19	0.56	0	0.08	0.17	9.8	0.102
14	1	6" oc	None	1000S162	0.68	0.56	19	0.56	7.5	0.08	0.17	18.4	0.054
	2	6" oc	12" oc	1000S162	0.68	0.56	19	0.56	7.5	0.08	0.17	18.1	0.055
	3	12" oc	None	1000S162	0.68	0.56	19	0.56	7.5	0.08	0.17	18.4	0.054
	4	12" oc	12" oc	1000S162	0.68	0.56	19	0.56	7.5	0.08	0.17	18.1	0.055
15	1	6" oc	None	1000S162	0.68	0.56	19	0.56	15	0.08	0.17	26.0	0.038
	2	6" oc	12" oc	1000S162	0.68	0.56	19	0.56	15	0.08	0.17	25.2	0.040
	3	12" oc	None	1000S162	0.68	0.56	19	0.56	15	0.08	0.17	26.0	0.038
	4	12" oc	12" oc	1000S162	0.68	0.56	19	0.56	15	0.08	0.17	25.2	0.040
16	1	6" oc	N/A	1000S162	0.68	0.56	38	0.56	0	0.08	0.17	12.4	0.081
	3	12" oc	N/A	1000S162	0.68	0.56	38	0.56	0	0.08	0.17	12.4	0.081
17	1	6" oc	None	1000S162	0.68	0.56	38	0.56	7.5	0.08	0.17	22.3	0.045
	2	6" oc	12" oc	1000S162	0.68	0.56	38	0.56	7.5	0.08	0.17	21.9	0.046
	3	12" oc	None	1000S162	0.68	0.56	38	0.56	7.5	0.08	0.17	22.3	0.045
	4	12" oc	12" oc	1000S162	0.68	0.56	38	0.56	7.5	0.08	0.17	21.9	0.046
18	1	6" oc	None	1000S162	0.68	0.56	38	0.56	15	0.08	0.17	30.1	0.033
	2	6" oc	12" oc	1000S162	0.68	0.56	38	0.56	15	0.08	0.17	29.0	0.034
	3	12" oc	None	1000S162	0.68	0.56	38	0.56	15	0.08	0.17	30.1	0.033
	4	12" oc	12" oc	1000S162	0.68	0.56	38	0.56	15	0.08	0.17	29.0	0.034

2.2 Lightweight steel-framed thermal bridges mitigation strategies: A parametric study

The authors, Santos et al., evaluated the performance of thermal break strategies such as thermal break rubber strips, vertical male or female studs, slotted steel studs, and combinations of the same along with different insulations like polyurethane foam, silica aerogel insulation blankets, and vacuum insulated panels (VIPs). The parametric study comprised of single thermal bridge mitigation strategies, combined mitigation strategies, and a parametric study for U-value improvement.

The wall assembly used for analysis can be seen in Figure 2 below, and the most effective single thermal break strategy was found to be the use of slotted steel studs which provided a reduction of U-value of 4.54%. Rubber strips offered a thermal advantage of 1.9% when 5mm rubber strips were used and 3.5% when 10mm rubber strips were used. The use of vertical male and female studs was found to have a negligible thermal advantage of 0.2% to 0.4%.




Figure 2: Description of CFS Wall Assembly and Components used by Santos et al

Combined mitigation strategies such as using rubber strips, slotted steel profiles and bolted connections offered a promising reduction in overall U-value of as high as 8.3%. A summary of these results can be seen in Table 3 on the next page.

Table 3: Summary of results for different single and combination based thermal break mitigation strategies (Santos et al.)

Model	Model description				U-value (W/(m ² K)) (ΔU)
	Without horizontal steel connections	Rubber strip	Vertical female or male studs	Slotted steel profiles	
Single strategies	A ^a				0.3011 (–)
	B ₁	✓ 5 mm			0.2954 (–1.9%)
	B ₂	✓ 10 mm			0.2906 (–3.5%)
	C ₁		✓ 15 mm		0.3021 (+0.4%)
	C ₂		✓ 25 mm		0.3018 (+0.2%)
	D ₁			✓ 14%Only vertical	0.2913 (–3.2%)
	D ₂			✓ 28%Only vertical	0.2904 (–3.5%)
	D ₃			✓ 28%	0.2874 (–4.5%)
	E	✓ 9 bolts			0.2949 (–2.1%)
Combined strategies	F	✓ 9 bolts	✓ 10 mm	✓ 28%Only vertical	0.2782 (–7.6%)
	G			✓ 28%	0.2762 (–8.3%)

^aReference model.

From their parametric study for U-value improvement, Santos et al. concluded that the best single strategy was using VIPs (49% reduction). Also, the most efficient solution was found to be placing 30mm VIPs on both sides in combination with the use of slotted steel profiles, 10mm rubber strips, and bolts. This provided an overall reduction of 68.2% in the calculated U-value. A summary of the results of the parametric evaluation can be seen in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Summary of Parametric Study for U-value improvement (Santos et al)

Model		Model description						U-value (W/(m ² K)) (ΔU)	
		Without horizontal steel connections	Rubber	Slotted steel profiles	Polyurethane foam		Aerogel		VIPs
					Without air gap and stone wool	With 40-mm air gap and without stone wool			
Single strategies	A ^a								0.3011 (–)
	H				✓				0.1615 (–46.4%)
	I					✓			0.1876 (–37.7%)
	J						✓ Internal side only		0.2295 (–23.8%)
	K						✓ External side only		0.2356 (–21.8%)
	L						✓		0.1889 (–37.3%)
	M							✓ Internal side only	0.2032 (–32.5%)
	N							✓ External side only	0.2048 (–32.0%)
Combined strategies	O							✓	0.1536 (–49.0%)
	P	✓	✓ 10 mm	✓ 28%Only vertical	✓				0.1271 (–57.8%)
	Q					✓			0.1525 (–49.3%)
	R			✓ 28%	✓				0.1173 (–61.0%)
	S					✓			0.1333 (–55.7%)
	T						✓		0.1406 (–53.3%)
	U							✓	0.0959 (–68.2%)

VIP: vacuum insulation panel.

^aReference model.

2.3 The effectiveness of Thermal Insulation in Lightweight Steel-Framed Walls with Respect to Its position

Roque and Santos in their paper “The effectiveness of Thermal Insulation in Lightweight Steel-Framed Walls with Respect to Its position”, evaluated the performance of cold-formed steel wall assemblies with a focus on the effectiveness of thermal insulation with regards to its position in the wall assembly. Three different insulation locations and the resulting cold, warm, and hybrid frame wall assemblies were studied, and they have been shown in Figure 3 below.




Figure 3: Roque and Santos Facade Wall Assemblies, (a) Warm, (b) Cold, and (c) hybrid frame construction. Materials: 1—Gypsum board; 2—OSB; 3—RW; 4—Air; 5—ETICS finish; 6—LSF; 7—EPS.

The purpose of their numerical study (Refer Table 5 below) was to evaluate the effectiveness of insulation, study the influence of the thermal bridges formed due to the cold-formed steel construction on overall thermal performance, and analyze the thermal performance in accordance with the Portugal Thermal Regulation for residential buildings.

Table 5: Roque and Santos Parametric Study on Insulation Location

Cold Construction			Warm Construction			Hybrid Construction		
Material ⁽¹⁾	d (mm)		Material ⁽¹⁾	d (mm)		Material ⁽¹⁾	d (mm)	
ETICS finish	5		ETICS finish	5		ETICS finish	5	
OSB	15		EPS	150	(W1)	EPS	75	(H1)
RW	150	(C1)		125	(W2)		62.5	(H2)
	125	(C2)		100	(W3)		50	(H3)
	100	(C3)		75	(W4)		37.5	(H4)
	75	(C4)		50	(W5)		25	(H5)
	50	(C5)		25	(W6)		12.5	(H6)
	25	(C6)	OSB	15		OSB	15	
Steel Studs	150		Steel Studs	150		RW	75	(H1)
OSB	10		OSB	10			62.5	(H2)
Plasterboard	15		Plasterboard	15			50	(H3)
							37.5	(H4)
							25	(H5)
							12.5	(H6)
						Steel Studs	150	
						OSB	10	
						Plasterboard	15	

⁽¹⁾ From outer to inner surface.

It was observed that for cold framed construction, neglecting the contribution of the CFS members overestimated the thermal performance of wall assemblies by as much as 94% (Figure 4). It was also observed that there exists a direct correlation in the reduction of insulation effectiveness when steel studs penetrate more of it. This implies that greater thicknesses of insulation in the same cavity have a more reduced effectiveness due to increased CFS stud penetration.




Figure 4: Results of the Cold Frame Construction Parametric Study (Roque and Santos)

Warm frame construction, where all the insulation is placed outside the façade cavity, this same effect was negligible, and the impact of CFS framing was limited to 0.4% to 1.4%. In the case of hybrid frame construction, a similar overestimation of thermal performance as observed in cold frame construction was observed. However, the difference in U value was significantly reduced with a maximum being about 25.6% (Figure 5). They determined that this diminishing effect was due to the presence of external insulation, which reduced the detrimental effect of studs piercing through the internal insulation.




Figure 5: Results of the Hybrid Frame Construction Parametric Study (Roque and Santos)

2.4 Steel vs. Wood: Long-Term Thermal Performance Comparison

In their report to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), North American Steel Framing Alliance (NASFA), and National Association of Home Builders (NAHB), the NAHB Research Center compared the thermal performance (energy consumption) of two nearly identical side-by-side unoccupied houses located in Valparaiso, Indiana. One of the houses was built from CFS members and the other was built up of conventional dimensional lumber. The electric use and natural gas use were the key parameters for comparison.

The CFS demonstration home (Figure 6) comprised of wall studs spaced 24 inches on center with loadbearing studs located directly in line with roof rafters and floor joists. The structural steel studs were 550S162-33 mil, and non-structural steel studs were 350S162-27 mil members. The steel framed members were designed using the Prescriptive Method for Residential Cold-Formed Steel Framing. Exterior wall sheathing was 7/16 inch oriented-strand-board and 3/4 inch rigid extruded polystyrene panels were secured to the outside of the OSB with plastic cup nails.



Figure 6: CFS Demonstration House (NAHB Report)

The wood demonstration home (Figure 7) comprised of wall studs spaced 16 inches on center with loadbearing studs located directly in line with roof rafters and floor joists. The structural wood studs were 2x6 Douglas Fir, and non-structural wood studs were 2x4 Douglas Fir. Exterior wall sheathing was 7/16 inch oriented-strand-board.



Figure 7: Wood Framed Demonstration House (NAHB Report)

Table 6 below provides a detailed comparison of the framing details used in both these demonstration houses.

Table 6: Comparison of Framing Details for the Wood Framed and CFS Framed Demonstration Homes (NAHB Report)

COMPONENT	STEEL HOUSE	WOOD HOUSE
Basement	Unfinished with Steel stud framing	Unfinished with Wood stud framing
Exterior Walls		
Drywall Size	1/2"x4'x8'/12'	1/2"x4'x8'/12'
Stud Size and Spacing	(2x6x33) Steel @ 24" o.c.	2x6 Wood @ 16" o.c.
Wall Sheathing	7/16"x4'x8' OSB	7/16" x4'x8' OSB
Rigid Foam Material & Thickness	3/4" Tenneco Extruded Polystyrene R-3.8 Rigid Foam Panels	N/A
Siding Material	Vinyl Siding	Vinyl Siding, Partial Brick Front
Ceiling Joists and Roof Rafters		
Joist Size and Spacing	(2x10x43) Steel @ 24" o.c.	2x10 Wood @ 16" o.c.
Drywall Size and Fastening	1/2"x4'x8'/12' w/Drywall screws	1/2"x4'x8'/12' w/Drywall screws
Rafter Size and Spacing	(2x8x54) Steel @ 24" o.c	2x8 Wood @ 16" o.c.
Roof Sheathing	7/16"x4'x8' Oxboard	7/16" x4'x8' Oxboard

For SI: 1 ft.= 305 mm, 1 inch= 25.4 mm.

It was found that the energy consumption during the summer months (Figure 8) was an average 17.1% higher for the CFS framed house when compared with the wood framed house. In the winter months (Figure 9), the CFS framed house only utilized an average of 1.5% more energy than the wood framed house. The normalized difference between the two houses was found to be 3.9% more natural gas usage and 7.8% more electric usage when comparing the CFS construction with wood construction. This corresponds to an increased annual cost of \$35.69 (Based on NIPSCO April 2001 rates) or an increased cost of \$0.016/ft² for the 2,200 ft² demonstration houses.




Figure 8: Comparison of Summer Electric Usage (NAHB Report)




Figure 9: Comparison of Winter Gas Usage (NAHB) Report

3.0 THERMAL MODELLING, ANALYSIS, AND VALIDATION

Extensive three-dimensional thermal modelling and analysis of the selected cold-formed steel wall assemblies were performed using ISO 10211:2007, Annex A, conforming specialty heat transfer software Blocon Heat3. The governing differential equation is solved by the software with explicit forward finite differences, and successive over-relaxation technique is used in the steady-state case.

Additionally, Heat3 only accepts input in the International System of Units (SI). Hence, material properties, geometric properties, and boundary conditions were converted from U.S. customary units to SI units and have been used in the research project. The following geometric properties, material properties, and boundary conditions were used for the analysis.

3.1 Geometric Properties

The wall assemblies used for analysis comprised of cold-formed steel studs, tracks, cavity insulation, external insulation (where applicable), gypsum sheathing, and fasteners. A representative assembly with these components can be seen in Figure 10 below. A detailed breakdown of individual components can be found in the modelling matrix (Table 17 – Table 32) in Appendix B.




Figure 10: Representative Wall Assembly
Components: 1—Gypsum board (Sheathing); 2—Cavity Insulation; 3—Fasteners;
4—CFS Studs and Tracks (Bottom track not shown for clarity); 5—XPS; 6—Stucco.

Heat3 software can only analyze linear geometries hence the following simplifications were made during the modelling process –

- CFS studs and tracks were assumed to have no corner radii, and flange and web interfaces were modelled as 90° angles

- Fasteners were modelled as cuboids with equivalent cross-sectional area and length as the chosen fastener's shank's cross-sectional area and total length respectively or from start of sheathing to interior end of CFS stud flange (Refer figure 11 below)
- Fastener head and threads were not modelled for the wall assemblies (Refer Appendix D for detailed discussion of this assumption and further information on fastener modelling)




Figure 11: 2-D Section Cut through Wall Assembly at Fastener Locations (Left – Fastener length modelled and Right – Fastener modelled from start of sheathing to interior of Flange)

3.2 Material Properties

Material properties used for the analysis and validation models were based on previous works by Morrison Hershfield Ltd. for RP18-1 from Appendix D in ASHRAE 765-RP and the ASHRAE HoF and have been summarized in Table 15 and Table 16 in Appendix A.

3.3 Boundary Conditions

The boundary conditions used for the analysis of validation and project wall assemblies were based on Table 10, Chapter 26 of the ASHRAE HoF and were kept the same as the values used in RP18-1 to ensure that this work can build upon and have results comparable with existing research. The internal and external surface air film resistances have been summarized in Table 7 below.

Table 7: Summary of Boundary Conditions

No	Surface Boundary	Temperature		Film Convective Coefficient	
		°F	°C	BTU/h·ft ² ·°F	W/m ² ·°C
1	Interior	33.8	1	1.46	8.31
2	Exterior	32	0	6.00	34.05

The internal and external temperatures were taken as 1°C and 0°C to obtain a non-dimensionalized temperature index.

3.4 Validation

Validation of selected boundary conditions, material properties, modelling, and analysis procedure was done by comparing simulated overall R-value and U-Value of validation models to values obtained by Morrison Hershfield for AISI in the report RP18-1, Thermal Analysis of Cold-Formed Wall Assemblies. Validation for the RP18-1 research project was done with hotbox data sets and well-defined reference cases in ASHRAE 1365-RP, ASHRAE 785-RP, and ORNL Hotbox Compilation Study. By comparing Heat3 simulated values with heat flow values obtained in RP18-1, the analysis procedure was validated with RP18-1 and consequentially with the above-mentioned standards and compilation studies.

The following four RP18-1 wall assemblies were modeled in Heat3 for comparison

Table 8: Summary of Validation Models

Validation Models								
Assembly Reference (RP18-1)	Exterior Finish	Exterior Finish Thickness (in)	Exterior Insulation	XPS Thickness (in)	Interior Fastener Pattern	Exterior Fastener Pattern	Outer Sheathing	Outer Sheathing Thickness (in)
1	Stucco	0.75	--	--	6" o.c	--	Gypsum	0.625
4	Stucco	0.75	--	--	6" o.c	--	Gypsum	0.625
2	Stucco	0.75	R-7.5	1.5	6" o.c	--	Gypsum	0.625
5	Stucco	0.75	R-7.5	1.5	6" o.c	--	Gypsum	0.625
Assembly Reference (RP18-1)	Outer Sheathing Thickness (in)	Steel Stud	Steel track	Steel Channel	Cavity Insulation	Cavity Insulation Thickness (in)	Interior Sheathing	Interior Sheathing Thickness (in)
1	0.625	362S162 - 43 Mil	362T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	Air Cavity	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
4	0.625	362S162 - 43 Mil	362T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-19	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
2	0.625	362S162 - 43 Mil	362T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	Air Cavity	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
5	0.625	362S162 - 43 Mil	362T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-19	3.625	Gypsum	0.625

Table 9 below summarizes the boundary conditions and material properties used for the validation models

Table 9: Material Properties for Validation Models

Material	Thickness	Conductivity K-Value	Component R-Value	Thickness	Conductivity K-Value	Component R-Value
	(in)	(BTU-in/hr·ft ² °F)	(hr·ft ² °F/BTU)	(m)	(W/m·K)	(m ² ·K/W)
Exterior Finish						
Stucco	0.7500	9.3750	0.0800	0.0191	1.3521	0.0141
Exterior Insulation						
R-7.5	1.5000	0.2000	7.500	0.0381	0.0288	1.3208
Outer Sheathing						
Gypsum	0.6250	1.1100	0.5631	0.0159	0.1601	0.0992
Steel Stud						
362S162-43 Mil	0.0428	495.00	--	0.0011	71.393	--
Steel Track						
362T162-43 Mil	0.0428	495.00	--	0.0011	71.393	--
Steel Channel						
150U150-43 mil	0.0428	495.00	--	0.0011	71.393	--
Cavity Insulation						
Air Cavity	3.6250	4.0278	0.9000	0.0921	0.5809	0.1585
R-19	3.6250	0.1908	19.000	0.0921	0.0275	3.3461
Interior Sheathing						
Gypsum	0.6250	1.1100	0.5631	0.0159	0.1601	0.0992

Table 10 below summarizes the results of the validation trials

Table 10: Summary of Validation Results

Assembly Reference (RP18-1)	Description	Simulated R-Value (RP18-1)	Simulated U-Value (RP18-1)	Simulated R-Value (AISI - SPF)	Simulated U-Value (AISI - SPF)	Δ R-Value	Δ U-Value
		hr·ft ² ·°F/BTU	BTU/hr·ft ² ·°F	hr·ft ² ·°F/BTU	BTU/hr·ft ² ·°F	%	%
1	No Cavity or Exterior Insulation	2.9	0.345	2.82	0.355	-2.84%	2.92%
4	R-19 Cavity and No Exterior Insulation	9.31	0.107	9.19	0.109	-1.30%	1.32%
2	No Cavity and R-7.5 Exterior Insulation	10.4	0.096	10.35	0.097	-0.53%	0.53%
5	R-19 Cavity and R-7.5 Exterior Insulation	18.6	0.054	18.44	0.054	-0.88%	0.88%

Upon comparing overall R-value and U-value of the selected validation models, a maximum difference of -2.84% and +2.92% was found. This error was deemed acceptable by the PMC, and the thermal modelling procedure and material properties were validated.

3.5 Parametric Evaluation and Modelling Matrix

For the parametric evaluation, 80 unique wall assemblies were created to study the impact of selected parameters on the overall thermal transmittance of the wall assembly, linear transmittance of the CFS studs and tracks, and point transmittance of the fasteners. The key variable parameters of the parametric evaluation were steel thickness, stud depth, stud spacing, cavity insulation R-value, external insulation thickness (R-value), fastener diameter and length. These parameters and their variable values have been summarized in Table 11 below

Table 11: Summary of Variable Parameters

Parameter	Variable Values
CFS Member Thickness	33, 43, 54, 68, 97 (mils)
CFS Member Depth	3.625 & 6.000 (inches)
CFS Stud Spacing	16 & 24 inches on center
Cavity Insulation R - Value	Air & R-13 (hr·ft ² °F/BTU)
External Insulation R - Value	R-7.5, R-10, R-12.5 (hr·ft ² °F/BTU)
Fastener Diameter and Length	#6, #8 1-15/16", #10 2-1/2", #10 3-00"

The CFS stud and track depth, thickness, and spacing for analysis were selected in consultation with the PMC. Cavity insulation and external insulation combinations were selected based on minimum insulation R-values prescribed by ASHRAE 90.1 2016 to include as many ASHRAE climate zones as possible. Table 12 below summarizes the combinations of insulation used for the analysis and the respective climate zone and building type (NR – Non-residential and R-Residential) they represent.

Table 12: Insulation Combinations and their Representative Climate Zones

Exterior Insulation	Cavity Insulation	ASHRAE 90.1 2016 Climate Zone
N/A (No XPS)	R-13	Zone 0 (NR & R) & 1 (NR & R)
R-7.5 (1.5 inches)	R-13	Zone 4 (NR & R), 3 (R), & 2 (R)
R-10.0 (2.0 inches)	R-13	Zone 5 (NR & R)
R-12.5 (2.5 inches)	R-13	Zone 6 (NR & R) & 7 (NR)

Fastener selection was based on AISI North American Standard for Cold-Formed Steel Structures (S240-2015 edition). This standard requires that the screws be self-drilling and that at least three threads are exposed for proper engagement.

Table 17 through Table 32 in Appendix B summarize the 80 unique wall assemblies analyzed as part of the parametric evaluation.

3.6 Estimation of Thermal Transmittance Coefficients

Thermal transmission coefficients were estimated by comparing the difference in the overall heat flow of the assembly when the anomaly is present with an iteration when the anomaly is removed. For example, to estimate the thermal transmission coefficient of CFS studs, an iteration of the wall assembly with studs (Figure 12, Left) was run, and then the heat flow value was compared to overall heat flow of the same assembly without the CFS studs (Figure 12, Right). This process was repeated to estimate the thermal transmission coefficients for tracks, fasteners, and no anomalies (homogenous wall), which resulted in 400 iterations of the wall assemblies.

The thermal transmission coefficients thus calculated provided excellent agreement with overall heat flow values estimated by 3-D finite element solutions and the heat flow values obtained by using the linear and point transmittance coefficients. The heat flow predicted by thermal transmittance coefficients was within -2.6% to +3.1% of the FEA solutions even though they were obtained from different iterations of the wall assembly.




Figure 12: Left to Right, Heat3 Model of Wall Assembly with CFS Studs & Heat3 Model of Wall Assembly without CFS Studs

4.0 RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

This section presents results from the three-dimensional steady-state analysis of the selected wall assemblies. Detailed results for overall U-value, R-value, point thermal transmittance coefficient of fasteners, and linear thermal transmittance coefficients of studs and tracks for all 80 assemblies can be found in Appendix C.

4.1 Effect of Increasing Stud and Track Thickness

To study the dependence of thermal transmission coefficients and overall heat flow with CFS member thickness, 55 wall assemblies were analyzed for the seven climate zones that are included in the parametric evaluation. As requested by the PMC, 33 mil, 43 mil, 54 mil, and 68 mil CFS member wall assemblies were analyzed. Additionally, 97 mil wall assemblies were included in the parametric evaluation to have a complete representation of possible CFS member thickness. It was observed that increasing the steel thickness directly increased the overall heat flow and linear thermal transmission coefficient for the studs and tracks. This increase followed a strong linear trend (Refer Figure 13 below) with high coefficients of determination for all the climate zones which have been summarized in Table 13 on the next page.




Figure 13: Heat Flow vs Steel Thickness for Different Climate Zones

Table 13: Summary of Coefficient of Determination for Linear Trend between Overall Heat flow and Member Thickness

ASHRAE Climate Zone	R ² Value
0 & 1	0.960
2, 3 & 4	0.921
5	0.923
6 & 7	0.921

A detailed table summarizing the results of the heat flow and thermal transmission coefficients can be found in Appendix C under Tables 33 through Table 35.

4.2 Effect of Increasing Stud and Track Depth

To study the dependence of thermal transmission coefficients and overall heat flow with CFS member depth, 40 wall assemblies were analyzed for the seven climate zones that are included in the parametric evaluation. As requested by the PMC, 3-5/8" and 6-00" web depth (362S162 and 600S162) CFS member wall assemblies were analyzed.

It was observed that increasing the member depth increased the heat flow and thermal transmittance coefficients of the assemblies located in Zone 2 and higher but decreased the same for assemblies located in Zone 1. The change in heat flow was approximately -2% to +1% and the change in linear thermal transmittance coefficients was approximately -4% to +5% for studs and -4% to +3% for tracks. Tables 33 through Table 35 summarizing the heat flow, U-value, R-value, and thermal transmittance coefficients can be found in appendix C.1 through C.3. Figure 14 through Figure 17 below represent the breakdown of heat flow through different components of the wall assembly for the analyzed models.




Figure 14: Comparison of Heat Flow through 362S162 - 43 Mil 24 in. on center and 600S162 - 43 mil 24 in. on center Assemblies





Figure 15: Comparison of Heat Flow through 362S162 - 43 Mil 16 in. on center and 600S162 - 43 mil 16 in. on center Assemblies





Figure 16: Comparison of Heat Flow through 362S162 - 68 Mil 24 in. on center and 600S162 - 68 mil 24 in. on center Assemblies




Figure 17: Comparison of Heat Flow through 362S162 - 68 Mil 16 in. on center and 600S162 - 68 mil 16 in. on center Assemblies

4.3 Effect of Stud Spacing

To study the dependence of thermal transmission coefficients and overall heat flow with CFS stud spacing, 40 wall assemblies were analyzed for the seven climate zones that are included in the parametric evaluation. As requested by the PMC, 16 inches on center and 24 inches on center stud spacing wall assemblies were analyzed and compared.

It was observed that decreasing the stud spacing increased the overall heat flow through the assembly and the thermal transmittance coefficient for the studs. However, the thermal transmittance coefficient of the tracks decreased when stud spacing was decreased even though no changes were made to the tracks. This resulted in an overall increase of 6 to 14% in the overall heat flow and an increase of 2 to 3% in the thermal transmittance coefficient of the studs. The thermal transmittance coefficient of the tracks decreased by 4 to 15%. These trends were observed in all the comparison assemblies and Table 33 through Table 35 in Appendix C summarizes the same. Figure 18 through Figure 21 on the next pages represent the breakdown of heat flow through different components of the wall assembly for the analyzed models.




Figure 18: Comparison of Heat Flow through 362S162 - 43 Mil 24 in. on center and 362S162 - 43 Mil 16 in. on center Assemblies




Figure 19: Comparison of Heat Flow through 600S162 - 43 Mil 24 in. on center and 600S162 - 43 Mil 16 in. on center Assemblies





Figure 20: Comparison of Heat Flow through 362S162 - 68 Mil 24 in. on center and 362S162 - 68 Mil 16 in. on center Assemblies





Figure 21: Comparison of Heat Flow through 600S162 - 68 Mil 24 in. on center and 600S162 - 68 Mil 16 in. on center Assemblies

4.4 Effect of Increasing External Insulation

To study the dependence of thermal transmission coefficients and overall heat flow with external insulation, 80 wall assemblies were analyzed for the seven climate zones (CZ) that are included in the parametric evaluation.

It was observed that increasing the external insulation had a drastic effect on the overall heat flow and thermal transmittance coefficients. The most significant decrease was observed when assemblies with insulation compliant with CZ - 0 and 1 were compared with assemblies compliant with CZ - 2, 3, and 4 (No external insulation to R-7.5 external insulation). This resulted in a decrease of approximately 50 to 55% in overall heat flow. The reduction in thermal transmittance coefficients of the studs and tracks was found to be 72 to 75% and 77 to 82% respectively.

Adding additional external insulation had a similar effect on overall U-value and thermal transmittance coefficients but diminishing returns were observed when comparing assemblies in CZ - 2, 3, and 4 to CZ - 5 (external insulation increased from R7.5 to R-10) and CZ - 5 to CZ - 6 and 7 (external insulation increased from R-0 to R12.5). The reduction in overall heat flow was found to be approximately 14% for CZ - 2, 3, and 4 to CZ - 5 and 11% for CZ - 5 to Zone 6 and 7. The reduction in thermal transmittance coefficients of studs and tracks was found to be 25% and 27% respectively when comparing CZ - 2, 3, and 4 to CZ - 5. Similarly, the reduction in thermal transmittance coefficients of studs and tracks was found to be 21% and 23% respectively, when comparing CZ - 5 to Zone 6 and 7.

These trends were observed in all the comparison assemblies and Table 33 through Table 35 in Appendix C. summarizes the same. Figure 22 below represent the breakdown of heat flow through different components of the wall assembly for 600S162 stud - 54 and 97 mil wall assemblies as external insulation is increased.




Figure 22: Heat Flow through 600S162 - 54 Mil 16 in. on center and 600S162 - 97 mil 16 in. on center Assemblies

4.5 Effect of Increasing Fastener Diameter and Penetration

To study the dependence of thermal transmission coefficients and overall heat flow with fastener diameter and penetration, 20 wall assemblies were analyzed. The fastener pattern was kept the same for all the assemblies and fasteners were spaced 6 inches on center from one another along the height of the stud.

It was observed that increasing fastener penetration and diameter had a negligible impact on the overall heat flow and linear transmittance coefficients of the studs and tracks. This can also be observed in Figures 14 through 22 on the previous pages where the heat flow through the fasteners (depicted in blue at the bottom of the stacked bars) is negligible enough that it does not register on the graphs. The point transmittance coefficient for fasteners increased drastically and was maximum for Climate Zone (CZ) 1 assemblies and minimum for Climate Zone 6 and 7 where external insulation was maximum. However, this drastic increase in fastener transmittance had a negligible effect on the overall performance of the wall assemblies.

Figures 23 below provides a summary of the effect of increasing fastener diameter and penetration for the different climate zones analyzed as part of the parametric evaluation. Detailed results for heat flow in individual climate zones due to variation in fasteners can be found in Table 33 through Table 35 in Appendix C.




Figure 23: Heat Flow vs Fastener Diameter and Penetration for Different Climate Zones

Additionally, Table 14 below presents the summary of the coefficient of determination calculated for overall heat flow and fastener diameter and penetration for the 8 ASHRAE climate zones studied. The low value corresponds with previous findings that faster diameter and penetration have a negligible impact on overall eat flow through the assembly.

Table 14: Summary of Coefficient of Determination for Heat flow and Fastener Diameter and Penetration

ASHRAE Climate Zone	R² Value
0 & 1	0.004
2,3, & 4	0.000
5	-0.001
6 & 7	0.008

4.6 Conclusions

Based on the parametric evaluation, the following conclusions can be made about the impact of selected parameters on the overall U-value and thermal transmittance coefficients –

- There exists a direct relationship between overall heat flow through the assemblies and the thickness of CFS members being used. This relationship is accurately represented by a linear trend which can be used to interpolate heat flow through assemblies for intermediate steel thickness with a maximum error of 3.2% when compared with three-dimensional finite steady-state solutions.
- Increasing stud and track depth has a nominal effect on overall heat flow through the assembly (-1 to 2%). The same changes the linear transmittance coefficient of studs by -4% to +5% and the linear transmittance coefficient of tracks by -4% to +3%.
- Decreasing stud spacing from 24 inches on center to 16 inches on center has a significant impact on overall heat flow, and the change is approximately +6 to +14%. The increase in linear thermal transmittance coefficient of the studs is +2 to +3% and the decrease in thermal transmittance coefficient of the tracks is -4 to -15%.
- External insulation thickness has a significant impact on overall heat flow and the thermal transmittance coefficients of studs and tracks. When the external insulation is increased from no insulation to R-7.5, the overall heat flow through the assembly is reduced by approximately 50 to 55% and the reduction in thermal transmittance coefficients of the studs and tracks was found to be 72 to 75%, and 77 to 82% respectively. However, diminishing reduction in overall heat flow is observed when additional insulation is added. The reduction in overall heat flow was found to be approximately 14% for R-7.5 to R-10 and approximately 11% for R-10 to R-12.5. This corresponded with a reduction of 25% and 21% in the linear thermal transmittance coefficient studs and 27% and 23% in the linear transmittance coefficient of tracks.
- Increasing fastener diameter and penetration had a negligible impact on the overall heat flow and the linear thermal transmittance coefficients of studs and tracks. However, the point thermal transmittance coefficient of fasteners increased by approximately 108% for Climate Zone (CZ) 1 assemblies and 5% for assemblies located in CZ - 6 and CZ - 7. The net effect was a maximum increase of 1% in the overall heat flow for assemblies located in CZ - 1.

5.0 FUTURE WORK

Based on the results of this research, the authors believe that the following work will serve to be most beneficial to future research that promotes sustainable, energy efficient, and improved building design recommendations and guidelines for engineers and architects alike –

- Additional parametric evaluations to calculate transmission coefficients for more stud depths, flange widths, framing factors, framing techniques (ex – ledger vs platform), etc. The work performed here has shown that the transmission coefficients calculated can predict heat flows through walls with high accuracy and there exists trend which can be exploited to come up with tables that can ease thermal calculation by reducing the need for additional finite element models. Additionally, this proposed work can potentially be used to develop simplified equations such as the ones proposed by Santos et al. which are more suited to the North American CFS industry. These in combination with the transmission coefficient tables can serve as a great tool for estimating the thermal performance of CFS walls for the purpose of compliance.
- Further, evaluation of mitigation strategies on the thermal as well as the structural performance of the wall assemblies can provide excellent insight into the advantages and disadvantages of using various mitigation strategies. Experimental testing of the impact of mitigation strategies on the structural performance can provide relevant information to develop high fidelity finite element models which can be used to study the performance of these strategies and come up with solutions that are most suited for the different scenarios being studied. Such a study can also be used to come up with possible design recommendations for including thermal break strategies in the detailing of CFS construction.

6.0 REFERENCES AND CITED WORKS

- A. Desjarlais, K. Biswas, P. Childs and J. Atchley, "A Compilation of Steady State Hot Box Tests Conducted in 2011 and 2012 by Oak Ridge National Laboratory; Part 1 and Part 2," ORNL, Oak Ridge, TN, USA., 2012.
- American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers Inc, "Handbook of Fundamentals," ASHRAE, Atlanta, GA, 2017.
- American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers Inc, "ASHRAE 1365-RP Thermal Performance of Building Envelope Details for Mid- And High-Rise Buildings," ASHRAE, Atlanta, GA, 2011.
- C. Martins, P. Santos, Simões da Silva L. Lightweight steel-framed thermal bridges mitigation strategies: A parametric study *Journal of Building Physics*, 39 (4) (2016), pp. 342-372,
- E. Roque, P. Santos. The effectiveness of thermal insulation in lightweight steel-framed walls with respect to its position." *Buildings*, 7.1 (13) (2017), pp. 1-18
- International Organization for Standardization, "ISO 10211: Thermal Bridges in Building Construction - Heat Flows and Surface Temperatures - Detailed Calculations," International Organization for Standardization, Geneva, Switzerland, 2007.
- Soares, N., et al. "Energy efficiency and thermal performance of lightweight steel-framed (LSF) construction: A review." *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 78 (2017): 194-209.
- Norris, Neil, and Fabio Almeida. *Thermal Analysis of Cold-Formed Steel Wall Assemblies, AISI RP18-1*. American Iron and Steel Institute, Washington, DC (2018).

APPENDIX A – MATERIAL PROPERTIES USED FOR VALIDATION AND PROJECT ASSEMBLIES

Tables x and Y below provide a summary of material properties used for the validation and project models respectively

Table 15: Summary of Material Properties used for Validation Assemblies

Material Properties for Validation Assemblies						
Material	Thickness (in)	Conductivity K-Value (BTU-in/hr-ft² °F)	Component R-Value (hr-ft² °F/BTU)	Thickness (m)	Conductivity K-Value (W/m-K)	Component R- Value (m² K/W)
Exterior Finishes						
Stucco	0.7500	9.3750	0.0800	0.0191	1.3521	0.0141
Exterior Insulation						
R-7.5	1.5000	0.2000	7.500	0.0381	0.0288	1.3208
Outer Sheathing						
Gypsum	0.6250	1.1100	0.5631	0.0159	0.1601	0.0992
Steel Stud						
362S162-43 Mil	0.0428	495.00	--	0.0011	71.393	--
Steel Track						
362T162-43 Mil	0.0428	495.00	--	0.0011	71.393	--
Steel Channel						
150U150-43 Mil	0.0428	495.00	--	0.0011	71.393	--
Cavity Insulation						
Air Cavity	3.6250	4.0278	0.9000	0.0921	0.5809	0.1585
R-19	3.6250	0.1908	19.0000	0.0921	0.0275	3.3461
Interior Sheathing						
Gypsum	0.6250	1.1100	0.5631	0.0159	0.1601	0.0992

Table 16: Summary of Material Properties used for the Project Assemblies

Material Properties for Project Assemblies						
Material	Thickness (in)	Conductivity K-Value (BTU-in/hr·ft² °F)	Component R-Value (hr·ft² °F/BTU)	Thickness (m)	Conductivity K-Value (W/m·K)	Component R-Value (m² K/W)
Exterior Finishes						
Stucco	0.7500	9.3750	0.0800	0.0191	1.3521	0.0141
Exterior Insulation						
R-7.5	1.5000	0.2000	7.5000	0.0381	0.0288	1.3208
R-10.0	2.0000	0.2000	10.000	0.0508	0.0288	1.7611
R-12.5	2.5000	0.2000	12.500	0.0635	0.0288	2.2014
Outer Sheathing						
Gypsum	0.6250	1.1100	0.5631	0.0159	0.1601	0.0992
Steel Stud						
362S162-43 Mil	0.0428	495.00	--	0.0011	71.393	--
362S162-68 Mil	0.0677	495.00	--	0.0017	71.393	--
600S162-33 Mil	0.0329	495.00	--	0.0008	71.393	--
600S162-43 Mil	0.0428	495.00	--	0.0011	71.393	--
600S162-54 Mil	0.0538	495.00	--	0.0014	71.393	--
600S162-68 Mil	0.0677	495.00	--	0.0017	71.393	--
600S162-97 Mil	0.0966	495.00	--	0.0025	71.393	--
Steel Track						
362T162-43 Mil	0.0428	495.00	--	0.0011	71.393	--
362T162-68 Mil	0.0677	495.00	--	0.0017	71.393	--
600T162-33 Mil	0.0329	495.00	--	0.0008	71.393	--
600T162-43 Mil	0.0428	495.00	--	0.0011	71.393	--
600T162-54 Mil	0.0538	495.00	--	0.0014	71.393	--
600T162-68 Mil	0.0677	495.00	--	0.0017	71.393	--
600T162-97 Mil	0.0966	495.00	--	0.0025	71.393	--

Material Properties for Project Assemblies (Continued)

Material	Thickness (in)	Conductivity K-Value (BTU-in/hr·ft ² ·°F)	Component R-Value (hr·ft ² ·°F/BTU)	Thickness (m)	Conductivity K-Value (W/m·K)	Component R-Value (m ² K/W)
Steel Channel						
150U150-33 Mil	0.0329	495.00	--	0.0008	71.393	--
150U150-43 Mil	0.0428	495.00	--	0.0011	71.393	--
150U150-54 Mil	0.0538	495.00	--	0.0014	71.393	--
150U150-68 Mil	0.0677	495.00	--	0.0017	71.393	--
150U150-97 Mil	0.0966	495.00	--	0.0025	71.393	--
Cavity Insulation						
Air Cavity	3.6250	4.0278	0.9000	0.0921	0.5809	0.1585
R-13	3.6250	0.2788	13.000	0.0921	0.0402	2.2894
Air Cavity	6.0000	6.6667	0.9000	0.1524	0.9615	0.1585
R-13	6.0000	0.4615	13.000	0.1524	0.0666	2.2894
Interior Sheathing						
Gypsum	0.6250	1.1100	0.5631	0.0159	0.1601	0.0992

APPENDIX B – MODELLING MATRIX FOR PROJECT ASSEMBLIES

This appendix summarizes the 80 unique wall assemblies that were analyzed for this research project. For viewing convenience, the matrix has been broken down into Table 17 through Table 32. The title of the tables represents the cold-formed steel thickness, stud depth, and stud spacing used in these assemblies.

APPENDIX B.1 – Summary of 362S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (24" on center)

Table 17: Summary of 362S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (24" on center)

362S162 - 43 Mil @ 24" on center Project Models

Assembly No.	Exterior Finish	Exterior Finish Thickness (in)	Exterior Insulation	XPS Thickness (in)	Interior Fastener Pattern	Outer Sheathing	Outer Sheathing Thickness (in)
1	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
2	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
3	Stucco	0.750	R-7.5	1.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
4	Stucco	0.750	R-10.0	2.000	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
5	Stucco	0.750	R-12.5	2.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
Assembly No.	Steel Stud	Steel track	Steel Bridging	Cavity Insulation	Cavity Insulation Thickness (in)	Interior Sheathing	Interior Sheathing Thickness (in)
1	362S162 - 43 Mil	362T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	Air Cavity	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
2	362S162 - 43 Mil	362T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
3	362S162 - 43 Mil	362T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
4	362S162 - 43 Mil	362T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
5	362S162 - 43 Mil	362T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	3.625	Gypsum	0.625

APPENDIX B.2 – Summary of 362S162 - 68 Mil Assemblies (24" on center)

Table 18: Summary of 362S162 - 68 Mil Assemblies (24" on center)

362S162 - 68 Mil @ 24" on center

Assembly No.	Exterior Finish	Exterior Finish Thickness (in)	Exterior Insulation	XPS Thickness (in)	Interior Fastener Pattern	Outer Sheathing	Outer Sheathing Thickness (in)
6	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
7	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
8	Stucco	0.750	R-7.5	1.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
9	Stucco	0.750	R-10.0	2.000	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
10	Stucco	0.750	R-12.5	2.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625

Assembly No.	Steel Stud	Steel track	Steel Bridging	Cavity Insulation	Cavity Insulation Thickness (in)	Interior Sheathing	Interior Sheathing Thickness (in)
6	362S162 - 68 Mil	362T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	Air Cavity	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
7	362S162 - 68 Mil	362T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	R-13	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
8	362S162 - 68 Mil	362T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	R-13	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
9	362S162 - 68 Mil	362T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	R-13	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
10	362S162 - 68 Mil	362T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	R-13	3.625	Gypsum	0.625

APPENDIX B.3 – Summary of 362S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (16" on center)

Table 19: Summary of 362S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (16" on center)

362S162 - 43 Mil @ 16" on center							
Assembly No.	Exterior Finish	Exterior Finish Thickness (in)	Exterior Insulation	XPS Thickness (in)	Interior Fastener Pattern	Outer Sheathing	Outer Sheathing Thickness (in)
11	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
12	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
13	Stucco	0.750	R-7.5	1.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
14	Stucco	0.750	R-10.0	2.000	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
15	Stucco	0.750	R-12.5	2.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
Assembly No.	Steel Stud	Steel track	Steel Bridging	Cavity Insulation	Cavity Insulation Thickness (in)	Interior Sheathing	Interior Sheathing Thickness (in)
11	362S162 - 43 Mil	362T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	Air Cavity	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
12	362S162 - 43 Mil	362T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
13	362S162 - 43 Mil	362T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
14	362S162 - 43 Mil	362T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
15	362S162 - 43 Mil	362T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	3.625	Gypsum	0.625

APPENDIX B.4 – Summary of 362S162 - 68 Mil Assemblies (16" on center)

Table 20: Summary of 362S162 - 68 Mil Assemblies (16" on center)

362S162 - 68 Mil @ 16" on center							
Assembly No.	Exterior Finish	Exterior Finish Thickness (in)	Exterior Insulation	XPS Thickness (in)	Interior Fastener Pattern	Outer Sheathing	Outer Sheathing Thickness (in)
16	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
17	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
18	Stucco	0.750	R-7.5	1.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
19	Stucco	0.750	R-10.0	2.000	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
20	Stucco	0.750	R-12.5	2.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
Assembly No.	Steel Stud	Steel track	Steel Bridging	Cavity Insulation	Cavity Insulation Thickness (in)	Interior Sheathing	Interior Sheathing Thickness (in)
16	362S162 - 68 Mil	362T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	Air Cavity	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
17	362S162 - 68 Mil	362T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	R-13	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
18	362S162 - 68 Mil	362T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	R-13	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
19	362S162 - 68 Mil	362T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	R-13	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
20	362S162 - 68 Mil	362T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	R-13	3.625	Gypsum	0.625

APPENDIX B.5 – Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (16" on center)

Table 21: Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (16" on center)

600S162 - 43 Mil @ 16" on center							
Assembly No.	Exterior Finish	Exterior Finish Thickness (in)	Exterior Insulation	XPS Thickness (in)	Interior Fastener Pattern	Outer Sheathing	Outer Sheathing Thickness (in)
21	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
22	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
23	Stucco	0.750	R-7.5	1.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
24	Stucco	0.750	R-10.0	2.000	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
25	Stucco	0.750	R-12.5	2.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
Assembly No.	Steel Stud	Steel track	Steel Bridging	Cavity Insulation	Cavity Insulation Thickness (in)	Interior Sheathing	Interior Sheathing Thickness (in)
21	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	Air Cavity	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
22	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
23	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
24	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
25	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625

APPENDIX B.6 – Summary of 600S162 - 68 Mil Assemblies (16" on center)

Table 22: Summary of 600S162 - 68 Mil Assemblies (16" on center)

600S162 - 68 Mil @ 16" on center							
Assembly No.	Exterior Finish	Exterior Finish Thickness (in)	Exterior Insulation	XPS Thickness (in)	Interior Fastener Pattern	Outer Sheathing	Outer Sheathing Thickness (in)
26	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
27	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
28	Stucco	0.750	R-7.5	1.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
29	Stucco	0.750	R-10.0	2.000	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
30	Stucco	0.750	R-12.5	2.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
Assembly No.	Steel Stud	Steel track	Steel Bridging	Cavity Insulation	Cavity Insulation Thickness (in)	Interior Sheathing	Interior Sheathing Thickness (in)
26	600S162 - 68 Mil	600T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	Air Cavity	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
27	600S162 - 68 Mil	600T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
28	600S162 - 68 Mil	600T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
29	600S162 - 68 Mil	600T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
30	600S162 - 68 Mil	600T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625

APPENDIX B.7 – Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (24" on center)

Table 23: Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (24" on center)

600S162 - 43 Mil @ 24" on center							
Assembly No.	Exterior Finish	Exterior Finish Thickness (in)	Exterior Insulation	XPS Thickness (in)	Interior Fastener Pattern	Outer Sheathing	Outer Sheathing Thickness (in)
31	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
32	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
33	Stucco	0.750	R-7.5	1.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
34	Stucco	0.750	R-10.0	2.000	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
35	Stucco	0.750	R-12.5	2.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
Assembly No.	Steel Stud	Steel track	Steel Bridging	Cavity Insulation	Cavity Insulation Thickness (in)	Interior Sheathing	Interior Sheathing Thickness (in)
31	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	Air Cavity	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
32	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
33	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
34	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
35	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625

APPENDIX B.8 – Summary of 600S162 - 68 Mil Assemblies (24" on center)

Table 24: Summary of 600S162 - 68 Mil Assemblies (24" on center)

600S162 - 68 Mil @ 24" on center							
Assembly No.	Exterior Finish	Exterior Finish Thickness (in)	Exterior Insulation	XPS Thickness (in)	Interior Fastener Pattern	Outer Sheathing	Outer Sheathing Thickness (in)
36	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
37	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
38	Stucco	0.750	R-7.5	1.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
39	Stucco	0.750	R-10.0	2.000	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
40	Stucco	0.750	R-12.5	2.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
Assembly No.	Steel Stud	Steel track	Steel Bridging	Cavity Insulation	Cavity Insulation Thickness (in)	Interior Sheathing	Interior Sheathing Thickness (in)
36	600S162 - 68 Mil	600T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	Air Cavity	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
37	600S162 - 68 Mil	600T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
38	600S162 - 68 Mil	600T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
39	600S162 - 68 Mil	600T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
40	600S162 - 68 Mil	600T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625

APPENDIX B.9 – Summary of 600S162 - 33 Mil Assemblies (16" on center) with #6 Fasteners

Table 25: Summary of 600S162 - 33 Mil Assemblies (16" on center) - #6 Fastener

600S162 - 33 Mil @ 16" on center - #6 Fastener

Assembly No.	Exterior Finish	Exterior Finish Thickness (in)	Exterior Insulation	XPS Thickness (in)	Interior Fastener Pattern	Outer Sheathing	Outer Sheathing Thickness (in)
41	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
42	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
43	Stucco	0.750	R-7.5	1.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
44	Stucco	0.750	R-10.0	2.000	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
45	Stucco	0.750	R-12.5	2.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625

Assembly No.	Steel Stud	Steel track	Steel Bridging	Cavity Insulation	Cavity Insulation Thickness (in)	Interior Sheathing	Interior Sheathing Thickness (in)
41	600S162 - 33 Mil	600T125 - 33 Mil	150U150 - 33 Mil	Air Cavity	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
42	600S162 - 33 Mil	600T125 - 33 Mil	150U150 - 33 Mil	R-13	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
43	600S162 - 33 Mil	600T125 - 33 Mil	150U150 - 33 Mil	R-13	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
44	600S162 - 33 Mil	600T125 - 33 Mil	150U150 - 33 Mil	R-13	3.625	Gypsum	0.625
45	600S162 - 33 Mil	600T125 - 33 Mil	150U150 - 33 Mil	R-13	3.625	Gypsum	0.625

APPENDIX B.10 – Summary of 600S162 - 54 Mil Assemblies (16" on center) with #6 Fasteners

Table 26: Summary of 600S162 - 54 Mil Assemblies (16" on center) - #6 Fastener

600S162 - 54 Mil @ 16" on center - #6 Fastener							
Assembly No.	Exterior Finish	Exterior Finish Thickness (in)	Exterior Insulation	XPS Thickness (in)	Interior Fastener Pattern	Outer Sheathing	Outer Sheathing Thickness (in)
46	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
47	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
48	Stucco	0.750	R-7.5	1.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
49	Stucco	0.750	R-10.0	2.000	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
50	Stucco	0.750	R-12.5	2.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
Assembly No.	Steel Stud	Steel track	Steel Bridging	Cavity Insulation	Cavity Insulation Thickness (in)	Interior Sheathing	Interior Sheathing Thickness (in)
46	600S162 - 54 Mil	600T125 - 54 Mil	150U150 - 54 Mil	Air Cavity	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
47	600S162 - 54 Mil	600T125 - 54 Mil	150U150 - 54 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
48	600S162 - 54 Mil	600T125 - 54 Mil	150U150 - 54 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
49	600S162 - 54 Mil	600T125 - 54 Mil	150U150 - 54 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
50	600S162 - 54 Mil	600T125 - 54 Mil	150U150 - 54 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625

APPENDIX B.11 – Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (24" on center) with #8 1-15/16 inch Fasteners

Table 27: Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (24" on center) - #8 1-15/16" Fastener

600S162 - 43 Mil @ 24" on center - #8 1-15/16"							
Assembly No.	Exterior Finish	Exterior Finish Thickness (in)	Exterior Insulation	XPS Thickness (in)	Interior Fastener Pattern	Outer Sheathing	Outer Sheathing Thickness (in)
51	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
52	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
53	Stucco	0.750	R-7.5	1.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
54	Stucco	0.750	R-10.0	2.000	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
55	Stucco	0.750	R-12.5	2.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
Assembly No.	Steel Stud	Steel track	Steel Bridging	Cavity Insulation	Cavity Insulation Thickness (in)	Interior Sheathing	Interior Sheathing Thickness (in)
51	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	Air Cavity	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
52	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
53	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
54	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
55	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625

APPENDIX B.12 – Summary of 600S162 - 97 Mil Assemblies (16" on center) with #6 Fasteners

Table 28: Summary of 600S162 - 97 Mil Assemblies (16" on center) - #6 Fastener

600S162 - 97 Mil @ 16" on center - #6 Fastener							
Assembly No.	Exterior Finish	Exterior Finish Thickness (in)	Exterior Insulation	XPS Thickness (in)	Interior Fastener Pattern	Outer Sheathing	Outer Sheathing Thickness (in)
56	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
57	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
58	Stucco	0.750	R-7.5	1.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
59	Stucco	0.750	R-10.0	2.000	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
60	Stucco	0.750	R-12.5	2.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
Assembly No.	Steel Stud	Steel track	Steel Bridging	Cavity Insulation	Cavity Insulation Thickness (in)	Interior Sheathing	Interior Sheathing Thickness (in)
56	600S162 - 97 Mil	600T125 - 97 Mil	150U150 - 97 Mil	Air Cavity	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
57	600S162 - 97 Mil	600T125 - 97 Mil	150U150 - 97 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
58	600S162 - 97 Mil	600T125 - 97 Mil	150U150 - 97 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
59	600S162 - 97 Mil	600T125 - 97 Mil	150U150 - 97 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
60	600S162 - 97 Mil	600T125 - 97 Mil	150U150 - 97 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625

APPENDIX B.13 – Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (24" on center) with #10 2-1/2 inch Fasteners

Table 29: Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (24" on center) - #10 2-1/2" Fastener

600S162 - 43 Mil @ 24" on center - #10 2-1/2"							
Assembly No.	Exterior Finish	Exterior Finish Thickness (in)	Exterior Insulation	XPS Thickness (in)	Interior Fastener Pattern	Outer Sheathing	Outer Sheathing Thickness (in)
61	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
62	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
63	Stucco	0.750	R-7.5	1.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
64	Stucco	0.750	R-10.0	2.000	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
65	Stucco	0.750	R-12.5	2.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
Assembly No.	Steel Stud	Steel track	Steel Bridging	Cavity Insulation	Cavity Insulation Thickness (in)	Interior Sheathing	Interior Sheathing Thickness (in)
61	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	Air Cavity	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
62	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
63	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
64	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
65	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625

APPENDIX B.14 – Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (16" on center) with #10 3-00 inch Fasteners

Table 30: Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (16" on center) - #10 3-00" Fastener

600S162 - 43 Mil @ 16" on center - #10 3-00"							
Assembly No.	Exterior Finish	Exterior Finish Thickness (in)	Exterior Insulation	XPS Thickness (in)	Interior Fastener Pattern	Outer Sheathing	Outer Sheathing Thickness (in)
66	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
67	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
68	Stucco	0.750	R-7.5	1.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
69	Stucco	0.750	R-10.0	2.000	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
70	Stucco	0.750	R-12.5	2.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
Assembly No.	Steel Stud	Steel track	Steel Bridging	Cavity Insulation	Cavity Insulation Thickness (in)	Interior Sheathing	Interior Sheathing Thickness (in)
66	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	Air Cavity	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
67	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
68	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
69	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
70	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625

APPENDIX B.15 – Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (24" on center) with #10 3-00 inch Fasteners

Table 31: Summary of 600S162 - 43 Mil Assemblies (24" on center) - #10 3-00" Fastener

600S162 - 43 Mil @ 24" on center - #10 3-00"							
Assembly No.	Exterior Finish	Exterior Finish Thickness (in)	Exterior Insulation	XPS Thickness (in)	Interior Fastener Pattern	Outer Sheathing	Outer Sheathing Thickness (in)
71	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
72	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
73	Stucco	0.750	R-7.5	1.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
74	Stucco	0.750	R-10.0	2.000	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
75	Stucco	0.750	R-12.5	2.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
Assembly No.	Steel Stud	Steel track	Steel Bridging	Cavity Insulation	Cavity Insulation Thickness (in)	Interior Sheathing	Interior Sheathing Thickness (in)
71	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	Air Cavity	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
72	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
73	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
74	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
75	600S162 - 43 Mil	600T125 - 43 Mil	150U150 - 43 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625

APPENDIX B.16 – Summary of 600S162 - 68 Mil Assemblies (24" on center) with #10 3-00 inch Fasteners

Table 32: Summary of 600S162 - 68 Mil Assemblies (24" on center) - #10 3-00" Fastener

600S162 - 68 Mil @ 24" on center - #10 3-00"							
Assembly No.	Exterior Finish	Exterior Finish Thickness (in)	Exterior Insulation	XPS Thickness (in)	Interior Fastener Pattern	Outer Sheathing	Outer Sheathing Thickness (in)
76	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
77	Stucco	0.750	--	--	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
78	Stucco	0.750	R-7.5	1.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
79	Stucco	0.750	R-10.0	2.000	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
80	Stucco	0.750	R-12.5	2.500	6" o.c	Gypsum	0.625
Assembly No.	Steel Stud	Steel track	Steel Bridging	Cavity Insulation	Cavity Insulation Thickness (in)	Interior Sheathing	Interior Sheathing Thickness (in)
76	600S162 - 68 Mil	600T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	Air Cavity	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
77	600S162 - 68 Mil	600T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
78	600S162 - 68 Mil	600T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
79	600S162 - 68 Mil	600T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625
80	600S162 - 68 Mil	600T125 - 68 Mil	150U150 - 68 Mil	R-13	6.000	Gypsum	0.625

APPENDIX C – SUMMARY OF RESULTS

This appendix summarizes the detailed results of the parametric evaluation such as the overall heat flow, calculated U and R – Values, thermal bridging coefficients, and the predicted U – value based on these coefficients.

APPENDIX C.1 – Summary of PA-01 to PA-30

Table 33: Summary of Results of the Parametric Evaluation (PA-01 to PA-30)

Assembly No	Heat Flow (W)	U - Value $\text{W/m}^2\cdot\text{K}$	R - Value $\text{m}^2\cdot\text{K/W}$	Ψ_{stud} $\text{W/m}\cdot\text{K}$	Ψ_{track} $\text{W/m}\cdot\text{K}$	χ_{Fastener} W/K	Predicted U - Value $\text{W/m}^2\cdot\text{K}$	Percentage Difference %
362S162 - 43 Mil @ 24" on center								
1	12.070	1.9962	0.5009	0.0276	0.0222	0.0002	1.9964	-0.01%
2	3.9493	0.6532	1.5310	0.1019	0.0751	0.0002	0.6489	0.65%
3	1.9455	0.3218	3.1076	0.0260	0.0163	0.0002	0.3211	0.20%
4	1.6893	0.2792	3.5812	0.0196	0.0120	0.0001	0.2785	0.25%
5	1.5002	0.2480	4.0323	0.0156	0.0095	0.0001	0.2473	0.29%
362S162 - 68 Mil @ 24" on center								
6	12.149	2.0093	0.4977	0.0326	0.0246	0.0002	2.0101	-0.04%
7	4.1107	0.6799	1.4709	0.1127	0.0793	0.0002	0.6749	0.73%
8	1.9690	0.3258	3.0693	0.0277	0.0165	0.0000	0.3223	1.07%
9	1.7060	0.2821	3.5446	0.0208	0.0123	0.0001	0.2809	0.42%
10	1.5131	0.2502	3.9966	0.0165	0.0096	0.0001	0.2491	0.44%
362S162 - 43 Mil @ 16" on center								
11	12.205	2.0185	0.4954	0.0276	0.0194	0.0001	2.0157	0.14%
12	4.4784	0.7400	1.3513	0.1037	0.0722	0.0002	0.7357	0.59%
13	2.0847	0.3449	2.8993	0.0268	0.0144	0.0000	0.3394	1.59%
14	1.7940	0.2967	3.3707	0.0202	0.0106	0.0001	0.2953	0.47%
15	1.5834	0.2618	3.8191	0.0160	0.0082	0.0001	0.2605	0.51%
362S162 - 68 Mil @ 16" on center								
16	12.318	2.0372	0.4909	0.0332	0.0234	0.0002	2.0377	-0.02%
17	4.6948	0.7764	1.2880	0.1147	0.0751	0.0002	0.7691	0.94%
18	2.1183	0.3505	2.8532	0.0285	0.0146	0.0000	0.3455	1.43%
19	1.8179	0.3006	3.3266	0.0214	0.0107	0.0001	0.2988	0.61%
20	1.6018	0.2649	3.7752	0.0170	0.0083	0.0001	0.2632	0.64%
600S162 - 43 Mil @ 16" on center								
21	12.129	2.0060	0.4985	0.0247	0.0198	0.0001	2.0053	0.03%
22	4.4021	0.7280	1.3737	0.0992	0.0691	0.0002	0.7211	0.95%
23	2.1031	0.3479	2.8741	0.0273	0.0145	0.0000	0.3430	1.43%
24	1.8059	0.2986	3.3487	0.0204	0.0107	0.0001	0.2963	0.79%
25	1.5936	0.2635	3.7947	0.0163	0.0082	0.0001	0.2614	0.81%
600S162 - 68 Mil @ 16" on center								
26	12.281	2.0311	0.4923	0.0318	0.0234	0.0002	2.0291	0.10%
27	4.6924	0.7760	1.2887	0.1139	0.0742	0.0002	0.7673	1.12%
28	2.1519	0.3560	2.8088	0.0298	0.0148	0.0000	0.3503	1.61%
29	1.8403	0.3043	3.2859	0.0222	0.0108	0.0001	0.3014	0.97%
30	1.6201	0.2679	3.7326	0.0176	0.0084	0.0001	0.2653	0.98%

APPENDIX C.2 – Summary of PA-31 to PA-60

Table 34: Summary of Results of the Parametric Evaluation (PA-31 to PA-60)

Assembly No	Heat Flow (W)	U - Value $\text{W/m}^2\cdot\text{K}$	R - Value $\text{m}^2\cdot\text{K/W}$	Ψ_{stud} $\text{W/m}\cdot\text{K}$	Ψ_{track} $\text{W/m}\cdot\text{K}$	χ_{Fastener} W/K	Predicted U - Value $\text{W/m}^2\cdot\text{K}$	Percentage Difference %
600S162 - 43 Mil @ 24" on center								
31	12.001	1.9848	0.5038	0.0242	0.0204	0.0001	1.9840	0.04%
32	3.8951	0.6442	1.5523	0.0974	0.0726	0.0002	0.6393	0.75%
33	1.9607	0.3244	3.0826	0.0265	0.0164	0.0000	0.3209	1.09%
34	1.6999	0.2811	3.5574	0.0199	0.0122	0.0001	0.2795	0.56%
35	1.5095	0.2496	4.0061	0.0159	0.0095	0.0001	0.2482	0.58%
600S162 - 68 Mil @ 24" on center								
36	12.115	2.0037	0.4991	0.0425	0.0246	0.0002	2.0252	-1.07%
37	4.1081	0.6794	1.4718	0.1115	0.0787	0.0002	0.6734	0.89%
38	1.9960	0.3303	3.0279	0.0289	0.0170	0.0000	0.3262	1.23%
39	1.7249	0.2852	3.5058	0.0216	0.0126	0.0001	0.2833	0.70%
40	1.5288	0.2528	3.9555	0.0172	0.0098	0.0001	0.2510	0.70%
600S162 - 33 Mil @ 16" on center - #6 MH Fastener								
41	12.034	1.9903	0.5024	0.0203	0.0167	0.0001	1.9899	0.02%
42	4.1852	0.6922	1.4447	0.0885	0.0653	0.0002	0.6880	0.60%
43	2.0624	0.3411	2.9317	0.0252	0.0141	0.0000	0.3368	1.27%
44	1.7770	0.2939	3.4026	0.0189	0.0104	0.0001	0.2919	0.68%
45	1.5934	0.2599	3.8483	0.0163	0.0082	0.0001	0.2613	-0.57%
600S162 - 54 Mil @ 16" on center - #6 MH Fastener								
46	12.210	2.0194	0.4952	0.0285	0.0216	0.0001	2.0179	0.07%
47	4.5648	0.7550	1.3246	0.1074	0.0720	0.0002	0.7471	1.04%
48	2.1309	0.3524	2.8375	0.0287	0.0147	0.0000	0.3472	1.48%
49	1.8255	0.3019	3.3122	0.0214	0.0108	0.0001	0.2992	0.90%
50	1.6088	0.2661	3.7584	0.0170	0.0083	0.0002	0.2662	-0.04%
600S162 - 43 Mil @ 24" on center - #8 1-15/16" L								
51	12.007	1.9858	0.5036	0.0237	0.0206	0.0002	1.9841	0.08%
52	3.8972	0.6445	1.5517	0.0971	0.0726	0.0002	0.6392	0.82%
53	1.9609	0.3243	3.0833	0.0263	0.0165	0.0000	0.3206	1.15%
54	1.7038	0.2817	3.5505	0.0201	0.0123	0.0001	0.2807	0.35%
55	1.5125	0.2500	3.9992	0.0160	0.0096	0.0001	0.2490	0.40%
600S162 - 97 Mil @ 16" on center - #6 Fastener								
56	12.424	2.0548	0.4867	0.0387	0.0264	0.0002	2.0516	0.15%
57	4.9086	0.8118	1.2318	0.1249	0.0777	0.0002	0.8019	1.22%
58	2.1858	0.3615	2.7662	0.0315	0.0150	0.0000	0.3555	1.67%
59	1.8640	0.3083	3.2438	0.0234	0.0110	0.0001	0.3047	1.15%
60	1.6383	0.2710	3.6907	0.0185	0.0084	0.0001	0.2678	1.15%

APPENDIX C.3 – Summary of PA-61 to PA-80

Table 35: Summary of Results of the Parametric Evaluation (PA-61 to PA-80)

Assembly No	Heat Flow (W)	U - Value $\text{W/m}^2\cdot\text{K}$	R - Value $\text{m}^2\cdot\text{K/W}$	Ψ_{stud} $\text{W/m}\cdot\text{K}$	Ψ_{track} $\text{W/m}\cdot\text{K}$	χ_{Fastener} W/K	Predicted U - Value $\text{W/m}^2\cdot\text{K}$	Percentage Difference %
600S162 - 43 Mil @ 24" on center - #10 2-1/2"								
61	12.016	1.9873	0.5032	0.0236	0.0204	0.0003	1.9853	0.10%
62	3.8972	0.6463	1.5472	0.0962	0.0708	0.0002	0.6358	1.62%
63	1.9619	0.3247	3.0802	0.0261	0.0164	0.0000	0.3203	1.35%
64	1.7104	0.2830	3.5334	0.0202	0.0124	0.0000	0.2794	1.29%
65	1.5116	0.2497	4.0045	0.0159	0.0095	0.0001	0.2486	0.44%
600S162 - 43 Mil @ 16" on center - #10 3.00"								
66	12.156	2.0104	0.4974	0.0238	0.0198	0.0004	2.0073	0.16%
67	4.4216	0.7313	1.3675	0.0981	0.0692	0.0000	0.7150	2.22%
68	2.1053	0.3482	2.8720	0.0266	0.0095	0.0000	0.3373	3.14%
69	1.8272	0.3022	3.3091	0.0210	0.0107	0.0001	0.2984	1.25%
70	1.6100	0.2663	3.7556	0.0167	0.0083	0.0002	0.2654	0.31%
600S162 - 43 Mil @ 24" on center - #10 3.00"								
71	12.020	1.9879	0.5030	0.0234	0.0206	0.0004	1.9856	0.12%
72	3.9091	0.6463	1.5472	0.0963	0.0727	0.0003	0.6396	1.05%
73	1.9624	0.3247	3.0802	0.0258	0.0164	0.0000	0.3198	1.50%
74	1.7107	0.2830	3.5334	0.0199	0.0124	0.0000	0.2789	1.44%
75	1.5294	0.2529	3.9542	0.0168	0.0098	0.0001	0.2505	0.96%
600S162 - 68 Mil @ 16" on center - #10 3.00"								
76	12.305	2.0351	0.4914	0.0238	0.0198	0.0004	2.0073	1.37%
77	4.4196	0.7309	1.3681	0.0980	0.0688	0.0003	0.7203	1.45%
78	2.1538	0.3562	2.8073	0.0294	0.0243	0.0004	0.3654	-2.58%
79	1.8422	0.3047	3.2822	0.0218	0.0108	0.0001	0.3006	1.32%
80	1.6216	0.2682	3.7287	0.0173	0.0106	0.0003	0.2718	-1.36%

APPENDIX D – Fastener Modelling

This section of the appendix discusses the methodology and reasoning behind modelling the fasteners as they were for the purpose of this project. For all the assemblies, the fasteners were modelled as square cuboids with the same cross-sectional area as the shank of the fastener being modelled. The length of these square prisms was kept the same as the original fastener length (including the fastener head). This was done due to the geometric limitation in Heat3 which does not allow modelling of non-prismatic members. Figure 24 below shows typical fasteners as modelled in Heat3.




Figure 24: Typical Fasteners as modelled in Heat3 for project assemblies

Additionally, no fastener heads and threads were modelled. This was done because the increased area of the fastener head was determined to have a negligible difference on the overall heat flow of the assembly. Table 36 below represents the geometric and material properties for the assembly used to verify this assumption.

Table 36: Summary of Geometric and Material Properties used for the assembly used to verify fastener modelling assumptions

Element	Description	Thickness (in)	Conductivity K-Value (BTU-in/hr ft ² °F)	Component R-Value (hr ft ² °F/BTU)
Exterior Finish	Stucco	0.75	9.375	0.08
Exterior Insulation	--	--	--	--
Interior Fastener Pattern (#10, 3-00")	6" o.c	0.19	346	--
Exterior Fastener Pattern	--	--	--	--
Outer Sheathing	Gypsum	0.625	1.12	0.56
Steel Stud (16.0 in. o.c.)	600S162 - 68 Mil	0.0677	495	--
Steel track	600T125 - 68 Mil	0.0677	495	--
Steel Channel	150U150 - 68 Mil	0.0677	495	--
Cavity Insulation	R-13 (6")	6.000	0.46	13.00
Interior Sheathing	Gypsum	0.625	1.10	0.57

This assembly was determined to be the most critical case for studying the impact of fastener heads for the following reasons –

- no external insulation is present and R-13 cavity insulation is present which corresponds with CZ-0 and CZ-1
- diameter and length of the fastener represent the maximum case of the parametric evaluation cases (#10, 3-00")

Due to this, the impact of fastener heads on the overall heat flow is the maximum possible. It was observed that with the fastener heads the net heat flow through the assembly increased by only 0.58% from 4.420 W to 4.445W. Based on the findings of this analysis, fastener heads were neglected in project models.



American Iron and Steel Institute

25 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20001
www.steel.org

