United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest Service

Forest
Products
Laboratory

General
Technical
Report
FPL–GTR–214

Evaluation of the Lateral Performance of Roof Truss-to-Wall Connections in Light-Frame Wood Systems

Andrew DeRenzis
Vladimir Kochkin
Xiping Wang

Abstract

This testing program was designed to benchmark the performance of traditional roof systems and incrementally improved roof-to-wall systems with the goal of developing connection solutions that are optimized for performance and constructability. Nine full-size roof systems were constructed and tested with various levels and types of heel detailing to measure the lateral performance of the roof-to-wall interface. Our test results indicate that the oriented strandboard (OSB) sheathed high-heel truss detail yields performance comparable to that of the unblocked, low-heel truss configuration that is currently allowed by code. Using OSB sheathing as bracing (without any additional blocking in the heel) can be considered an adequate bracing option in high-heel conditions where the intent is to provide structural performance comparable to that of an unblocked, low-heel truss condition. Results also show that extending the OSB sheathing down and including additional nailing to the top plate of the wall below provide strength and stiffness performance superior to that of the solid, intermittent blocking that is currently required in high-wind regions and should be considered a viable truss heel bracing solution to intermittent blocking.

Keywords: blocking, lateral performance, low-heel truss, high-heel truss, roof system, roof-to-wall connection

Acknowledgment

This project was funded through a cooperative research agreement between the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) Research Center and the USDA Forest Service Forest Products Laboratory.

August 2012

DeRenzis, Andrew; Kochkin, Vladimir; Wang, Xiping. 2012. Evaluation of the lateral performance of roof truss-to-wall connections in light-frame wood systems. General Technical Report FPL-GTR-214. Madison, WI: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forest Products Laboratory. 25 p.

A limited number of free copies of this publication are available to the public from the Forest Products Laboratory, One Gifford Pinchot Drive, Madison, WI 53726–2398. This publication is also available online at www.fpl.fs.fed.us. Laboratory publications are sent to hundreds of libraries in the United States and elsewhere.

The Forest Products Laboratory is maintained in cooperation with the University of Wisconsin.

The use of trade or firm names in this publication is for reader information and does not imply endorsement by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) of any product or service.

The USDA prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or a part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720–2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250–9410, or call (800) 795–3272 (voice) or (202) 720–6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Contents

Introduction 1
Objectives 1
Code Requirements 1
Loading Considerations 2
  Wind Considerations 3
  Seismic Considerations 5
Methods and Materials 5
  General 5
  Specimen Collection 5
  Test Setup and Protocol 9
Results 11
Summary and Conclusions 18
References 19
Appendix A—Summary Load–Displacement Curves 20
Appendix B—Specimen Load–Displacement Curves 21

Conversion table

English unit	Conversion factor	SI unit
inch (in.)	25.4	millimeter (mm)
foot (ft)	0.3048	meter (m)
mile (mi)	1.6093	kilometer (km)
square foot (ft^2)	0.092903	square meter (m^2)
pound (lb), mass	0.45359	kilogram (kg)
pound (lb), force	4.4482	newton (N)
pound per inch (lb/in)	175.13	newton per meter (N/m)
pound per foot (lb/ft)	14.594	newton per meter (N/m)

Evaluation of the Lateral Performance of Roof Truss-to-Wall Connections in Light-Frame Wood Systems

Andrew DeRenzis, Structural Engineer
Vladimir Kochkin, Director
NAHB Research Center, Upper Marlboro, Maryland

Xiping Wang, Research Forest Products Technologist
Forest Products Laboratory, Madison, Wisconsin

Introduction

The 2009 International Residential Code (IRC) includes new requirements for roof-to-wall connections (section R602.10.6) at braced wall panels (ICC 2009). These new requirements were introduced in an effort related to the work of the ICC Ad Hoc Committee on Wall Bracing with the intent to clarify or, where appropriate, reinforce the lateral load path between the roof and the braced wall panels of the supporting walls below. (The Ad Hoc Committee on Wall Bracing was established by the International Code Council (ICC) to review the provisions of the IRC related to wall bracing.) Particularly, significant changes were introduced for homes with high-heel trusses or deep rafters and for homes located in high hazard areas (wind speeds of 100 mi/h or higher or Seismic Design Category D0, D1, or D2). The requirements include provisions for additional fastening, eave blocking, knee walls, sheathing, or a combination of those elements. These requirements were further clarified and refined for the 2012 IRC.

The new requirements are labor intensive and have implications on cost and time of construction, particularly as high-heel roof configurations become more common as a solution for meeting increasing energy-efficiency standards. The proposed testing program was designed to benchmark the performance of traditional roof systems and incrementally improved roof-to-wall systems with the goal of developing connection solutions that are optimized for performance and constructability.

Objectives

With the general focus on the lateral capacity of the roof-to-wall connections in the direction parallel to ridge, specific objectives of this test study were as follows:

1. Establish performance-based limitations on traditional low-heel roof-to-wall connections using hurricane ties and without eave blocking, with three specific goals:
    a. Benchmark capacities of the unblocked roof diaphragm and unblocked ceiling diaphragms tested as part of a roof assembly
    b. Benchmark rotational response of the roof-to-wall connections without eave blocking
    c. Understand the system response of the overall roof assembly, including the interaction between roof and ceiling diaphragms
2. Establish performance-based limitations for high-heel roof trusses attached with hurricane ties without eave blocking
3. Measure the performance of high-heel truss systems with intermittent blocking
4. Measure the performance of high-heel truss systems braced against rotation with wood structural panel sheathing attached to the vertical heel member of the truss

Code Requirements

The new IRC provisions are intended to increase the capacity of the heel joint in (1) resisting lateral forces between the roof and the wall and (2) resisting local rotation of the roof members at supports. Table 1 summarizes the 2012 IRC provisions for attachment of roof to walls. Figure 1 illustrates the IRC prescriptive detailing options. The special detailing requirements are triggered based on the following:

- Wind speed of 100 mi/h or greater
- Seismic design category D0 and higher
- Heel heights of 9-1/4 and 15-1/4 in.

In the 2012 IRC, eave blocking is the primary method to increase the lateral capacity of the heel joint. The blocking members transfer shear load to the top plate of the wall below through face nailing or toe-nailing and restrict local rotation of the roof framing members caused by the eccentricity of the heel joint. The load from the roof diaphragm is transferred through sheathing connectors into a top chord

Table 1—2012 IRC provisions for roof-to-wall attachment

Triggers			
Wind/seismic[a]	Roof configuration	Minimum requirements	Notes
Wind less than 100 mi/h and SDC A, B, C	Rafter or truss heel joint 9-1/4 in. or less	Nailed connection per IRC table R602.3(1)	At each heel joint along length of entire wall
	Rafter heel joint height 9-1/4 in.–15-1/4 in.	Nailed connection per IRC table R602.3(1) and partial height blocking nailed to wall top plate	Blocking is only at the braced wall panel
	Truss heel joint height 9-1/4 – 15-1/4 in.	Trusses attached per IRC sections R802.10 and R802.11 and partial height blocking nailed to wall top plate	
Wind at 100 mi/h or greater and SDC D0, D1, D2	Rafter or truss heel joint height up to 15-1/4 in.	Nailed connection per IRC table R602.3(1) and partial height blocking nailed to wall top plate	
At all wind speeds and all SDCs	Rafter or truss heel joint exceeds 15-1/4 in.	Options: (1) Blocking at overhang and at top plate per figure R602.10.6.2(2) (2) Partial height blocking with wall panels per figure R602.10.6.2(3) (3) Engineered full-height blocking panels nailed to roof sheathing (blocked diaphragm) (4) Other engineered methods	

[a] SDC, seismic design category.

member and then into the blocking either through end bearing or, if constructed as a blocked diaphragm with the roof sheathing nails penetrating the blocking, through the sheathing fasteners.

Loading Considerations

The heel joint at the roof-to-wall interface is subject to wind and seismic forces:

- Lateral forces (wind or seismic)
- Uplift forces (wind; roof uplift forces due to vertical seismic accelerations are not considered in residential design)
- Rotational (overturning) forces (secondary forces due to eccentricity of lateral force)

The scope of this project is limited to investigating the lateral load path and the connections and detailing in the IRC for resisting lateral forces in the direction perpendicular to the roof framing members (parallel to the ridge of the roof). Figure 2 shows the loads and the forces in the direction of interest of this study (note that uplift and orthogonal components are not shown intentionally for clarity). The perpendicular-to-ridge direction is not included as it does not contribute to the lateral load or overturning moment in the direction perpendicular to the trusses.

The effect of the uplift component on the response of roof systems with toe nails or hurricane ties under combined loading has been extensively studied by others (Riley and Sadek 2003, Scoville 2005, Kopp 2010, Simpson Strong-Tie 2010) and therefore is not included in this testing program. In addition, wind uplift forces do not have direct effect on the diaphragm action, cross-grain bending of roof members, truss rotation, and eave blocking performance—the primary areas of this study. Furthermore, significant spatial variations of wind uplift pressure exist across the roof surface, and the wind profiles developed specifically for design purposes (i.e., ASCE 2005) may not be directly applicable to full-scale roof testing for combined loading applications. Their effects should be captured more accurately through full-size wind tunnel testing.

Lateral forces from wind and seismic events are generated through two different mechanisms and imposed on the structure in two different manners. Therefore, the loading type has implications on the selection of appropriate testing procedures. Wind pressures act on the building surfaces, whereas seismic forces act at the location of the masses of the building elements. The following discussion identifies



Figure 1. Prescriptive detailing options in IRC: (a) partial height solid blocking, (b) eave bracing, (c) blocking panels.

unique features of each loading type with respect to the forces acting at the roof-to-wall connections.

Wind Considerations

The ASCE 7 lateral wind load profile in the direction parallel to the ridge is shown in Figure 3, with wind pressures acting on both the windward wall surface (positive pressure) and leeward wall surface (negative pressure—suction) of the building. For a typical residential floor aspect ratio, the windward pressure is about twice the leeward pressure. These pressures have the same vector direction and their actions are superimposed to develop the total lateral force acting on the building. The wind pressures on the wall surface are transferred through the vertical framing mem-



Figure 2. Wind and seismic loading in the parallel-to-wind direction. (Uplift and orthogonal components are not shown for clarity.)



Figure 3. ASCE 7 wind loading profile.

bers to roof, ceiling, and floor diaphragms and from there to shear walls. This discussion is focused on the forces transferred from the gable end walls into the roof assembly and into the walls below the roof assembly. The forces from gable end wall wind pressures are resisted by the roof sheathing diaphragm and the ceiling diaphragm. Figure 4 shows the tributary wind areas associated with each diaphragm. The applicable forces from the top story wall are transferred into the ceiling diaphragm. Typical bracing details at the gable end wall are intended to redistribute the load into the diaphragms and may to some degree affect the distribution of forces between the roof sheathing diaphragm and the ceiling diaphragm. This bracing may also impart some amount of rotational restraint to the roof members near the gable ends. Conversely, this restraint contribution would be minimal at the interior roof sections.

Eccentricity at the connection depends on the ratio of load delivered to the truss heel through the ceiling to the load delivered through the roof diaphragms, with a higher ratio indicating that there is less load transferred through the roof sheathing and therefore less overturning load at the truss heel. Each diaphragm resists a part of the total load and the ratio of the loads between the two diaphragms varies depending upon the roof configuration and location of the gable end wind load resultant. In Example 1 we calculate the ratio of load to the two diaphragms for a typical house configuration. For a house with a 5/12 roof pitch and a roof span of 32 ft, the resultant loading ratio of ceiling diaphragm load to roof diaphragm load is 3.2:1; that is, the force transferred through the ceiling diaphragm is 3.2 times greater than the force transferred through the roof diaphragm. For a roof pitch of 7/12 for the same house configuration, the loading ratio is 2.5:1.

Example 1—Calculation of the ratio of wind load to roof diaphragms

Building configuration:
Building plan: 32 by 50 ft
Two stories
Story height: 9 ft
Roof pitch: 5/12
Mean roof height: 25 ft
Gable end roof
Wind parallel to ridge
Overhang: 2 ft

Basic wind speed: 140 mi/h (ASCE 7–10)
Exposure: B
Wind pressure: 30 lb/ft^2 (rounded for simplicity of calculations)

Gable end wall forces:
Total gable end area:
(distribution from top of wall to ridge)
× (roof width) × 0.5 = [((32 ft ÷ 2) + 2 ft)(5/12)]
× (32 ft + 4 ft) × (0.5) = 135 ft^2

Force into each diaphragm from gable end:
(simply supported, vertical framing members spanning between two diaphragms)
(135 ft^2) × (30 lb/ft^2) × (0.5) = 2,025 lb

Second-story wall forces:
Tributary wall area of the top story:
(building width) × (wall height) × 0.5
= (32 ft) × (9 ft) × (0.5) = 144 ft^2
Force into ceiling diaphragm from top story wall:
(144 ft^2) × (30 lb/ft^2) = 4,320 lb

Ratio of roof diaphragm load to ceiling diaphragm load: 1:3.2

The same example for a roof pitch of 7/12 results in: 1:2.5



Figure 4. Tributary area of wind loads.

Seismic Considerations

Unlike wind pressures, which are imposed on the outside shell of the structure, seismic load is distributed throughout the building based on the mass of the elements. The eccentricity at the truss heel connection is still governed, however, by the ratio of loading between the two diaphragms. The total force resisted by the roof-to-wall connections is associated with (1) the mass of the roof diaphragm, (2) the mass of the ceiling diaphragm, and (3) the mass of half the height of the top story walls below the roof gable end. The walls supporting the roof eave do not directly contribute to the overturning forces at the roof heel.

The distribution of the weight between the two diaphragms is close to symmetric with the weight of the sheathing materials (oriented strandboard (OSB) and gypsum) and the primary framing members being located around the perimeter of the roof triangle. The weight of the shingles is attributed to the top chords, and the weight of insulation, eaves, overhangs, and any mechanical equipment is attributed to the bottom of the roof assembly. Example 2 shows that the top story walls contribute only 10% to the total lateral force resisted by the ceiling diaphragm, and that contribution is ignored for the purposes of this study. Therefore, the resultant loading ratio of ceiling diaphragm load to roof diaphragm load is about 1:1; that is, half the total force is transferred through the ceiling diaphragm and half is transferred through the roof sheathing diaphragm.

Example 2—Calculation of the eccentricity of seismic load

Building configuration:
- Building plan: 32 by 50 ft
- Two stories
- Story height: 9 ft
- Roof pitch: 5/12
- Mean roof height: 25 ft
- Gable end roof
- Acceleration parallel to ridge

Overhang: 2 ft
Roof dead load: 15 lb/ft^2
Wall dead load: 9 lb/ft^2

Roof weight: (15 lb/ft^2) × (32 ft + 2 ft) × (50 ft)
= 25,500 lb
(half overhang is used at 15 lb/ft^2 dead load)
Wall weight: (9 lb/ft^2) × (32 ft) × (9 ft ÷ 2) × (2 walls)
= 2,592 lb

Ratio of roof diaphragm load to ceiling diaphragm load: 1:1

Methods and Materials

General

Testing was conducted at the NAHB Research Center laboratory facility located in Upper Marlboro, Maryland. All specimens were constructed in the laboratory, and all construction materials were purchased from local suppliers.

Table 2 shows a test matrix summarizing specimen configurations, including connections, truss–heel height, and blocking. A purpose statement with explanation is provided for each configuration. Nine full-size roof systems were tested with various levels and types of heel detailing to measure the lateral performance of the roof-to-wall interface.

Specimen Collection

Table 3 summarizes materials and methods used in construction of the specimens, and Table 4 provides details of the various blocking/bracing methods.

Each specimen was constructed with five 24-ft-span wood trusses spaced at 24 in. on center (o.c.), with the overall size of the full roof system at 24 ft wide by 8 ft deep with additional 16-in.-long overhangs on each side (Fig. 5). Trusses were supported at the heel by 4-ft-high light-frame knee walls anchored to the laboratory's strong floor. Strength and stiffness of the knee walls were sufficiently higher than those of the roof system to prevent any significant

Table 2—Test matrix

Configuration	Diagram	Truss/heel height[a]	Roof-to-wall attachment	Blocking/ bracing at heel	Purpose	Notes
A Low-heel truss		Low-heel truss H = 9-1/4 in.	H2.5T hurricane clip at each truss	None	Benchmark performance of both typical low-heel trusses and unblocked roof and ceiling diaphragms	This configuration will allow establishing performance limits on the conventional low-heel roof system with hurricane clip connections.
B High-heel truss without blocking		High-heel truss H = 15-1/4 in.	H2.5T hurricane clip at each truss	None	Investigate the impact of a high heel truss through comparison to Configuration A	This configuration will allow establishing limits on high-heel conditions constructed without blocking/bracing.
C High-heel truss without blocking with low (3/12) roof pitch		High-heel truss H = 15-1/4 in.	H2.5T hurricane clip at each truss	None	Through comparison to Configuration B, investigate the impact of low roof slope (presumed decreased rotational restraint from the roof sheathing)	This configuration will demonstrate whether roof slope has a measurable impact on contribution of roof sheathing to overturning resistance of the roof heel.
D High-heel truss braced with OSB sheathing		High-heel truss H = 15-1/4 in.	H2.5T hurricane clip at each truss	Truss heel braced with OSB sheathing (OSB not extended over wall top plate)	Evaluate the effectiveness of continuous OSB sheathing nailed to the truss heel in restraining truss overturning	This configuration represents an alternative to the blocking details in the 2012 IRC.
E High-heel truss braced with OSB sheathing extended over wall plate		High-heel truss H = 15-1/4 in.	H2.5T hurricane clip at each truss	Truss heel braced with OSB sheathing (OSB attached to wall top plate)	Same as above, but the OSB sheathing extended over the top plate of the double top plate and attached with an additional horizontal row of nails into top plate	This configuration represents an alternative to the blocking details in the 2012 IRC.

Table 2—Test matrix—con.

Configuration	Diagram	Truss/heel height[a]	Roof-to-wall attachment	Blocking/ bracing at heel	Purpose	Notes
F High-heel truss with blocking at intermittent locations		High-heel truss H = 15-1/4 in.	H2.5T hurricane clip at each truss	Partial height blocking (25% of wall length)	Evaluate the condition where blocking is installed in an intermittent configuration (this configuration represents a scenario where blocking is installed at braced wall panels only)	This configuration is intended to evaluate the use of intermittent compared with continuous blocking.
G High-heel truss with blocking at every other bay		High-heel truss H = 15-1/4 in.	H2.5T hurricane clip at each truss	Partial height blocking (50% of wall length)	Evaluate the condition where blocking is installed at every other bay	This configuration is intended to evaluate the use of intermittent compared with continuous blocking.
H High-heel truss with braced webs		Low-heel truss H = 15-1/4 in.	H2.5T hurricane clip at each truss	Diagonal bracing of truss webs	Evaluate the effectiveness of web bracing in restraining truss overturning at the heel	This configuration is intended to evaluate the contribution of web bracing that may already be present in the roof assembly in resisting other forces.
I High-heel truss braced with OSB sheathing and a reinforced ceiling diaphragm		High-heel truss H = 15-1/4 in.	H2.5T hurricane clip at each truss	Sheathing extended down to capture top plate	Evaluate performance of Configuration E blocking method with reinforced gypsum diaphragm	The ceiling diaphragm is reinforced in an attempt to force failure at the truss heel connection instead of the gypsum diaphragm. This test is intended to validate the performance of OSB bracing detail at higher diaphragm capacities (i.e., higher overturning force at the heel).

[a]All trusses are spaced 24 in. on center (o.c.).

Table 3—Specimen materials and construction

Materials	Construction
Roof span	24 ft (plus 16-in. overhang on each end)
Roof length	8 ft
Roof pitch	7/12 or 3/12 per test matrix (Table 2)
Roof framing members	Metal-plate-connected wood trusses fabricated with No. 2 southern yellow pine lumber; heel heights either 9-1/4 or 15-1/4 in. per test matrix (Table 2)
Truss spacing	24 in. o.c.[a]
Truss-to-wall connections	Simpson Strong-Tie H2.5T hurricane truss clips connecting each truss and both top plate members with a total of 10 8d common (2-1/2- by 0.131-in.) nails (5 nails per each truss)
Fascia board	1- by 6-in. nominal lumber face nailed to each truss end with two 8d common (2-1/2- by 0.131-in.) nails
Roof sheathing materials	7/16-in.-thick OSB sheathing installed perpendicular to framing member with steel edge clips and unblocked edges parallel to ridge
Roof sheathing fasteners	8d common (22-1/2- by 0.131-in.) at 6 in. o.c. on panel perimeter and 12 in. o.c. in panel field
Ceiling material	1/2-in.-thick gypsum panels installed perpendicular to truss bottom chord members, joints taped and mudded
Ceiling fasteners	1-5/8-in. Type W drywall screws: Configurations A to H—12 in. o.c. with first rows of fasteners 8 in. in from side walls (i.e., floating edges) Configuration I—8 in. o.c. with first rows of fasteners 8 in. in from side walls (i.e., floating edges)
Ceiling boundary chord	Configuration I only—2- by 4-in. nominal double chord member face nailed together with 10d (3- by 0.128-in.) nails at 24 in. o.c. and 8 16d (3-1/2- by 0.135-in.) nails in spliced sections; outer trusses toe nailed to double chord member with 8d box (2-1/2- by 0.113-in.) nails at 6 in. o.c.
Knee wall framing (including top plates)	2- by 4-in. nominal SPF No. 2 grade lumber
Knee wall sheathing	7/16-in.-thick OSB sheathing attached with 8d common (2-1/2- by 0.131-in.) nails at 3 in. o.c. on panel perimeter and 12 in. o.c. in panel field

[a] o.c., on center.

Table 4—Truss blocking/bracing construction details

Configuration	Blocking/bracing	Connection
High heel braced with OSB	7/16-in. OSB, 10-1/2 in. wide by 8 ft long	Face nailed to each truss heel with 3 8d common (2-1/2- by 0.131-in.) nails
High heel braced with OSB attached to top plate	7/16-in. OSB, 11-1/2 in. wide by 8 ft long	Face nailed to each truss heel with 3 8d common (2-1/2- by 0.131-in.) nails; face nailed to top member of double top plate with 8d common (2-1/2- by 0.131-in.) nails at 6 in. o.c.[a]
High heel with 25% blocking	1-1/8-in.-thick by 14-in.-high iLevel rim board contact fit between trusses	End nailed to trusses with 2 16d box (3-1/2- by 0.135-in.) nails; toe nailed to top plate with 5 8d box (2-3/8- by 0.113-in.) nails at 6 in. o.c.
High heel with 50% blocking	1-1/8-in.-thick by 14-in.-high iLevel rim board contact fit between trusses	End nailed to trusses with 2 16d box (3-1/2- by 0.135-in.) nails; toe nailed to top plate with 5 8d box (2-3/8- by 0.113-in.) nails at 6 in. o.c.
High heel with diagonal web bracing	2- by 4-in. nominal SPF No. 2 grade lumber	Face nailed to truss web with 2 8d common (2-1/2- by 0.131-in.) nails

[a] o.c., on center.



Figure 5. Specimen construction.

deformations in the supporting structure. Roof trusses were attached to the double top plate of the knee wall in accordance with fastening schedules specified in Tables 3 and 4. The double top plate was attached to the knee wall framing with bolts and was replaced after each test.

For all tests, truss bottom chords were connected to the top plates of the supporting knee walls using H2.5T hurricane clips. Clips on both ends of a truss were installed on the same face of that truss; the installation face was alternated between adjacent trusses (Fig. 5) to eliminate any directional bias in the resistance behavior of the clips. A continuous 1- by 6-in. nominal fascia board was installed on both sides of the specimens.

The roof sheathing was installed perpendicular to the truss top chord members with a staggered panel layout. Metal sheathing clips were installed on the unblocked edges of each panel at 24 in. o.c. between the framing members. A 2-in.-wide roof vent was provided at the ridge (at 1 in. on each side of the ridge) such that bearing of panel edges did not occur during testing.

The ceiling gypsum panels were installed perpendicular to the truss bottom chord members, and the first row of fasteners was located approximately 8 in. from each knee wall (that is, floating edges) in accordance with the Gypsum Association's Application and Finishing of Gypsum Panel Products (GA-216-2010) (Gypsum Association 2010). All interior gypsum panel joints were taped and mudded, and no finishing was done at the interface of the ceiling and the knee walls. The ceiling diaphragm of Specimen I was reinforced at the front and back trusses with a double top plate boundary member and 2-in. nominal nailing member (Fig. 6f). The fastener spacing of the ceiling diaphragm in Specimen I was also reduced from 12 to 8 in. o.c. to increase the diaphragm's capacity. (Specimens A through H were constructed without these additional boundary/chord members.)

Figure 6 provides details of the various blocking methods evaluated in this testing program. All blocking methods were in addition to the typical roof specimen described earlier in this section.

Test Setup and Protocol

Figure 7 shows the test setup including the specimen, loading brace, and instrumentation. Figure 8 provides a photograph of the test setup, reaction frame, and data acquisition system.

Load was applied to the specimen through permanent truss bracing (2- by 6-in. nominal Southern Pine, No. 2 grade lumber) attached at mid-height of the center vertical web member of each truss. The intent of using a pair of typical permanent truss braces was to minimize the restraints imposed on the specimen by the loading apparatus by applying the load through members that are typically present in truss roof assemblies. Load was applied at a mid-height permanent bracing location that yielded a 1:1 roof diaphragm to ceiling diaphragm loading ratio (i.e., the loading ratio caused by a seismic loading scenario). This loading condition results in the highest eccentricity at the heel such that observations on the effectiveness of the tested heel blocking/bracing options are appropriate for a broad range of applications.

Each center vertical truss web member was reinforced with a double 2- by 8-in. nominal vertical member to prevent weak-axis bending failure of the web. Each permanent



Figure 6. Truss-blocking details: (a) high heel with OSB; (b) high heel with OSB to plate; (c) high heel with 25% blocking; (d) high heel with 50% blocking; (e) high heel with diagonal web bracing; (f) high heel with OSB to plate and reinforced ceiling diaphragm (OSB not shown for clarity).



Figure 7. Test setup and instrumentation.

Figure 8. Test setup.

bracing member was attached to the vertical reinforcing member with a single 4-1/2- by 1/2-in. lag bolt to provide sufficient load transfer with minimal rotational restraint.

The loading brace members were loaded in tension using a computer-controlled hydraulic cylinder mounted to a steel reaction frame. The reaction frame was attached to the laboratory structural floor. Load was applied monotonically in tension at a constant displacement rate of 0.06 in/min to allow for sufficient visual observations throughout the test and was measured using an electronic load cell installed between the cylinder and the loading bracket. Displacement was continued until failure, defined as a 20% drop in load from the peak.

Displacements of the roof system relative to either the supporting knee walls or the laboratory structural floor were measured using electronic linear motion position transducers (LMPTs) at several locations:

- Ceiling diaphragm at mid-span of the roof/truss assembly
- Top and bottom of the heel on the first/front truss at both ends
- Top and bottom of the heel on the fourth truss at both ends (Specimens F and G only)
- The bottom of the heel on the fifth/rearmost truss

Displacement of the top of the supporting knee walls was also measured relative to the structural floor using LMPTs. Finally, displacement at the peak of the roof/truss assembly was measured relative to the steel reaction frame using a string potentiometer. Uplift at the rear of the specimen was not measured; initial tests showed that uplift was minimal because of the vertical restraint provided by the hurricane clip connections.

All load and displacement measurements were recorded using an electronic data acquisition system.

Results

Results of the testing are summarized in Table 5, including peak load reached by the roof assembly and unit peak capacity of the truss-to-wall connections. Table 5 also includes initial stiffness values for each specimen determined from the displacement at the top of the truss heel (TOH) measured relative to the top plate. The initial stiffness was calculated at a 760-lb load level, selected as an approximate representation of the linear range for performance comparison between systems tested in this study. Figures 9 and 10 compare peak capacity and stiffness, respectively, for various specimens tested. (Fig. 10 shows specimen load–displacement curves where displacement was measured at the peak of the specimen, not at the top of the truss heel.) See Appendix A for summary figures of load–displacement curves measured at the TOH location. Appendix B provides several load–displacement curves for each individual specimen measured at various locations on the specimen, including the midpoint of both the top and bottom chords of

Table 5—Test results

Configuration	Diagram	Peak load (lb)	Peak load per truss connection (lb)	Unit peak capacity (lb/ft)[a]	Initial stiffness (lb/in)[b]
A Low-heel truss		5,140	514	255	8,828
B High-heel truss without blocking		3,525	352	175	4,432
C High-heel truss without blocking with low (3/12) roof pitch		3,780	378	190	3,950
D High-heel truss braced with OSB sheathing		4,344	434	215	10,395
E High-heel truss braced with OSB sheathing extended over wall plate		4,755	475	240	32,224
F High-heel truss with blocking at intermittent locations		3,988	399	200	23,548
G High-heel truss with blocking at every other bay		4,520	452	225	26,581

Table 5—Test results—con.

Configuration	Diagram	Peak load (lb)	Peak load per truss connection (lb)	Unit peak capacity (lb/ft)[a]	Initial stiffness (lb/in)[b]
H High-heel truss with braced webs		3,633	363	180	5,469
I High-heel truss braced with OSB sheathing and a reinforced ceiling diaphragm		6,794	679	340	41,362

[a]Unit peak capacity is calculated by dividing the peak load per connection by the typical 2-ft truss spacing (i.e., the tributary area of a typical truss).
[b]Initial stiffness measured at roof peak of specimen.



Figure 9. Comparison of peak capacities per truss connection.

Truss 1, the left and right TOH of Truss 1, and where applicable, the left and right TOH of Truss 4.

A discussion of each individual test is provided in this section, including discussion of peak capacities and initial stiffness relative to baselines (where applicable) and observed governing failure modes. Visual observations regarding rotation of the trusses are noted as part of the failure mode discussion. Additional analysis of rotation/displacement of the truss heels and comparisons of peak capacities to typical design loads are summarized and presented at the end of this section.

Specimens A to C were intended to establish baseline capacities and performance characteristics for low- and high-heel roof systems without blocking or bracing the truss heel. The low-heel truss configuration (Specimen A) represents the highest allowable heel height by code that does not require blocking. Specimen A achieved a peak load of 5,140 lb (peak unit capacity of 255 lb/ft) and initial stiffness of



Figure 10. Load–displacement curves (measured at peak of the roof).

8,828 lb/in. Failure of Specimen A included initial fastener tear-through at the outer ends of the ceiling diaphragm near the knee walls followed by complete failure of the fasteners in the center gypsum panel (Figs. 11 and 12). Only minor rotation of the truss heels was observed during testing as well as minor rotation and buckling of the hurricane clips (Fig. 13). Minor displacement of the truss top chord relative to the bottom chord at the heel joint was also observed, along with slight deformation of the metal connector plate at the heel joint (Fig. 14).

Specimen B represents the second trigger height specified by code (see Table 1). Trusses with heel heights between the 9-1/4-in. height of Specimen A and the 15-1/4-in. height of Specimen B are currently required to have solid blocking between each truss when framed over top of a braced wall panel. Specimen B omitted this blocking in order to compare the effect of higher heel height on roof system capacity with the Specimen A results and to establish a baseline performance benchmark against which the various blocking/bracing details evaluated in this study could be measured. Specimen B reached a peak load of 3,525 lb (peak unit capacity of 175 lb/ft) and initial stiffness of 4,432 lb/in. This is a 33% drop in capacity and a 50% drop in initial stiffness from the results of Specimen A, illustrating the effect of increased heel height on the global response for a system without blocking. The primary failure mode was again tear-through of the gypsum panel fasteners at both ends of the specimen near the knee walls. All the gypsum panels, however, remained intact and attached to the framing members throughout the test. Significant rotation of the trusses at the heel connections and minor buckling of the hurricane clips were also observed.

Figure 11. Gypsum fastener tear-through (Specimen A).

Specimen C was designed to evaluate the effect of a lower roof slope on the performance of the truss-to-wall connections. Specimen C was similar in construction to Specimen B and reached a peak capacity of 3,780 lb (peak unit capacity of 190 lb/ft) and initial stiffness of 3,950 lb/in. Specimen C exhibited similar damage and failure modes as Specimen B (that is, gypsum fastener tear-through, significant rotation observed at the truss heel). Additional damage was also observed in the form of buckled hurricane clips (Fig. 15) and member separation at the heel joint metal plate connectors. Comparisons of both peak capacity and initial stiffness values between Specimen B (7/12 roof slope) and Specimen C (3/12 roof slope) yield a <10% difference in strength and stiffness performance between the two specimens,

Figure 12. Complete failure of gypsum fasteners (Specimen A).

Figure 13. Rotation of hurricane clip at failure (Specimen A).

Figure 14. Truss member displacement and metal connector plate deformation at heel joint (Specimen A).

Figure 15. Buckling of hurricane clip (Specimen C).

Figure 16. Specimen C heel rotation at failure.

indicating that the degree of roof slope has minimal effect on heel connection performance. Figure 16 shows truss rotation observed in Specimen C at failure.

Specimens D and E were designed to investigate the contribution of OSB sheathing installed on the exterior face of the truss heel. The OSB sheathing in Specimen D was not attached to the top plates of the supporting knee walls and provided only rotational restraint to the truss heel. The OSB strip in Specimen E extended down and was nailed to the upper member of the wall double top plate and as such provided both a rotational restraint for the trusses and an additional load transfer mechanism from the trusses to the supporting wall. Specimen D reached a peak capacity of 4,340 lb (peak unit capacity of 220 lb/ft) and an initial stiffness of 10,395 lb/in. This peak capacity is a 26% increase over the capacity of Specimen B and only 16% less than the peak capacity of the low-heel configuration. The increase in performance resulting from the OSB bracing strip is also

evident when comparing initial stiffness values; the addition of the OSB bracing strip increased the initial stiffness by 18% over the low-heel baseline specimen and by a factor of 2.3 over the unblocked high-heel baseline specimen. The primary failure mode was again fastener failure in the gypsum panels. Some fastener tear-through occurred at the edges of the OSB bracing strip. The bracing of heel joints with OSB was also effective in controlling rotation of the truss. Figure 17 compares truss heel position prior to testing with that after gypsum failure. Specimen E exhibited the same failure modes as Specimen D while achieving a peak capacity of 4,760 lb (or a peak unit capacity of 240 lb/ft) and initial stiffness of 32,224 lb/in (Fig. 18). Although this peak capacity from Specimen E is 7% less than the peak capacity of the low-heel configuration (Specimen A), the additional nailing of the OSB bracing strip to the supporting wall below in Specimen E increased the initial stiffness of the specimen threefold over both the OSB bracing strip without top plate nailing and the benchmark low-heel specimen (3.1 times and 3.6 times greater, respectively).

Specimens F and G were designed to evaluate the performance of code-compliant blocking details. Specimen F included a solid blocking panel installed in a single truss bay on each side (that is, 25% of the specimen wall length). Specimen G was constructed with alternating blocked and unblocked bays, resulting in blocking of two bays per side (that is, 50% of the specimen wall length). The 25% blocking specimen (Specimen F) reached a peak load of 3,988 lb (unit peak capacity of 200 lb/ft) and an initial stiffness of 23,548 lb/in and exhibited gypsum fastener failure as its primary failure mode, as was observed and described for previous specimens. The same moderate rotation was observed at both the front two trusses (where blocking was installed) and the fourth (where no blocking was installed). This visual observation was confirmed through displacement measurements at both locations, indicating that the single blocked bay provides rotational restraint to the entire specimen (that is, the effect of the blocking is not localized). Figure 19 compares the rotation of the first and last trusses.

The 50% blocked specimen (Specimen G) reached a peak load of 4,520 lb (unit peak capacity of 225 lb/ft) and an initial stiffness of 26,581 lb/in and exhibited similar failure modes as Specimen F, including the primary failure mode of gypsum fastener tear-through. Some rotation of the trusses relative to the blocking panels was also observed, as shown in Figure 20. When compared with the tested benchmark capacities of Specimens A and B, the 50% blocked specimen exhibited a 28% increase in capacity over the unblocked high-heel specimen and a 12% decrease in capacity compared to the unblocked low-heel specimen. Interestingly, the addition of the second blocking panel resulted in only a 12% increase in stiffness over the 25%-blocked specimen (Specimen F). The stiffness of both blocked specimens, however, exceeded the low-heel baseline configuration by more than a factor of 2.5.



Figure 17. Comparison of rotation at Truss 5 (Specimen D): (a) before test, (b) after test.

Figure 18. Truss rotation of Specimen E at failure (Truss 5).

Comparison of peak capacities and initial stiffness values of Specimens E to G shows that the use of an OSB bracing strip attached to the face of the truss heel and tied to the supporting wall below yields slightly greater performance than both the 25% and 50% blocking options.



Figure 19. Comparison of truss heel rotation (Specimen F): (a) Truss 1, (b) Truss 5.

Figure 20. Rotation of truss heel at blocking location (Specimen G).

The purpose of Specimen H was to evaluate the effect of diagonal truss web bracing on the performance of the high-heel connection, particularly with regard to rotation. The diagonal bracing specimen reached a peak load of 3,633 lb (unit peak capacity of 180 lb/ft). No differences were observed in response and failure mode compared with Configurations B and C (high heel without blocking or bracing), indicating that web bracing does not provide a mechanism for resisting rotation of high-heel trusses.

Specimen I was designed to further evaluate the OSB blocking method by testing it in conjunction with a reinforced ceiling diaphragm. The intent was to validate the effectiveness of the OSB bracing option in applications with a stronger gypsum diaphragm, while also attempting to force failure in the truss heel joint and truss-to-wall connections. Testing of Specimen I yielded a peak load of 6,794 lb (unit peak capacity of 340 lb/ft). Tear-out failure of the OSB-to-heel fasteners, cross grain bending failure of a bottom chord, and failure of the metal plates (causing displacement of the heel relative to the bottom chord) were all observed. Tear-through failure of the gypsum fasteners was also observed at all four corners of the diaphragm. Observation of the overall system response indicates that Configuration I was a balanced system such that further improvements to individual parts of the system likely would not lead to significant improvements of the system's performance without implementing improvements for all parts. The reinforced ceiling diaphragm only served to strengthen the entire roof system and did not have an adverse effect on the performance of heel connections.

Table 6 compares measured lateral capacities of the roof-to-wall connections to several typical design wind load scenarios. The wind loads were determined using table 2.5B of the 2001 edition of *Wood Frame Construction Manual for One- and Two-Family Dwellings* (AFPA 2007) for a 36-ft-wide by 40-ft-long house built in Exposure Category B, with a mean roof height of 30 ft, a 7/12 roof pitch, and the trusses spanning in the short direction. Table 6 also provides an alternative summarization of specimen rotational stiffness performance by normalizing the top-of-heel (TOH) displacements used to calculate initial stiffness by the specimen heel height.

Analysis presented in Table 6 shows that all tested specimens, including the benchmark specimens without eave blocking, exhibited significant strength capacity over design wind loads in both 90- and 110-mi/h wind zones, with factors of safety ranging from 3.1 for the unblocked high-heel specimen up to 6.0 for the OSB-braced specimen with a reinforced ceiling diaphragm. The results are more moderately conservative compared with the 130-mi/h design wind speed but still meet or exceed a factor of safety of 2.0 in all cases. The analysis in Table 6 shows again the increased stiffness performance of the OSB-sheathed and partially eave-blocked specimens over the benchmark low-heel specimens. It is worth noting that the disparity in stiffness performance between the various specimens without eave blocking decreases when the results are normalized for heel height, indicating that even an unblocked high-heel condition yields stiffness performance characteristics that are comparable to the currently code-accepted, low-heel condition.

Table 6—Ratios of lateral roof connection capacity relative to typical design wind loads[a]

Configuration	Factor of safety: 90 mi/h, Exposure B (39 lb/ft)	Factor of safety: 110 mi/h, Exposure B (57 lb/ft)	Factor of safety: 130 mi/h, Exposure B (89 lb/ft)[b]	TOH displacement as percentage of heel height[c]
A Low-heel truss	6.6	4.5	2.9	1.0
B High-heel truss without blocking	4.5	3.1	2.0	1.2
C High-heel truss without blocking with low (3/12) roof pitch	4.8	3.3	2.1	1.3
D High-heel truss braced with OSB sheathing	5.6	3.8	2.4	0.5
E High-heel truss braced with OSB sheathing extended over wall plate	6.1	4.2	2.7	0.2
F High-heel truss with blocking at intermittent locations	5.1	3.5	2.2	0.3
G High-heel truss with blocking at every other bay	5.8	4.0	2.5	0.3
H High-heel truss with braced webs	4.7	3.2	2.0	1.0
I High-heel truss braced with OSB sheathing and a reinforced ceiling diaphragm	8.7	6.0	3.8	0.1

[a]Typical design wind loads calculated for a 36-ft-wide by 40-ft-long house built in Exposure Category B, with a mean roof height of 30 ft, a 7/12 roof pitch, and the trusses spanning in the short direction.
[b]Design wind loading at 130 mi/h and Exposure B is equivalent to the 110 mi/h and Exposure C design criteria that is the upper limit used in the 2012 IRC structural provisions.
[c]TOH displacement measured at same load level as initial stiffness calculations (i.e., 760 lb).

Summary and Conclusions

This testing program was designed to benchmark the performance of traditional roof systems and incrementally improved roof-to-wall systems with the goal of developing connection solutions that are optimized for performance and constructability. The results of this study are expected to provide guidance toward determining appropriate trigger levels for continuous blocking between high-heel trusses and viable alternative blocking solutions to those currently required by code. The following is a summary of results of this testing program:

1. The benchmark code-allowed low-heel (9-1/4 in.) roof system with no blocking and hurricane truss clip connections reached a peak unit capacity of 255 lb/ft.
2. The benchmark high-heel (15-1/4 in.) roof system without blocking achieved a peak unit capacity of 175 lb/ft. This is a 33% decrease in capacity compared with the low-heel configuration. The initial stiffness of the high-heel specimen was approximately half that of the low-heel specimen, indicating that heel height significantly affects truss rotation where no blocking is installed.
3. Comparison of performance results for high-heel trusses with two different roof slopes (7/12 and 3/12) indicates no measurable effect of roof slope on truss rotation at the heel.
4. The high-heel roof specimen with OSB sheathing used for heel bracing (Specimen D) exhibited a 26% increase in capacity over the benchmark high-heel test (220 lb/ft compared with 175 lb/ft) and only an 18% decrease in capacity compared with the benchmark low-heel test (220 lb/ft compared with 245 lb/ft). The addition of the OSB sheathing also increased the specimen's initial stiffness by 18% over the low-heel specimen (10,395 lb/in compared with 8,828 lb/in). This increase in stiffness, along with the reserve strength capacity over typical design wind loads, indicates that using OSB sheathing as bracing in the high-heel condition is comparable to the currently code-allowed, unblocked, low-heel truss condition.
5. Nailing the OSB sheathing to the supporting top plate (Specimen E) increased the capacity to 240 lb/ft. This is only 7% less than the low-heel configuration (Specimen B) and 7% higher than the intermittent blocking configuration (Specimen G). The attachment to the wall top plate also significantly increased the rotational stiffness of the heel joint exceeding that for the low-heel specimen (32,224 lb/in compared with 8,828 lb/in).
6. High-heel systems with intermittent blocking amounts of 25% (Specimen F) and 50% (Specimen G) achieved peak unit capacities of 200 lb/ft and 225 lb/ft, respectively. Comparison of TOH displacements at both blocked and unblocked locations within Specimen F indicates

that a single blocked bay provides rotational restraint to the entire specimen length (that is, the rotational restraint is not localized). Comparison of initial stiffness between Specimens F and G indicates that the addition of a second blocking panel provides only 12% greater rotational restraint to the specimen.

7. Comparison of Specimen E (OSB sheathing also nailed to the top plate) performance to that of the 50% intermittently blocked specimen (Specimen G) shows that Specimen E exceeded Specimen G in both peak load capacity (240 lb/ft compared with 225 lb/ft) and initial stiffness (32,224 lb/in compared with 26,581 lb/in).
8. The addition of diagonal truss web bracing to a high-heel truss without any additional blocking provides no measurable improvement over the benchmark high-heel configuration in either peak unit capacity or rotational restraint.

Several conclusions can be drawn based on the results of this testing program. Comparing the performances of Specimens A and D shows that the OSB-sheathed high-heel truss detail yields comparable (and in terms of stiffness, superior) performance to that of the unblocked, low-heel truss configuration that is currently allowed by code (see Table 1 and Fig. 1). This performance, along with the reserve strength capacity over typical design wind loads, indicates that using OSB sheathing as bracing (without any additional blocking in the heel) can be considered an adequate bracing option in high-heel conditions where the intent is to provide structural performance comparable to that of an unblocked, low-heel truss condition.

Further comparison between Specimens E and F shows that extending the OSB sheathing down and including additional nailing to the top plate of the wall below provides superior strength and stiffness performance to that of the solid, intermittent blocking that is currently required in high-wind regions and should be considered a viable truss heel bracing solution to said intermittent blocking.

References

AFPA. 2007. Woodframe construction manual for one and two family dwellings (including 2007 errata/addendum). Leesburg, VA: American Wood Council.

ASCE. 2005. Minimum design loads for buildings and other structures. Reston, VA: American Society of Civil Engineers.

Gypsum Association. 2010. Application and finishing of gypsum panel products (GA-216-2010). Hyattsville, MD: Gypsum Association.

ICC. 2009. International residential code for one and two family dwellings. Country Club Hills, IL: International Code Council.

Kopp, G. 2010. Wind loading on low-rise buildings. In: Presentation at an expert meeting on IRC wind wall bracing: combined uplift and shear load path. Leesburg, VA.

Riley, M.; Sadek, F. 2003. Experimental testing of roof-to-wall connections in wood frame houses (NISTIR 6938). Gaithersburg, MD: National Institute of Standards and Technology, Building and Fire Laboratory.

Scoville, E. 2005. Investigation of the response of low-rise wood-frame roof-wall systems under combined uplift and in-plane shear loads. Clemson, SC: Clemson University.

Simpson Strong-Tie. 2010. Personal communication, Randy Shackelford, Simpson Strong-Tie. Truss anchorage for multiple loading, presentation of testing conducted at Clemson University.

Appendix A—Summary Load–Displacement Curves



Figure A1. Load–TOH displacement (measured at left end of Truss 1)



Figure A2. Load–TOH displacement (measured at right end of Truss 1)

Appendix B—Specimen Load–Displacement Curves



Figure B1. Specimen A



Figure B2. Specimen B



Figure B3. Specimen C



Figure B4. Specimen D



Figure B5. Specimen E



Figure B6. Specimen F



Figure B7. Specimen G



Figure B8. Specimen H



Figure B9. Specimen I