White, Robert H. Analytical methods for determining fire resistance of timber members. 1988. The SFPE handbook of fire protection engineering. Quincy, MA: National Fire Protection Association: 3-130-3-142. Chapter 8.

ANALYTICAL METHODS FOR DETERMINING FIRE RESISTANCE OF TIMBER MEMBERS

Robert H. White

INTRODUCTION

The fire resistance ratings of wood members and assemblies, as of other materials, have traditionally been obtained by testing the assembly in a furnace in accordance with American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard E-119.[1] These ratings are also published in listings, such as the Underwriters Laboratories *Fire Resistance Directory*[2] or the Gypsum Association's *Fire Resistance Design Manual.*[3] and in the model building codes.[4,5] The ratings listed are limited to the actual assembly tested and normally do not permit modifications such as adding insulation. changing member size, changing or adding interior finish. or increasing the spacing between members. Code interpretation of the test results sometimes allows the substitution of larger members. thicker or deeper assemblies, reduction in member spacing, and thicker protection layers, without reducing the listed rating. In recent years, two fire-endurance design procedures for wood that allow greater flexibility have gained U.S. and Canadian building code acceptance. In addition. other procedures and models have been proposed or are bring developed.

When attention is given to all details, the fire endurance of a wood member or assembly depends on three items:

1. Performance of its protective membrane (if any).
2. Extent of charring of the structural wood element. and
3. Load-carrying capacity of the remaining uncharred portions of the structural wood elements.

The following sections review the methods available for determining the contribution of each item and discuss the major properties of wood that affect the thermal and structural response of wood assemblies or components.

CONTRIBUTION OF THE PROTECTIVE MEMBRANE

Gypsum wallboard and plywood paneling are two common types of protective membrane. which is the first line of resistance to a fire in wood construction. In a protected assembly, the fire resistance rating is largely determined by the type and thickness of the protective membrane. The effects of the protective membrane on the thermal performance of an assembly are included in Harmathy's ten rules of fire endurance rating.[6] These ten rules (Figure 3-8.1) provide guidelines to evaluate the relative effects of changes in materials on the fire resistance rating of an assembly. The rules apply primarily to the thermal performance of the assembly.

The contribution of the protective membrane to the fire resistance rating of a light-frame assembly is clearly illustrated in the component additive calculation procedure discussed in the following subsection. Brief discussions of fire-resistive coatings in wood construction and numerical heat transfer models are also addressed.

Component Additive Calculation Procedure

The component additive calculation procedure is a method to determine conservatively the fire resistance ratings of load-bearing light-frame wood floor assemblies and of load-bearing and nonload-bearing wall assemblies. With this procedure, as with Harmathy's rules 1 and 2, one assumes that times can be assigned to the types and thicknesses of protective membranes and that an assembly with two or more protective membranes has a fire resistance rating at least that of the sum of the times assigned for the individual layers and the time assigned to the framing. The procedure was developed by the National Research Council of Canada and has been in the *National Building Code of Canada* (*NBCC*)[7] for a number of years. It has recently been introduced into the U.S. building codes as a result of efforts by the National Forest Products Association.

The times assigned to the protective membrane (Table 3-8.1), the framing (Table 3-8.2), and other factors are based on empirical correlation with actual ASTM E-119 tests of assemblies. Tables 3-8.1 through 3-8.4 are based on the 1985 *Standard Building Code* (*SBC*).[5] There are differences between the 1985 SBC' and the 1985 *NBCC.*[7] The *SBC*[5] accepts calculated ratings to 60 min, whereas the *NBCC*[7] accepts them to 90 min. In addition to the times listed in Table 3-8.1, *NBCC* assigns a time of 50 min to a double

Dr. Robert H. White is a Research Forest Products Technologist at the USDA, Forest Service, Forest Products Laboratory. His research has primarily been in the areas of wood charring and fire endurance of wood assemblies.



Fig. 3-8.1. Harmathy's ten rules of fire endurance.[6]

0.5-in. gypsum wallboard, if a wire mesh with 0.06-in.-diameter wire and 1 sq in. openings is fastened between the two sheets of wallboard. The *NBCC* also includes times for lath and plaster protection. The times given in Table 3-8.1 are based on the membrane's ability to remain in place during fire tests. The times assigned to the protective membranes are not the "finish ratings" of the material cited in test reports or listings. (A finish rating is defined as the time for an average temperature rise of 250°F. or a maximum rise of 325°F. on the unexposed side of the material.)

In addition to the wood stud and wood joist framing. the 1985 *NBCC* assigns a time of 5 min to wood roof and floor truss assemblies with spacings of 24 in. Wood trusses are assumed to consist of wood chord and web framing members not less than 2 × 4 in., nominal. and connector plates fabricated from at least 1-mm-thick galvanized steel with projecting teeth at least 8 mm long.[7]

The 1985 *SBC*[5] includes a provision for adding 15 min to the fire resistance rating of wood stud walls. if the spaces between the studs are filled with glass fiber. rock wool. or slag mineral wool batts weighing not less than $^1/_4$ 1b/ft^2 of wail surface. The 1985 *NBCC*[7] has deleted the glass fiber insulation from the provision. for lack of test data. There are minimal requirements for the membrane on the side not

TABLE 3-8.1 ***Time Assigned to Protective Membranes Based on SBC[5*,**]***

Description of finish	Time
	(min)
$^1/_2$-in. fiberboard	5
$^3/_8$-in. Douglas fir plywood. phenolic bonded	5
$^1/_2$-in. Douglas fir plywood, phenolic bonded	10
$^5/_8$-in. Douglas fir plywood. phenolic bonded	15
$^3/_8$-in. gypsum wallboard	10
$^1/_2$-in. gypsum wallboard	15
$^5/_8$-in. gypsum wallboard	30
$^1/_2$-in. type X gypsum wallboard	25
$^5/_8$-in. type X gypsum wallboard	40
Double $^3/_8$-in. gypsum wallboard	25
$^1/_2$-in. + $^3/_8$-in. gypsum wallboard	35
Double $^1/_2$-in. gypsum wallboard	40

* Gypsum board should be installed with the long dimension parallel to framing members in walls and perpendicular to framing members in floor/ceiling and root/ceiling assemblies, and all joints should be finished.

** These values apply only when framing members are spaced a maximum of 16 in. on center.

TABLE 3-8.2 ***Time Assigned for Contribution of Wood Frame Based on SBC[5*]***

Description of frame	Time assigned to frame
	(rnin)
Wood studs, 16-in. on Center	20
Wood floor and root joists, 16-in. on center	10

* All studs should be nominal 2 in. × 4 in.; all joists should have a nominal thickness of at least 2 in. and spacing between studs or joists should not exceed 16 in. on center.

TABLE 3-8.3 ***Alternative Membranes on Face of Wood Stud Walls Not Exposed to Fire (Exterior) Based on SBC[5*]***

Sheathing	Paper	Exterior finish
5/8-in. tongue and groove lumber	Sheathing paper	Lumber siding
5/16-in. exterior grade plywood		Wood shingles and shakes
1/2-in. gypsum wallboard		1/4-in. plywood exterior grade
5/8-in. gypsum wallboard		1/4-in. hardboard
1/2-in. fiberboard		Metal siding
		Stucco on metal lath
		Masonry veneer
None		3/8-in. exterior grade plywood

* Membrane may be any combination of sheathing, paper, and exterior finish listed in table or any other membranelisted at 15 minor greater in Table 3-8.1.

exposed to fire (Tables 3-8.3 and 3-8.4), in order to assure that the assembly does not fail because of fire penetration or heat transfer through the assembly. Instead of being one of the combinations listed in Tables 3-8.3 and 3-8.4, the membrane on the side not exposed to fire (the outside) may be any membrane listed in Table 3-8.1 with a rated time of 15 min or greater. The 1985 *NBCC*[7] lists only the first three sheathings listed in Table 3-8.3 and omits the requirement for sheathing paper. Both *SBC*[5] and *NBCC*[7] include requirements for fastening the protective membranes to the frame.

This procedure gives flexibility. for example, in calculations for plywood and gypsum combined as an interior finish.

EXAMPLE:

The calculated fire resistance rating of a wood stud wall (2-in. × 4-in. studs. 16 in. on center) with 5/8-in. Douglas fir phenolic-bonded plywood over 1/2-in. type X gypsum wallboard on the side exposed to fire is:

From Table 3-8.1:	
5/8-in. Douglas nr plywood, phenolic bonded	15 min
1/2-in. type X gypsum wallboard	25 min
From Table 3-8.2:	
Wood stud framing	20 min
Calculated rating (total)	60 min

The other side of the wall. if it has no fire resistance requirement, can be 3/8-in. exterior grade plywood (Table 3-8.3) or any panel with an assigned time of 15 min (Table 3-8.1).

Model for Fire-Resistive Coatings on Wood

The steel industry improves the fire endurance of steel members by covering them with fire-resistive materials or coatings. Currently. the marketing of fire-resistive coatings for use on wood is very limited or nonexistent. The fire retardant coatings marketed for wood are only designed and recognized for use to reduce the spread of flames over a surface (flamespread).

Depending upon its thickness and durability under fire exposure, a coating may merely delay ignition of the wood for a few minutes or may provide an effective insulative layer that reduces the rate of charring. Both for fire-retardant coatings and fire-resistive coatings, the performance as a fire resistant membrane on wood has been evaluated? and empirical equations have been developed, describing benefits of their use.[9,10] These equations can readily be combined with fire resistance models for a fire-exposed wood member or assembly. However. they need additional verification before they can be used in the field. Tests on coated timber members have also been reported in Finland and U.S.S.R.[11]

Numerical Heat Transfer Models

The protective membrane contributes to fire resistance by providing thermal protection. Numerical heat transfer methodologies are available to evaluate this thermal protection. Fung[12] developed a one-dimensional finite difference model and computer program for thermal analysis of construction walls. Difficulties in modeling the charring of wood and the physical deterioration of the panel products complicate these numerical methodologies.

Numerical heat transfer models are used not only to model the performance of the protective membranes but also lo model the charring of the structural wood members. the second major factor in the fire endurance of a wood member or assembly.

CHARRING OF WOOD

Wood undergoes thermal degradation (pyrolysis) when exposed to fire. (See Figure 3-8.2). The pyrolysis and combustion of wood have been studied extensively. Literature reviews include articles by Browne,[13] Schaffer.[14,16] Hall *et al*,[15] and Hadvig.[17] By converting the wood to char and gas. pyrolysis results in a reduction in the wood's density. The

TABLE 3-8.4 ***Flooring or Roofing over Wood Framing Based on SBC[5*]***

Assembly	Subfloor or roof deck	Finish flooring or roofing
Floor	1/2-in. plywood or 11/16-in. tongue and groove softwood	Hardwood or softwood flooring on building paper Resilient flooring, parquet floor. felted-synthetic-fiber floor coverings, carpeting; or ceramic tile on 3/8-in.-thick panel-type underlay Ceramic tile on 1 1/4-in. mortar bed.
Roof	1/2-in. plywood or 11/16-in. tongue and groove softwood	Finish roofing material with or without insulation

* Structural members are wood. Table applies only to wood joist construction. In SBC, it is not applicable to wood truss construction. Upper membrane consists of a subfloor and finish floor, roof deck and roofing, or any other membrane listed at 15 min or greater in Table 3-8.1.



Fig. 34.2. Degradation zones in a wood section.

pyrolysis gas undergoes flaming combustion as it leaves the charred wood surface. Glowing combustion and mechanical disintegration of the char eventually erode or ablate the outer char layer.

The charring rate generally refers to the linear rate at which wood is converted to char. Under standard fire exposure. the charring rates tend to be fairly constant after a higher initial charring rate.

Establishing the charring rate is critical to evaluating fire resistance because char has virtually no load-bearing capacity, There is a fairly distinct demarcation between char and uncharred wood. The base of the char layers is wood reaching a temperature of approximately 290°C (550°F). To determine the charring rate. we use both empirical models based on experimental data and theoretical models based on chemical and physical principles.

EMPIRICAL MODELS

Standard ASTM E-119 Fire Exposure

Expressions for charring rate in the standard ASTM E-119 test are the result of many experimental studies. The empirical model that is most generally used assumes a constant transverse-to-grain char rate of 0.6 mm/min ($1^1/_2$ in./hr) for all woods, when subjected to the standard fire exposure. There are differences among species associated with their density, chemical composition. and permeability. In addition, the moisture content of the wood affects the charring rate.

The British *Code of Practice for the Structural Use of Timber*[18,19] divides species into three groups. The assigned charring rates are:

	Charring Rate (mm/min)
1. Western red cedar	0.83
2. Oak, utile, keruing (gurjun), teak, greenheart, jarrah	0.50
3. All other listed structural species	0.66

Schaffer[20] reported transverse-to-grain charring rates as a function of density and moisture content for white oak. Douglas fir. and southern pine. The regression equations for B (min per in., the reciprocal of charring rate) were

$$B = 2[(28.726 + 0.578M)\mathrm{r} + 4.187] \quad \text{for Douglas fir} \tag{1}$$

$$B = 2[(5.832 + 0.120M)\mathrm{r} + 12.862] \quad \text{for southern pine} \tag{2}$$

$$B = 2[(20.036 + 0.4031M)\mathrm{r} + 7.519] \quad \text{for white oak} \tag{3}$$

where

M = percent moisture content. and
r = dry specific gravity.

Assumption of a constant charring rate is reasonable when the member or panel product is thick enough to be treated as a semi-infinite slab. For smaller dimensions. the charring rate increases once the temperature has risen above the initial temperature at the center of the member or at the unexposed surface of the panel.

In practice, the linear charring rate model is adequate. However, statistical analysis of char depth over time indicates a lack of fit. Kanury and Holve[21] suggest the model

$$\frac{\ell}{t} \approx \left(\frac{2}{a}\right)\left(1 - \frac{b\ell}{a}\right) \tag{4}$$

where

ℓ = thickness of slab.
t = fire endurance time, and
a,b = constants.

They consider the $(2/a)$ factor an ideal charring rate and the ratio $(b\ell/a)$ as a correction factor accounting For thickness and thermal diffusion effects. From tests of Douglas fir floor joists. Lawson *et al*[22] obtained the equation

$$x = 0.051t^{0.8} \tag{5}$$

where

x = char depth (in.), and
t = time (min).

This equation for charring rate corresponds roughly to the generally accepted 0.6 mm/min linear charring rate, which is the equation

$$x = 0.024t \tag{6}$$

The charring rate parallel to the grain of wood is approximately twice that transverse to the grain.[15] As a beam or column chars, the comers become rounded. The rounding is generally considered to have a radius equivalent to the char depth on the sides.

The effect of fire-retardant treatment and adhesives on fire resistance depends on the type of adhesive or treatment. Lumber bonded with phenolic or resorcinol adhesives has a charring rate consistent with that of solid wood. Fire-retardant treatments are designed to reduce flamespread. The fire retardant's effect on the charring rate may be to only slightly increase the time until ignition of the wood. Some fire retardants reduce flammability by lowering the temperature at which charring occurs. This may increase the charring rate. However, a few fire retardants have been found to improve charring resistance.[23]

Nonstandard Fire Exposures

The above equations were stated to apply to the standard ASTM E-119 fire exposure.[1] Hadvig[17] has developed equations for nonstandard fire exposure. The charring rate in a real fire depends upon the severity of the fire to which the wood is exposed. The fire severity depends upon such factors as the available combustible material (fire load) and the available air supply (design opening factor).

The design fire load is

$$q = k \cdot \frac{Q}{A_t} \tag{7}$$

where

q = design fire load (MJ/m²),
k = transfer coefficient (dimensionless),
Q = sum of the products of density and lower calorific value of materials to be found in the compartment (MJ), and
A_t = total internal area of the compartment (m²).

The transfer coefficients are given in Table 3-8.5 for different types of compartments and geometrical opening factors. In the case of fire compartments whose bounding structures do not come under any of the types A-H, k is usually determined by a linear interpolation in the table between appropriately chosen types of compartments.

The geometrical opening factor is

$$F' = \frac{A\sqrt{h}}{A_t} \tag{8}$$

where

F' = geometrical opening factor (m^1/2),
A = total area of windows, doors, and other openings in walls (i.e., vertical openings only) (m²). and
h = weighted mean value of the height of vertical openings, weighted against the area of the individual openings(m).

The design opening factor is

$$F = F' \cdot k \cdot f \tag{9}$$

where

F = design opening factor (m^1/2),
F' = geometrical opening factor (m^1/2),
k = transfer coefficient of bounding structure (dimensionless). and
f = coefficient (dimensionless) to account for horizontal openings.

TABLE 3-8.5 ***The Transfer Coefficient. k[17,24]***

Type of fire compartment*	Geometrical opening factor, F'					
	0.02	0.04	0.06	0.08	0.10	0.12
A	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
0	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
C	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5
D	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.50	1.55	1.65
E	1.65	1.50	1.35	1.50	1.75	2.00
F**	1.0-0.5	1.0-0.5	0.8-0.5	0.7-0.5	0.7-0.5	0.7-0.5
G	1.50	1.45	1.35	1.25	1.15	1.05
H	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	25

* A: (Standard fire compartment). The average consisting of brick, concrete, and gas concrete.

B: Concrete. including concrete on the ground.

C: Gas concrete (density 500 kg/m³).

D 50 pct concrete, 50 pct gas concrete (density 500 kg/m³).

E: 50 pct gas concrete (density 500 kg/m³). 33 pct concrete, and 17 pct laminate consisting of (taken from the inside) 13-mm plasterboard (density 500 kg/m³). 10-cm mineral wood (density 50 kg/m³), and brick (density 1,800 kg/m³).

F: 80 pct steel plate, 20 pct concrete. The fire compartment is comparable to a storehouse or other building of a similar kind with an uninsulated roof, walls of steel plate, and floor of concrete.

G: 20 pct concrete and 80 pct laminate consisting of a double plasterboard (2 x 13 mm) (density 790 kg/m³). 10-cm air space, and another double plasterboard (2 x 13 mm) (density 790 kg/m³).

H: Steel plate on either side of 100-mm mineral wood (density 50 kg/m³).

**The higher values apply to q < 60 MJ/m; the lower values apply to q > 500 . MJ/m². Intervening values are found by interpolation.

The dimensionless coefficient. f, (Figures 3-8.3 and 3-8.4) increases the opening factors when there are horizontal openings. For only vertical openings, f is equal to 1.

Hadvig's[17] equations are

$$\theta = 0.0175 \frac{q}{F} \tag{10}$$

$$\beta_0 = 1.25 - \frac{0.035}{F + 0.021} \qquad \text{for } 0.02 \le F \le 0.30 \tag{11}$$

$$X = \beta_0 \cdot \tau \qquad \text{for } 0 \le \tau \le \frac{\theta}{3} \tag{12}$$



Fig. 3-8.3. Diagram for the determination of f for fire temperatures of 500°C and 1000°C.



Fig. 34.4. Simplified sketch of vertical cross-section of ventilated compartment with notation.[17]

$$X = \beta_0\left(-\frac{1}{12}\theta + \frac{3}{2}\tau - \frac{3}{4}\frac{\tau^2}{\theta}\right) \quad \text{for } \frac{\theta}{3} \le \tau \le \theta \tag{13}$$

where

q = time at which maximum charring is reached for the values used for F and q (min).
β_0 = initial value of rate of charring (mm/min),
X = charring depth (mm),
F = design opening factor ($m^{1/2}$) (defined in Equation 9),
q = design fire load (MJ/m^2) (defined in Equation 7), and
t = time (min).

These equations are valid for fire exposures less than 120 min and a room where the combustible material is wood. Plastic bums more violently and for a shorter time than wood. When the combustible materials in the room are plastics. Equations 10 and 11 are therefore modified for faster char rate (β_0 is 50 percent higher), shorter time is allowed for maximum charring (q is cut in half), and Equation 12 is applicable for t < q.[17]

Equations 10 through 13 are for glued timber with a density of 470 kg/m^3 including a moisture content of 10 percent and minimum width of 8 cm or greater or square members of minimum 5 × 5 cm. Equations 12 and 13 are valid only for $0 < X < b/4$, where b is the dimension of the narrow face (cm) of a rectangular member. For dimensions of nonsquare cross-sections between 3 and 8 cm, the ratio of the original dimensions must be equal to or greater than 1.7. the charring depth perpendicular to the wide face is X, and the charring depth perpendicular to the narrow face is determined by multiplying Equation 12 or 13 times the dimensionless quantity

$$1.35 - 0.044(b) \tag{14}$$

EXAMPLE:

The room is a standard fire compartment consisting of brick. concrete. and gas concrete. The floor area is 5 × 10 m, and the height is 3 m. The openings are one window 1.5 m high and 2 m wide. three windows 1.4 m high and 2 m wide. and one skylight 1.5 x 3 m. The skylight is 2 m above the midheight of the windows. The fire load is 6 m^3 of wood.

Assuming a fire temperature of 1000°C, a wood density of 500 kg/m^3, and lower calorific value of 17 MJ/kg, describe the charring of a 3.8- × 25-cm wood beam exposed on three sides after 8 min of the fire.

The geometrical opening factor (Equation 8) is

$$F' = \frac{A\sqrt{h}}{A_t} = \frac{[1(1.5 \times 2) + 3(1.5 \times 1)]\sqrt{1.5}}{[2(5 \times 10) + 2(3 \times 5) + 2(3 \times 10)]}$$

$$= \frac{7.5\sqrt{1.5}}{190} = 0.048 \text{ m}^{1/2}$$

The design opening factor (Equation 9) is

$$F = F' \cdot k \cdot f$$

The k is obtained from Table 3-8.5 (k = 1.0 for type A, F' = 0.048). The f is obtained from Figures 3-8.3 and 3-8.4.

$$\frac{A_h\sqrt{h_1}}{A\sqrt{h}} = \frac{(1.5 \times 3)\sqrt{2}}{7.5\sqrt{1.5}} = \frac{4.5\sqrt{2}}{7.5\sqrt{1.5}} = 0.69$$

$$\frac{A_h}{A} = \frac{4.5}{7.5} = 0.6$$

For $A_h\sqrt{h_1}/A\sqrt{h}$ of 0.69 and A_h/A of 0.6,

the f from Figure 3-8.3 is 2.4.

$$F = (0.048)(1.0)(2.4) = 0.115 \text{ m}^{1/2}$$

The design fire load (Equation 7) is

$$q = k \cdot \frac{Q}{A_t} = (1.0)\frac{(6 \times 500 \times 17)}{190} = \frac{51{,}000}{190} = 268 \text{ MJ/m}^2$$

Maximum charring will be reached at q min (Equation 10).

$$\theta = 0.0175\frac{268 \text{ MJ/m}^2}{0.115 \text{ m}^{1/2}} = 41 \text{ min}$$

The initial charring rate (Equation 11) will be

$$\beta_0 = 1.25 - \frac{0.035}{0.115 + 0.021} = 1 \text{ mm/min}$$

At 8 min, the char depth (Equation 12) will be

$$X = 1 \times 8 = 8 \text{ mm} \qquad \text{for } 0 \le 8 \le \frac{41}{3}$$

The minimum dimension b of the beam is 3.8 cm. The charring depth criterion $0 < x < b/4$ is $0 < 8 < 9.5$ mm, so Equations 12 and 13 are valid. The ratio of the original dimensions is 2513.8 or 6.6. Since 3.8 cm is less than 8 cm, the multiplying factor (Equation 14) is

$$1.35 - 0.044(3.8) = 1.18$$

At 8 min. the uncharred area of the beam will be approximately

38 mm - 2(8 mm) = 22 mm wide

and

250 mm - (1.18 x 8 mm) = 240 mm high

As the charring proceeds after (9.5 mm)/(1 mm/min) or 9.5 min. the $b/4$ criterion of the equations no longer holds. This is because the charring rate increases as the temperature at the center of the beam starts to increase.

For situations for which no empirical models exist. solutions may be found by the use of theoretical models. Most theoretical models have the flexibility to be used for any desired fire exposures.

Theoretical Models

Considerable efforts have gone into developing theoretical models for wood charring. Theoretical models allow calculation of the charring rate for geometries other than a semi-infinite slab and for nonstandard fire exposures. Unfortunately, no completely satisfactory model has yet been developed. Roberts[27] reviewed the problems associated with the theoretical analysis of the burning of wood, including structural effects and internal heat transfer, kinetics of the pyrolysis reactions. heat of reaction of the pyrolysis reactions, and variations of thermal properties during pyrolysis. He considered the major problems to be in the formulation of a mathematical model for the complex chemical and physical processes occurring and in the acquisition of reliable data for use in the model.

Many models for wood charring are based on the standard conservation of energy equation. The basic differential equation includes a term for each contribution to the internal energy balance. An early model for wood charring was given by Bamford *et al.*[26] The basic differential equation used by Bamford was

$$c\rho \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = K \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial X^2} - q \frac{\partial w}{\partial t} \qquad (15)$$

where

K = thermal conductivity.
T = temperature.
X = location.
w = weight of volatile products per cubic centimeter of wood,
t = time,
q = heat liberated at constant pressure per gram of volatile material evolved,
c = specific heat. and
r = density.

In Equation IS. the term on the left side of the equal sign represents the energy stored at a given location as indicated by the increase or decrease of the temperature with time at that location. The first term on the right side of the equal sign represents the thermal conduction of energy away from or into the given location. The second term on the left side represents the energy absorbed (endothermic reaction) or the energy given off (exothermic reaction) as the wood undergoes pyrolysis or thermal degradation. Numerical solutions using computers are normally used to solve these differential equations.

In Bamford's calculations using Equation 15, the rate of decomposition was given by an Arrhenius equation. The heat of decomposition. q, was the difference between the heat of combustion of the wood and that of the products of decomposition. Thermal constants for wood and char were assumed to be the same. and the total thickness of char and wood was assumed to remain constant.

Thomas[29] added a convection term to Bamford's equation to obtain

$$\rho c \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = K \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial X^2} + M c_g \frac{\partial T}{\partial X} - q \frac{\partial w}{\partial t} \qquad (16)$$

where

M = local mass flow of pyrolysis gases, and
c_g = specific heat of the gases.

The convection term represents the energy transferred in or out of a location as a result of the convection of the pyrolysis gases through a region with a temperature gradient.

The Factory Mutual model (SPYVAP) includes terms for internal convection of volatiles and thermal properties as functions of temperature and density. It was developed by Kung[28] and later revised by Tamanhi Atreya[30] has further revised this model to include moisture absorption. His energy conservation equation is

$$(\rho_a C_{pa} + \rho_c C_{pc} + \rho_m C_{pm}) \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial X}\left(K \frac{\partial T}{\partial X}\right) + i\left(1 - j\frac{\rho_c}{\rho_f}\right) M_g \frac{\partial H_g}{\partial X}$$
$$- \frac{\partial \rho_s}{\partial t}\left[-Q + \left(H_a - H_c \frac{\rho_f}{\rho_w}\right) \Big/ \left(1 - \frac{\rho_s}{\rho_w}\right) - H_g\right]$$
$$- \frac{\partial \rho_m}{\partial t}(-Q_m + H_m - H_g) \qquad (17)$$

where

C_p = specific heat (cal/gm °C).
K = thermal conductivity (cal/cm °C s),
T = temperature (K),
t = time (s),
X = distance (cm),
r = density (gm/cm^3),
M_g = outward mass flux of volatile gases (gm/cm^2 s),
H = thermal-sensible specific enthalpy (cal/gm),
Q = endothermic heat of decomposition of wood for a unit mass of volatiles generated (cal/gm at T_∞). and
i,j = parameters to simulate cracking. between 0 and 1;

subscripts:

∞ = ambient,
w = virgin wood,
c = char,
g = volatile gases,
a = unpyrolyzed active material,
m = moisture,
f = final value, and
s = solid wood.

Equation 17 is similar to the previous equations except the material has been broken up into its components (wood, water. and char). The parameter j eliminates the convection term if the pyrolysis gases are escaping through cracks or fissures in the wood. The last term represents the heat absorbed with vaporization of the water. The conservation of mass equation is

$$\frac{\partial M_g}{\partial X} = \frac{\partial \rho_s}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho_m}{\partial t} \tag{18}$$

and ensures that the mass of the gases equals the mass loss due to thermal degradation of the wood and Vaporization of the moisture.

As noted before. the decomposition kinetics equation for wood is the Arrhenius equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho_s}{\partial t} = -A \frac{(\rho_s - \rho_f)}{\left(1 - \frac{\rho_f}{\rho_w}\right)} \exp(-E/RT) \tag{19}$$

where

A = frequency factor (l/s),
E = activation energy (kcal/mole), and
R = gas constant.

Atreya[30] uses a moisture desorption kinetics equation for vaporization of the water in the wood, which is .

$$\frac{\partial \rho_m}{\partial t} = -A_m \rho_m \exp(-E_m/RT) \tag{20}$$

Parker[31] has taken char shrinkage parallel and normal to the surface into account in the model.

Kanury and Holve[21] have presented dimensional. phenomenological. approximate analytical, and exact numerical solutions for wood charring. Other models include those of Havens.[32] Knudson and Schniewind,[33] Kansa *et al*,[34] Hadvig and Paulsen,[35] and Tinney.[36]

Moisture desorption and surface recession were not considered until recently. There may be not only moisture desorption but also an increase in moisture content behind the char front caused by moisture movement away from the surface.[37] The CMA model[38] developed for NASA provides good results for oven-dry wood, because it includes surface recession but does not take into account moisture desorption. A major problem in the use of the more sophisticated models is the lack of adequate data to use as input.

Most theoretical models for wood charring not only define the charring rate but provide results for the temperature gradient. This temperature gradient is important in evaluating the load-carrying capacity of the wood remaining uncharred.

LOAD-CARRYING CAPACITY OF UNCHARRED WOOD

During the charring of wood caused by fire. the temperature gradient is fairly steep in the wood section remaining uncharred. Some loss of strength undoubtedly results from elevated temperatures. Schaffer *et al*[39] have combined parallel-to-grain strength and stiffness relationships with temperature and moisture content and the gradients of temperature and moisture content within a fire-exposed slab to obtain graphs of relative modulus of elasticity, compressive strength. and tensile strength as a function of distance below the char layer. (See Figure 3-8.5.) The theoretical models discussed previously can be used to determine the temperature gradient within the wood remaining uncharred.

There are basically two approaches to evaluating the load-carrying capacity: to evaluate the remaining section either as a single homogeneous material or as a composite of layers with different properties.



Fig. 3-85. Relative modulus of elasticity and compressive and tensile strength as a function of distance below char layer in softwood section under fire exposures. (Expressed in percent of that at 25°C and initial moisture content of 12 percent.) Duration of fire exposure should be equal to or greater than 20 min to apply results of this figure.

Empirical a Models

In the standard ASTM E-I19 test, structural failure is assumed to occur when the member is no longer capable of supporting its design load. the design load being a fraction of the ultimate load of the original beam. Failure occurs when the cross-sectional area of the member has been reduced by the charring of the wood. One common approach in accounting for the loss in strength in the section remaining uncharred is to assume that the strength and stiffness of the entire uncharred region are fractions a of their room temperature values.

For bending rupture of a beam. an equation of this type would be

$$\frac{M}{S(t)} = \alpha \sigma_o \tag{21}$$

where

M = applied moment (design load),
s = section modulus of charred member,
s_o = modulus of rupture at room temperature, and
t = time.

Assuming the residual cross-section is rectangular in shape before and during fire exposure, the section modulus of the charred member is[40]

$$S(t) = \tfrac{1}{6}[(B - 2C_1 t)(D - jC_2 t)^2] \tag{22}$$

where

B = original breadth of beam.



Fig. 3-8.6. Fire exposure of beams on three or four sides.

D = original depth of beam,
C_1 = charring rate in breadth direction,
C_2 = charring rate in depth direction, and
j = 1 for three-sided fire exposure or 2 for four-sided fire exposure (Figure 3-8.6).

Alternative to Equations 21 and 22 are the following, Equations 23 through 25:

$$\frac{k}{\alpha}\frac{B/D}{[d/D-(1-B/D)]}=\left(\frac{d}{D}\right)^2 \tag{23}$$

for exposure on all four sides,[41] and

$$\frac{k}{\alpha}\frac{B/D}{[B/D-2(1-d/D)]}=\left(\frac{d}{D}\right)^2 \tag{24}$$

for exposure on three sides, [42,43]

where

k = load, as fraction of room temperature ultimate load of original member, and
d = critical depth of the uncharred beam.

The fire resistance is equal to the time to reach the critical depth, or

$$t=(D-d)/jC \tag{25}$$

Proposed a values ranged from 0.5 in New Zealand to 0.83 in France.[40] The differences in a values are due to uncertainty, differences in design load, and desired level of safety.

The effect of the rounding of the charred member can be taken into account by increasing the value for char rate or including the effect in the empirical a parameter of Equation 21. In addition to bending rupture, the fire resistance of a beam may depend on lateral buckling of the beam. [41,44] Similar expressions can be developed for columns and tension members.[19,40,42,43,45]

The application of the above equations is generally limited to large wood members. Other reviews of fire resistance design methodologies for large wood members include those of Schaffer,[40] Pettersson.[46] and Barthelemy and Kruppa.[47] Kirpichenkov and Romanenkov[48] discussed the calculation procedures in the Soviet Union. The fire resistance of wood structures is also briefly discussed by Odeen.[49]

In developing a model for fire-exposed unprotected wood joist floor assemblies, Woeste and Schaffer[50,51] evaluated various time-dependent geometric terms that could be used to modify the strength reduction factor. a. The selected term was

$$\alpha=\frac{1}{1+\left(\frac{B+2D}{BD}\right)\gamma t_f} \tag{26}$$

where

t_f = failure time. and
g = empirical thermal degrade parameter.

The model has been experimentally evaluated,[52] extended to floor-truss assemblies,[51,53] and used as part of a first-order second-moment reliability analysis of floor assemblies.[50,51]

Composite Models

A second approach to evaluating the fire endurance of a wood member is to assume that the uncharred region consists of layers. In one model with layers, the compressive and tensile strengths and modulus of elasticity of each layer are assumed to be fractions of the room temperature values. Using one 1.5-in. heated layer with reduced properties, Schaffer *et al* [35] analyzed a beam using transformed section analysis. In a second model with layers, an equivalent zero-strength layer was calculated. The result of the 1.5-in. heated layer was used to calculate an equivalent zero-strength layer, d. For bending. the d was estimated to be 0.3 in. thick. This zero-strength layer, d, was added to the char depth. *ßt,* to obtain the total zero-strength layer. The rest of the member was then evaluated using room temperature property values. For fire-damaged members. Williamson[54] recommended 6 of 0.25 in. for designs controlled by compression (0.625 in. if design is controlled by tension) and the use of 100 percent of the original basic allowable stresses in calculation of load capacity.

Do and Springer[55-57] have proposed a fire resistance model for wood beams based on mass loss versus strength data. The work included a program to predict the temperatures and mass loss within the wood member. The input data came from small-scale tension. compression. and shear tests done on specimens that had previously been heated in a muffle oven.

The approach of an a factor has been used to develop code-approved equations for 1-hr fire-resistive exposed wood members. The 6 approach has also been used to develop a model for exposed glued-laminated members. These are discussed in the rest of this section.

ONE-HOUR FIRE-RESISTIVE EXPOSED WOOD MEMBERS

Lie[42] developed simple formulas for calculating the fire resistance of large wood beams and columns. based on theoretical studies involving experimental data and equations similar to Equations 21 through 25, These formulas are



Fig. 3-8.7. Load factor versus load on member as percent of allowable. (NBCC uses 12 instead of 11 as criterion for two curves.)

(CABO) Report No. *NRB-250*[58] and the supplement to the *National Building Code of Canada.*[7] The methodology is discussed in two American Institute of Timber Construction publications.[59,60] These formulas give the fire resistance time, *t,* in minutes, of a wood beam or column with minimum nominal dimension of 6 in. The net finish width for a nominal 6-in. glued-laminated member is $5^1/_8$ inches.

For beams, the equations are

$$t = 2.54ZB[4 - 2(B/D)] \quad \text{for fire exposure on four sides} \qquad (27)$$

$$t = 2.54ZB[4 - (B/D)] \quad \text{for fire exposure on three side} \qquad (28)$$

where

B = width (breadth) of a beam before exposure to fire (in.),
D = depth of a beam before exposure to fire (in.), and
Z = load factor. (See Figure 3-8.7.)

For columns. the equations are

$$t = 2.54ZD[3 - (D/B)] \quad \text{for fire exposure on four sides} \qquad (29)$$

$$t = 2.54ZD[3 - (D/2B)] \quad \text{for fire exposure on three sides} \qquad (30)$$

where

B = larger side of a column (in.), and
D = smaller side of a column (in.),

For columns. the load factor. Z, (see Figure 3-8.7) includes the effect of the effective length factor. K_e, (see Figure 3-8.8) and the unsupported length of the column. **l**, (in.). Currently. the codes do not permit the wide side of the column to be the unexposed face (Equation 29). The full dimensions of the column are used even if the column is recessed into a wall.

Connectors and fasteners relating to support of the member must be protected for equivalent fire-resistive construction. Where minimal 1-hr fire endurance is required, connectors and fasteners must be protected from fire exposure by $1^1/_2$ in. of wood. fire-rated gypsum board, or any coating approved for a 1 hr rating. CABO *Report No. NRB-250*[58] includes diagrams giving typical details of such protection.

There is often a high-strength tension laminate on the bottom of glued-laminated timber beams. As a result, it is required that a core lamination be removed. the tension zone moved inward, and the equivalent of an extra nominal 2-in.-thick outer tension lamination be added to ensure that there is still a high-strength laminate left after fire exposure.

EXAMPLE:

Determine the fire resistance rating for a $5^1/_8$-in. × 21-in. beam exposed to fire on three sides and loaded to 75 percent of its allowable load.

D = 21 in.
B = 5.125 in.

From Figure 3-8.7, Z for a beam loaded to 75 percent of allowable is 1.1. From Equation 28,

$$t = 2.54(1.1)(5.125)[4 - (5.125/21)]$$

$$t = 53.8 \text{ min.}$$

EFFECTIVE COLUMN LENGTH FOR VARIOUS END CONDITIONS



Fig. 3-8.8. Effective column length.

Fire-Exposed Glued-Laminated Beam

Bender *et al* [61] developed a reliability-based model to predict the strength of glued-laminated beams under normal temperature conditions. Using the approach of a ßt + d zero-strength layer. they extended the model to include fire endurance analysis. The char rate, b, and incremental zero-strength layer thickness. d, were assumed to remain constant. The glued-laminated model uses transformed section analysis to determine the stresses within the laminates. In the fire endurance model. the char depth is increased at each time increment until the calculated stresses within the laminates exceed the corresponding tensile strength values. The critical moment permitted by lateral torsional buckling was also calculated. and the lowest value of moment leading either to predicted rupture or to buckling governs time to failure.

PROPERTY DATA

Proper input data are critical to the use of any model. For the models discussed in this section, property data include strength and stiffness properties and thermal properties. Property data for wood can be found in the Wood Handbook: Wood as an Engineering Material[62] and Principles of Wood Science and Technology.[63] Equations and graphs of the strength and stiffness of wood as functions of temperature and moisture content are available, [64-66] but additional research is needed to better understand these relationships. Thermal properties can also be found in the various references for charring models and in an article by Kubler.[67] Thermal properties are needed for char and wood at the higher temperatures.

While it is often less complicated to assume constant property values, these properties are very often a function of other properties or factors. Most wood properties are functions of density. moisture content, grain orientation. and temperature.[62] Chemical composition may also be a factor. Since an understanding of these factors is important to the application of property data. the factors are defined in the rest of this section.

The oven-dry density of wood can range from 10 lb/ft³ to over 65 lb/ft³. but most species are in the 20 to 45 lb/ft³ range.[62] The density of wood relative to the density of water, i.e., specific gravity. is normally used to express the density. The specific gravity of wood is normally based on the oven-dry weight and the volume at some specified moisture content, but in some cases the oven-dry volume is used. As the empirical equations for charring rate show, the materials with higher density have slower char rate.

Wood is a hygroscopic material, which gains or loses moisture depending upon the temperature and relative humidity of the surrounding air. Moisture content of wood is defined as the weight of water in wood divided by the weight of oven-dry wood. Green wood can have a moisture content in excess of 100 percent. However, air-dry wood comes to equilibrium at a moisture content less than 30 percent. Under the conditions stated in ASTM E-I19 (23°C, 50 percent relative humidity). wood has an equilibrium moisture content of 9 percent. At 23°C, 65 percent relative humidity, the equilibrium moisture content is 12 percent.[62] Moisture generally reduces the strength of wood but also reduces the charring rate.

Both density and moisture content affect the thermal conductivity of wood. The average thermal conductivity perpendicular to the grain for moisture contents below 40 percent[62] is

$$k = S(1.39 + 0.028M) + 0.165$$

where

k = thermal conductivity (Btu · in./hr · ft² °F),
S = specific gravity based on volume at current moisture content and oven-dry weight. and
M = moisture content (percent).

The fiber (grain) orientation is important because wood is an orthotropic material. The longitudinal axis is parallel to



Fig. 3-8.9. The immediate effect of temperature on modulus of elasticity parallel to the grain at two moisture contents relative to value at 20°C. The plot is a composite of results from several studies. Variability in reported trends is illustrated by the width of bands.[62]



Fig. 3-8.10. The immediate effect of temperature on modulus of rupture in bending at three moisture contents relative to value at 20°C.[62]



Fig. 3-8.11. The immediate effect of temperature on compressive strength parallel to the grain at two moisture contents relative to the value at 20°C.[62]

the fiber or grain. The two transverse directions (perpendicular to the grain) are the radial and tangential axes. The radial axis is normal to the growth rings, and the tangential axis is tangent to the growth rings. For example. the longitudinal strength properties are usually about 10 times the transverse properties, and the longitudinal thermal conductivity is 2.0 to 2.8 times the transverse property.

In fire resistance analysis, temperature can have a significant influence on the properties of wood. The preponderance of property data is often limited to temperatures below 100°C. The effect of temperatures on the strength properties of wood is shown in Figures 3-8.9 through 3-8.11, The specific heat of dry wood is approximately related to temperature, t, in °F by[62]

$$\text{Specific heat} = 0.25 + 0.0006t$$

The major components of wood are cellulose, lignin. hemicellulose. extractives, and inorganic materials (ash). Softwoods have lignin contents of 23 to 33 percent, while hardwoods have only 16 to 25 percent. The types and amounts of extractives vary. Cellulose content is generally around 50 percent by weight. The component sugars of hemicellulose are different for the hardwood and softwood species. Chemical composition can affect the kinetics of pyrolysis (Equation 19) and the percentage weight of the residual char.

REFERENCES

1. ASTM E-119 83. *Standard Methods of Fire Tests of Building Construction and Materials*. American Society for Testing and Materials. Philadelphia (1985).
2. *Fire Resistance Directory*. Underwriters Laboratories, Northbrook (1983).
3. *Fire Resistance Design Manual*. Gypsum Association. Evanston (1984).
4. *Uniform Building Code*. International Conference of Building Officials. Whittier (1985).
5. *Standard Building Code*. Southern Building Code Congress International. Birmingham (1985).
6. T.Z. Harmathy. *Fire Tech.*, 1, 93 (1965).
7. *Supplement to the National Building Code of Canada*. National Research Council of Canada, Ottawa (1980).
8. R.H. White. in *ASTM STP 826*. American Society for Testing and Materials. Philadelphia (1983).
9. R.H. White. in *Proceedings. 3rd Annual Fire Engineering Conference*. Manhattan College. Riverdale (1985).
10. R.H. White. *J. of Test. and Eval.*, 14. 97 (1986).
11. *Fire Resistance of Wood Structures*. Technical Research Centre of Finland. Helsinki (1980).
12. F.C.W. Fung. *NBSIR 77-1260*. National Bureau of Standards. Washington (1977).
13. F.L. Browne. *Rep. No. 2136*. USDA Forest Service. Forest Product Lab.. Madison (1958).
14. E.L. Schaffer. *Res. Note FPL-145*. USDA Forest Service. Forest Product Lab.. Madison (1966).
15. G.S. Hall. R.G. Saunders. R.T. Allcorn. P.E. Jackman. M.W. Hickey. and R. Fitt. *Fire Performance of Timber—A Literature Survey*. Timber Research and Development Association. High Wycombe (1971).
16. E.L. Schaffer. *Wood and Fiber*. 9. 145 (1977).
17. S. Hadvig. *Charring of Wood in Building Fires*. Technical University of Denmark. Lyngby (1981).
18. BS 5268. *Code of Practice for the Structural Use of Timber: Method of Calculating Fire Resistance of Timber Members*. British Standards Institution. London (1978).
19. H.L. Malhotra. *Design of Fire-Resisting Structures*. Surrey University Press. London (1982).
20. E.L. Schaffer. *Res. Pap. FPL 69*. USDA Forest Service. Forest Product Lab.. Madison (1967).
21. A.M. Kanury and D.J. Holve. *NBS-GCR 76-50*. National Bureau of Standards. Washington (1975).
22. D.I. Lawson. C.T. Webster. and L.A. Ashton. *Struc. Engg.*, 30, 27 (1952).
23. E.L. Schaffer. *J. Fire and Flamm.*, 1, 96 (1974).
24. O. Pettersson. S.E. Magnusson. and J. Thor. *Publication 50*. Swedish Institute of Steel Construction. Sweden (1976).
25. A.F. Roberts. in *Thirteenth Symposium (Int.) on Combustion*. The Combustion Institute. Pittsburgh (1971).
26. C.H. Bamford. J. Crank. and D.H. Malan. *Proc. of Camb. Phil. Soc.*, 46. 166 (1946).
27. P.H. Thomas. *Fire Research Note No. 446*. Fire Research Station. Borehamwood (1960).
28. H. Kung. *Combustion and Flame*. 18. 185 (1972).
29. F. Tamanini. in *Appendix A of Factory Mutual Research Corporation Report No. 21011.7*. Factory Mutual Research Corp.. Norwood (1976).
30. A. Atreya. *Pyrolysis: Ignition and Fire Spread on Horizontal Surfaces of Wood*. Ph.D. Thesis. Harvard University. Cambridge (1983).
31. W.J. Parker. in *Fire Safety Science—Proceedings of the First International Symposium*. Hemisphere. New York (1986).
32. J.A. Havens. *Thermal Decomposition of Wood*. Dissertation. University of Oklahoma (1969).
33. R.M. Knudson and A.P. Schniewind. *Forest Prod. J.*, 25. 23 (1975).
34. E.J. Kansa. H.E. Perlee. and R.F. Chaiken. *Comb. and Flame*. 29. 311 (1977).
35. S. Hadvig and O.R. Paulsen. *J. Fire and Flamm.*, 1. 433 (1976).
36. E.R. Tinney. in *Tenth Symposium (Int.) on Combustion*. The Combustion Institute. Pittsburgh (1965).
37. R.H. White and E.L. Schaffer. *Wood and Fiber*. 13. 17 (1981).
38. R.H. White and E.L. Schaffer. *Fire Tech.*, 14. 279 (1978).
39. E.L. Schaffer. C.M. Marx. D.A. Bender. and F.E. Woeste. *Res. Pap. FPL 467*. USDA Forest Service. Forest Product Lab.. Madison (1986).

40. E.L. Schaffer, *Res. Pap. FPL 450*, USDA Forest Service, Forest Product Lab., Madison (1984).
41. C. Imaizumi, *Norsk Skogind*, 16, 140 (1962).
42. T.T. Lie, *Can. J. of Civil Engg.*, 4, 161 (1977).
43. K. Odeen, in *Fire and Structural Use of Timber in Buildings*, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London (1970).
44. B. Fredlund, *Report No. 79-5*, Lund Institute of Technology, Lund (1979).
45. C. Meyer-Ottens, in *Three Decades of Structural Fire Safety*, Building Research Establishment, Fire Research Station, Borehamwood, England (1983).
46. O. Pettersson, in *Three Decades of Structural Fire Safety*, Building Research Establishment, Borehamwood (1983).
47. B. Barthelemy and J. Kruppa, *Resistance au Leu des Structures*, Editions Eyrolles, Paris (1978).
48. G.M. Kirpichenkov and I.G. Romanenkov, *NBSIR 80-2188*, National Bureau of Standards, Washington (1980).
49. K. Odeen, *Fire Tech.*, 21, 34 (1985).
50. F.E. Woeste and E.L. Schaffer, *Fire and Matls.*, 3, 126 (1979).
51. F.E. Woeste and E.L. Schaffer, *Res. Pap. FPL 386*, USDA Forest Service, Forest Product Lab., Madison (1981).
52. R.H. White, E.L. Schaffer, and F.E. Woeste, *Wood and Fiber*, 16, 374 (1984).
53. E.L. Schaffer and F.E. Woeste, in *Proceedings, Metal Plate Wood Truss Conference*, Forest Products Research Society, Madison (1981).
54. T.G. Williamson, in *Evaluation, Maintenance, and Upgrading of Wood Structures*, American Society of Civil Engineers, New York (1982).
55. M.H. Do and G.S. Springer, *J. of Fire Sci.*, 1, 271 (1983).
56. M.H. Do and G.S. Springer, *J. of Fire Sci.*, 1, 285 (1983).
57. M.H. Do and G.S. Springer, *J. of Fire Sci.*, 1, 297 (1983).
58. National Evaluation Board, *Report No. NRB-250*, Council of American Building Officials (1984).
59. *Technical Note No. 7*, American Institute of Timber Construction, Englewood (1984).
60. American Institute of Timber Construction, *Timber Construction Manual*, John Wiley and Sons, New York (1985).
61. D.A. Bender, F.E. Woeste, E.L. Schaffer, and C.M. Marx, *Res. Pap. FPL 460*, USDA Forest Service, Forest Prod. Lab., Madison (1985).
62. *Wood Handbook: Wood as an Engineering Material (USDA Agr. Hdbk. No. 72)*, Superintendent of Documents, Washington (1987).
63. F.F.P. Kollmann and W.A. Cote, in *Principles of Wood Science and Technology*, Springer-Verlag, New York (1968).
64. C.C. Gerhards, *Wood and Fiber*, 14, 4 (1982).
65. F.C. Beall, in *Structural Use of Wood in Adverse Environments*, Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York (1982).
66. B.A.-L. Ostman, *Wood Sci. Tech.*, 19, 103 (1985).
67. H. Kubler, in *Encyclopedia of Materials Science and Engineering*, Pergamon, Oxford (1986).