Testing Painted Wood: Past Practices at the Forest Products Laboratory and Recommendations for Future Research

R Sam Williams

Proceeding: 2009 AC Series, Third International Coating Wood and Wood Composites: Durability and Sustainability—Today and Beyond
Charlotte, NC
September 22–23, 2009

Abstract

A brief history of paint research at the Forest Products Laboratory (FPL) in Madison, Wisconsin, sets the stage for a discussion of testing paint on wood and wood products. Tests include laboratory and outdoor tests, and I discuss them in terms of several degradation mechanisms (loss of gloss and fading, mildew growth, extractives bleed, and cracking, flaking, and peeling). The paper is not a review of standard tests, but rather a summary of my opinions and recommendations for focusing tests to obtain specific information on finish performance on wood.

Introduction

Materials testing, particularly testing paint performance on wood, is not "Rocket Science"—it's much more difficult! Think about the range of materials you use.

- Varnishes, tinted clears, semitransparent stains, solid color stains, paints, and two-part epoxies and urethanes

- Water-borne formulations, solvent-borne formulations

- Hardwoods
  From balsa (*Ochroma pyramidale*), specific gravity (SG) 0.1 to
  Ipe (*Tabebuia* Lapacho group), SG 1.0

- Softwoods
  From western redcedar (*Thuja plicata*), SG 0.3 to
  Loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*), SG 0.5

- Grain angle
  Flat grain (flat sawn)
  Vertical grain (quarter sawn)

- Wood Products
  Lumber (solid wood)
  Composites (e.g., plywood, particleboard, and glulam beams)
  Fiberboard

(Note: The list of materials does not include application—complex variables that can affect finish performance more than materials interactions.)

The number of combinations is not infinite, but it is a really big number. It is impossible to test all combinations. In fact, it is impossible to test a specific finish even on a small fraction of wood species and composite wood products that customers may paint. However, it is possible to select substrate–finish combinations to yield paint performance information that is applicable to most anticipated uses. The trick is to focus on a substrate or substrates that stress the coating in a way that represents stresses on coatings in service and to develop laboratory tests to target specific types of degradation and the mechanism(s) causing the degradation. This is not easy! If one is not careful, a test that is supposed to test paint may actually test wood. For example, a few years ago, Bill Feist and I reported the results of several finishes on yellow poplar (*Liriodendron tulipifera* L.) and sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua* L.) plywood.[1] As we expected, the semitransparent stain did not perform as well as the paint. No semitransparent stain was left on the plywood; however, the paint was in almost perfect condition after 12 years. The plywood—that was a different story. The plywood that had been stained was in almost perfect condition, but the plywood under the perfect paint was badly decayed. We designed the test to evaluate paint, but as the test proceeded, we found interactions between wood durability and paint service life. The finish affected the durability of the wood, and various finishes had different service lives. Coatings affect wood durability, and it's not always in a positive way; wood affects service life of paint, and it's not always in a positive way.

Even within a single wood species, different pieces of wood have considerable variability in growth rate, density, earlywood/latewood ratio, heartwood/sapwood, and grain angle. It is impossible to ensure matched pieces of wood, so one should not expect to evaluate paint performance by assuming that the substrate is the same for various finishes. One should not assume that wood properties are the same from one end of a two-meter-long board to the other end. In these types of matched wood substrate experiments, the substrate probably affects the finish performance, but researchers assume they remove this variability, which is a big mistake—really big! Many cases in the literature report this type of experiment. The report often gives a ranking to the various finishes. I believe that if researchers repeat the work using wood, even from the same species, the ranking would be different.

Following a brief review of wood properties that affect finish performance and an overview of finishing research at the U.S. Forest Service, Forest Products Laboratory (FPL), I will introduce the concept of the "bathtub" plot.[2] This concept will be used to guide my discussion of methods for testing paint on wood. In some cases, the methods are already being used at FPL and other laboratories; in other cases, the methods are my opinions and suggestions for future work. This paper includes the following:

- Discussion of wood properties
- Background on FPL
- Highlights from wood–paint research at FPL (1930s and 1940s)
- Effects of juvenile failure on the "20-year warranty"

- Analysis of various types of finish degradation (gloss, fade, mildew resistance, cracking, flaking, peeling, and film integrity)
- Recent studies at FPL
- Artificial weathering

Wood Properties

Wood Anatomy

Wood cell structure (anatomy) and chemistry of a wood species determine surface properties of wood, properties that affect adhesion and performance of finishes. As a tree grows, wood cells form under the bark of the stem or branch. Two types of cells form in softwoods (axial tracheids and ray cells), and three types of cells form in hardwoods (fibers, ray cells, and vessels) (Figures 1 and 2). Cell structure determines whether a wood species is a hardwood or softwood, not the density (specific gravity) or its hardness. In the early part of the growing season in temperate climates, softwood axial tracheids have large open centers (lumina) and thin cell walls; this is earlywood (EW, formerly referred to as springwood). As the growing season progresses, cell walls become thicker and darker, forming latewood (LW, formerly called summerwood). In hardwoods, vessels form along with the axial fibers. Vessels formed throughout the growing season (i.e., in EW and LW) having about the same diameter give diffuse-porous hardwoods. Large-diameter vessels formed early in the growing season followed by small-diameter vessels later in the growing season give ring-porous hardwoods. Vessel size and placement may vary between these two extremes, and in some cases, we see semi-ring-porous hardwoods.



Figure 1. Illustration of a typical softwood showing axial and radial cells, earlywood and latewood, and a resin-canal complex.

The combination of EW/LW (and vessels in hardwoods) gives annual growth rings. When lumber is cut from a log, growth rings define grain angle and slope of grain of the lumber. Properties of these growth rings and the grain angle that they determine affect the ease with which finishes can be applied (paintability) and how long finishes last (service life). Figures 1 and 2 illustrate the orientation of cells in a softwood and ring-porous hardwood. The large opening in the softwood (Figure 1) is a resin canal complex, not a vessel.



Figure 2. Illustration of a typical ring-porous hardwood showing axial and radial cells, earlywood and latewood, and vessels.

Cross-section micrographs of three hardwoods and three softwoods (Figure 3) show three types of growth characteristics. Softwoods may have “no transition” (no EW/LW boundary (3A)), gradual transition between EW and LW (3B), or abrupt transition between EW and LW (3C). Note that the “no-transition” softwood is a tropical species (i.e., no seasons, therefore no EW/LW transition). Hardwoods may be diffuse porous (3D), semi-ring porous (3E), or ring porous (3F). Finishing characteristics for wood fall into three categories:

1. Easy to finish (“no-transition” or gradual-transition softwoods and diffuse-porous hardwoods)
2. Moderately easy to finish (abrupt-transition softwoods having narrow latewood bands or semi-ring-porous hardwoods)
3. Difficult to finish (abrupt-transition softwoods having wide latewood bands or ring-porous hardwoods)



Figure 3. Cross-section micrographs of (A) a tropical softwood, (B) white spruce (*Picea glauca*), (C) Douglas-fir, (D) sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), (E) persimmon (*Diospyros virginiana*), and (F) white ash (*Fraxinus americana*).

The important message from wood anatomy is to look at the wood. The six classifications (Figure 3) do not include all possible combinations. The micrographs of end grain clearly show the EW/LW transition and the porosity of the hardwoods. These differences at the microscopic scale give us a basis for evaluating wood at the macroscopic scale. Keeping in mind the two dimensional end-grain micrographs, translate this to pieces of wood and examine how the EW/LW transitions, vessels, and ray cells appear on the six sides of the wood (Figures 4 and 5). When determining paintability, look at grain angles (both flat grain versus vertical grain and slope of grain). Look at the width of the EW/LW bands and the transition between them. The blocks show radial and tangential surfaces (i.e., vertical and flat grain) for four softwoods. Note the gradual transitions and narrow LW bands on white pine (*Pinus strobus*) (Figure 4a) and western redcedar (*Thuja plicata*) (Figure 4b) and the abrupt transition and wide LW bands on Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) (Figure 5a) and loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda* L.) (Figure 5b). Surfaces having wide LW bands and abrupt transition between EW and LW are difficult to finish. In contrast, white pine and western redcedar do not have wide latewood bands, and these species give excellent paint performance. Moisture-induced dimensional change increases as wood density increases (see text box “Moisture”). Changes are greater for latewood than for earlywood. Different dimensional change for “abrupt-transition” (or ring-porous) species at the earlywood/latewood boundary places stress on coatings.

MOISTURE
The chemical commonly called "water" (H_2O) has three states according to temperature and pressure conditions: gas (water vapor or steam), liquid (water), or solid (ice). When water interacts with wood, it can occur in a fourth state (bound water). Moisture is not one of the states of water; it is a term with the power to indicate uncertainty about the water's state, or to refer collectively to water in all its states in wood. For example, some of the moisture in a board at 50% moisture content will occur as liquid water (or ice, depending on the temperature) within cell cavities of the wood, some will occur as water vapor, and some will be bound water (bound within cell walls). Moisture thus accounts for any or all of these states in a single word. In this paper, the term water designates water in its liquid state.



Figure 4. Lateral and end-grain surfaces of (A) eastern white pine and (B) western redcedar.



Figure 5. Lateral and end-grain surfaces of (A) Douglas-fir and (B) loblolly pine.

Wood-specific gravity, radial and tangential dimensional change, EW/LW transition, approximate EW/LW ratio, and paintability for common North American wood species are listed in Table 1. Shrinkage values given in Table 1 were obtained from drying wood from its green state (fiber saturation) to ovendry (0% moisture content (MC)); swelling values would be about the same. Some species have wide LW bands (Figure 5). For softwoods, the transition is gradual (G) or abrupt (A). G/A for western hemlock (*Tsuga heterophylla*) indicates that some samples are A and some are G. For hardwoods, the transition is diffuse porous (D), ring porous (R), or semi-ring porous (SR). Estimates of paintability are based on EW/LW transition and EW:LW

ratio. For example, softwoods having gradual transition and less than about 1/3 LW are listed Table 1 as I; those having abrupt transition and greater than about 1/3 LW are listed as III. For hardwoods, diffuse-porous species are listed as I; ring-porous species having greater than about 1/3 LW are listed as III. These paintability estimates don't take into consideration the dimensional change or grain angle. For example, flat grain white pine would not be as paintable as vertical grain. Redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*) is listed in category I even though it is an abrupt-transition species because the LW bands are narrow. Table 1 merely gives a starting point for evaluating paintability of a species. One needs to look at the lumber and evaluate its paintability. Some wood species have many appearance grades of lumber; grade affects paintability. For example, high-grade lumber of a species in category II may have better paintability than low-grade lumber in category I.

Table 1. Painting Characteristics of Common Wood Species

Wood species	Specific gravity[a] green/dry	Shrinkage (%)[b]		Paintability (latex paint)	EW/LW transition	Is LW greater than about 1/3 of GR?[c]	Color of heartwood
		Tangential	Radial				
Softwoods							
Bald cypress	0.42/0.46	6.2	3.8	II	A	No	Light brown
Cedars							
Incense	0.35/0.37	5.2	3.3	I	G	No	Brown
Northern white	0.29/0.31	4.9	2.2	I	G	No	Light brown
Port-Orford	0.39/0.43	6.9	4.6	I	G	No	Cream
Western red	0.31/0.32	5	2.4	I	G	No	Brown
Alaska yellow	0.42/0.44	6	2.8	I	G	No	Yellow
Douglas-fir[d, e]	0.45/0.48[f]	7.6	4.8	III	A	Yes	Pale red
Pines							
Eastern white	0.34/0.35	6.1	2.1	I	G	No	Cream
Ponderosa	0.38/0.42	6.2	3.9	II	A	Yes/No	Cream
Southern[f]	0.47/0.51[f]	8	5	III	A	Yes	Light brown
Western white	0.36/0.38	7.4	4.1	I	G	No	Cream
Radiata pine	0.45/0.53	7.0	4.2	III	A	Yes/No	Cream
Redwood[g]	0.38/0.40	4.4	2.6	I	A	No	Dark brown
Spruce[h]	0.33/0.35	7.1	3.8	I	G	No	White
Tamarack/larch	0.49/0.53	7.4–9.1	3.7–4.5	II	A	Yes/No	Brown
True fir	0.37/0.39	7.0	3.3	I	G	No	White
Western hemlock	0.42/0.45	7.8	4.2	II	G/A	Yes/No	Pale brown
Hardwoods							
Red alder	0.37/0.41	7.3	4.4	I	D	NA	Pale brown
Ash	0.55/0.60	8	5	III	R	Yes	Light brown
Aspen/poplar/cottonwood	0.36/0.40	7.0–9.2	3.5–3.9	I	D	NA	Pale brown
Basswood	0.32/0.37	9.3	6.6	I	D	NA	Cream
Beech	0.56/0.64	11.9	5.5	I	D	NA	Pale brown
Birch	0.55/0.62	9.5	7.3	I	D	NA	Light brown
Butternut	0.36/0.38	6.4	3.4	II	SR	Yes	Light brown
Cherry	0.47/0.50	7.1	3.7	I	D	NA	Brown
Chestnut	0.40/0.43	6.7	3.4	III	R	Yes	Light brown
Elm, American	0.46/0.50	9.5	4.2	III	R	Yes	Brown
Hickory	0.64/0.72	11	7	III	R	Yes	Light brown
Maple, sugar	0.56/0.63	9.9	4.8	I	D	NA	Light brown
Oaks							
White oak group	0.60/0.68	8.8	4.4	III	R	Yes	Brown
Red oak group	0.56/0.63	8.6	4.0	III	R	Yes	Brown
Sweetgum	0.46/0.52	10.2	5.3	I	D	NA	Brown
Sycamore	0.46/0.49	8.4	5	I	D	NA	Pale brown
Walnut	0.51/0.55	7.8	5.5	II	SR	Yes	Dark brown
Yellow-poplar	0.40/0.42	8.2	4.6	I	D	NA	Pale brown

[a] Specific gravity based on ovendry weight and volume at green or 12% moisture content.
[b] Value obtained by drying from green to ovendry.
[c] A is abrupt-transition softwood, G is gradual-transition softwood, R is ring-porous hardwood, D is diffuse-porous hardwood, SR is semi-ring porous hardwood, Y is yes (typically), N is no (typically), NA is not applicable, Y/N is yes or no (depending on the specimen). In ring-porous hardwoods, the growth rate (number of rings per inch) will determine the relative proportions of earlywood and latewood.
[d] Lumber and plywood.
[e] Coastal Douglas-fir.
[f] Loblolly, shortleaf, specific gravity of 0.54/0.59 for longleaf and slash.
[g] Redwood is listed as I because its LW band is very narrow.
[h] S pruce. Values are for Engelmann spruce; other species are similar.

Several factors affect finish performance:

- Density (overall density, EW/LW density difference, and how abruptly density changes at the EW/LW boundary)
- Thickness of latewood bands
- Ray cells (number and placement)
- Vessels (size and distribution)
- Extractives content (water-soluble and solvent-soluble)
- Growth rate (Some species grow faster than others, and site conditions affect growth rate)

Weathered Wood

Weathering is the general term describing outdoor degradation of materials, and it manifests itself physically and chemically (e.g., cracking and exfoliation of rock, corrosion of metals, and photodegradation of organic materials). Ultraviolet (UV) radiation in sunlight catalyzes photodegradation of organic materials exacerbated by moisture, temperature change, freeze/thaw cycles, abrasion by windblown particles, and growth of microorganisms. Photochemical degradation occurs at and near the surface of wood, wood products, and finishes.

Photochemical degradation cleaves chemical bonds of lignin, which weakens fiber-to-fiber adhesion. As fiber-to-fiber adhesion weakens, fibers slowly erode from the surface. Badly weathered wood having loosely attached fibers on the surface obviously cannot hold paint. A weathered surface is not obvious on wood that has been outdoors for less than two to three weeks. The wood appears unchanged. Research has shown that chemical changes of wood exposed to sunlight for 1, 2, 4, 8, or 16 weeks prior to painting (preweathering) affect service life of subsequently applied paint. The longer the wood preweathered, the shorter the time until the paint began to peel. For boards preweathered 16 weeks, the paint peeled within three years; for boards preweathered only one week, the paint peeled slightly after 13 years.

Panels that were not preweathered showed no sign of peeling after 20 years. Paints were commercial oil–alkyd or acrylic–latex primers with one acrylic-latex topcoat over planed all-heartwood vertical-grain western redcedar. For species with low specific gravity, the wood must be finished as soon as possible after installation, or better yet, primed before installation. In other tests using dense wood species such as Douglas-fir and southern yellow pine, little peeling was noted until boards had been preweathered for three to four weeks. Species and amount of weathering are important if one is using weathered wood to test paint adhesion.

Finish Research at FPL

Finish research at FPL is different from that of the paint industry in several ways. Our tests last a long time—usually more than 10 years and sometimes up to 20 years (Figure 6). The tests focus on the interactions of substrate and finish, usually as they relate to paint adhesion, cracking, flaking, and peeling. Our primary focus is on the way wood affects paint performance. We obtain general information on generic finishes versus substrate (e.g., the service life of semitransparent stains versus solid-color stains on smooth Douglas-fir lumber and plywood). Paint tests by industry are often short term and focus on paint surfaces (gloss, fade, mildew growth). These degradations may be apparent with short test periods and need to be determined because if they occur, they indicate potential problems with short-term customer satisfaction.

Figure 6. Forest Products Laboratory test site near Madison, Wisconsin.

Following is a historical perspective of finishing research at FPL.

Prior to 1950

The wood finishing program at FPL started in 1922. Frederick L. Browne wrote the early history (1922–1963) of wood finishing in "The Origin and Early History of the Paint Section," which is contained in "Chronicle of 65 Years of Wood Finishing at the Forest Products Laboratory."[3] In the section on test-fence studies, Browne stated the following on page 7:

> The favorite excuse for failure of house paints in 1922 was the unsuitable nature of the wood painted. The opinions of the paint industry and of painting contractors were highly conflicting, but they might be summarized, with little exaggeration, to the effect that eastern white pine was the only wood fit to paint; but even the white pine then available was not what it used to be. Clearly our first

> problem in house paints was to discover the facts about the painting characteristics of the various woods and cuts of wood.

Dr. Browne wrote this approximately 50 years ago and referred to the state of the wood–paint industry in 1922—almost 100 years ago! I find it interesting that the white pine then available "was not what it used to be." I guess wood is never "what it used to be"—whatever that is.

In my opinion, the most serious problem with paint during those years was the flow of moisture from inside structures to siding (see text box "Moisture"). Structures had no vapor retarder/air barrier. Research using the blister box helped explain how moisture affected paint. This work led to the development of the "Madison Formula," an oil-based semitransparent stain. Based on the Madison Formula, paint companies developed other semitransparent stains—a new product line for the paint industry. Laboratory tests such as the blister box augmented information from field tests and paint evaluations on existing structures.

From 1922 to 1950, researchers at FPL discovered many of the fundamental wood–paint properties necessary for improving performance on wood. Following are a few noteworthy accomplishments:

- Worked with the paint industry to develop wood primer paint
- Identified compatibility problems between different paint formulations
- Established procedures for determining moisture-excluding effectiveness of paint
- Developed the "blister box" to show the effect of moisture diffusion through structure walls
- Developed water-repellent preservatives (WRPs) and semitransparent stains
- Established minimum thickness of paint on wood necessary to avoid cracking and flaking

Since 1950

Modern structures usually have a vapor retarder/air barrier to limit the flow of humid air through the structure envelope. When these barriers are installed properly (e.g., without holes for plumbing and electrical service), inside water vapor seldom causes catastrophic paint failure; therefore, blister box experiments ceased. Laboratory experiments focused on accelerated weathering using carbon arc and xenon arc weathering chambers and adhesion testing. However, outdoor field tests remained an important part of the paint program. Field tests evaluated the performance of generic finishes on different substrates. Our research still involves evaluating wood paintability rather than comparing different brands of paint.

Over the past 50 years, experimental design of outdoor tests has evolved. From 1950 to 1985, almost all studies used a panel made up of three pieces of siding on a plywood backing (Figure 7). Figure 7 shows a two- or three-coat paint system (oil–alkyd primer/acrylic–latex topcoat) on western redcedar after 29 years on the test fence near Madison, Wisconsin. End grain was not sealed and the three pieces of siding were the "replicates." In the mid-1980s, researchers at FPL started using 1.2-m (4-ft.) boards instead of panels (Figure 8). Half the board was usually pretreated with a WRP. Various sections of the board had one topcoat, primer plus one topcoat, or primer plus two topcoats, with or without the WRP pretreatment. We designed experiments to evaluate various types of finish on different wood species and the interaction of WRPs. We used

three or six boards ("replicates") for each experimental treatment. Recent experiments evaluate interactions of wood/finishes on wall systems (rain screen (Figure 9) or flashing (Figure 10)). We are striving to use robust experimental designs having enough specimens (a large "*n*") to represent a particular wood–paint system and are evaluating specimens frequently. In our latest field studies, we use statistical designs to focus on specific degradation mechanisms (e.g., evaluating effects of wood density, grain angle, and growth rate on paint cracking and flaking) and are evaluating the specimens monthly.

Figure 7. Western redcedar boards painted with oil-alkyd primer and one acrylic-latex topcoat (left) and two topcoats (right) after 29 years outdoor exposure at the Forest Products Laboratory test site near Madison, Wisconsin.



Figure 8. Painted boards showing water-repellent preservative (WRP) treatment on right half of boards, no WRP treatment on left half, and the arrangement of primer

and topcoats to give primer and one topcoat, primer and two topcoats, and topcoat having no primer.

Figure 9. Boards on test fence showing rain screen on the left and no rain screen on the right.

Figure 10. Painted plywood with Z-flashing between panels.

20-Year Warranty

If paint on wood lasts one year, it should last 20 years. Tests should be designed to detect failures that often occur within one year (juvenile failures). Juvenile failures are those failures that occur at a decreasing rate at the beginning of the life of a product (or living things, for that matter).

They are most easily explained using a "bathtub plot" (Figure 11).[5] The plot is a Wiebull distribution of three types of failures superimposed: a juvenile failure curve on the left side (caused primarily by flaws), constant failure rate shown by the flat portion in the middle (based on random failures that may have nothing to do with product durability), and end-of-life failure curve on the right side (wearing out). The slope of Wiebull distributions for juvenile failures (decreasing rate) and end-of-life (increasing rate) become small at the center of the bathtub plot and can be ignored. The random failure rate is the dominant effect through the central portion of the bathtub plot.



Figure 11. Bathtub plot showing juvenile and end-of-life failure rates with respect to time.

In materials testing, we need to understand which part of the plot we are using to predict "service life." The rate of failure for the juvenile failure portion is not constant (i.e., it is defined as the portion having a decreasing rate). We can predict any service life, depending on the portion of the curve selected. If one picks a rate early in the juvenile failure portion, one gets a rather short service life. Estimating service life from the flat portion of the curve gives an extremely long service life prediction. The rate of failure in the flat portion gives a mean time between failures (MTBF). This abbreviation is often corrupted to "mean time *before* failure." Some people even assume it means "*minimum* time *before* failure." This is not wise! That is, rate of failure of the flat portion of the curve does not equate to service life. This assumption ignores juvenile and end-of-life failure portions of the curve. For example, if the low rate of failure at the flat portion of the bathtub plot is used to predict service life, one often gets a prediction of "hundreds of years." The end-of-life portion of the bathtub plot comes into play long before "hundreds of years." A better way of predicting performance is to consider mean time to failure (MTTF). This includes the end-of-life failure mode but may not include juvenile failures (Figure 12).



Figure 12. Probability of failure with respect to time for mean time between failures (MTBF) and mean time to failure (MTTF).

These are easy concepts to understand and to visualize for human life. Juvenile death may be caused by birth defects (left side), random death by accidents (middle), and then we wear out and die (right side). Insurance companies have this all figured out—term insurance for a 30-year-old is cheap because they probably base the rate on MTBF in the flat portion of the curve. Full life insurance is not as cheap, particularly as one gets older; in this case, the end-of-life (MTTF) comes into play.

How can we apply these concepts to testing paint on wood? First, we need a representative sample of the population (a large *n*) and frequent evaluations. Second, we target testing to isolate various types of failure. That is, we conduct more than one type of test. We design tests to evaluate specific types of failure and their interactions. Third, we use measurement techniques other than "how it looks." That means developing non-subjective measurement techniques, data collection systems, databases, and software to manipulate the data. (Though I must admit—consumers use the "how it looks" evaluation system, so we shouldn't ignore it.)

Large *n* and frequent evaluation are the secret. We need to evaluate performance in two areas of the bathtub plot: juvenile failure and end-of-life. The most important area may be the juvenile failure portion. (These are the failures that often land a company in court.) A large number of replicates and frequent measurement enable one to evaluate failure in terms of rate and determine juvenile failure from decreasing rate and end-of-life failure from increasing rate. Field studies having only three replicates enable one to observe general trends, but the studies lack sufficient replicates to evaluate juvenile and end-of-life failures, particularly if specimens are not evaluated often. If we continue to "hang three specimens on the fence to see what we get," we'll continue to get little value for what it costs to do field experiments. In the following sections, I point out where one can use field, laboratory, and accelerated tests having large *n* and frequent evaluations to determine juvenile and end-of-life failures.

What Are You Testing?

Target your tests. We need to decide ahead of time what type of degradation we are evaluating and design tests to assess that degradation. In experiments, substrate has a strong influence on finish performance for some types of degradation but not for others. If substrate has an effect, use it to focus the experiments to get answers quickly, precisely, and accurately. Some tests may require heartwood of highly colored wood species, some may be done on sapwood, and others may be done on substrates other than wood. I classify finish degradation in two ways: changes in appearance and degradation/debonding of the film. Appearance changes (such as gloss, fade, extractives bleed, and mildew) affect paint surfaces. Degradation/debonding (such as cracking, flaking, and peeling) affect the finish film and interphase between paint and substrate. Consider methods and measurements that can distinguish between juvenile failures and end-of-life failures.

Gloss, Fade (Appearance)

Appearance of finished wood is unacceptable if the finish fades or loses gloss. Fading and loss of gloss are surface degradations of finishes (i.e., they don't usually involve the finish/wood interphase) induced by ultraviolet (UV) radiation and visible light (particularly short-wavelength blue light). Loss of gloss is a degradation of the polymer in the finish and occurs with film-forming finishes such as paint. All finishes degrade in this way over time, and we consider it normal aging. Film integrity is not compromised unless the polymer rapidly degrades to give excessive chalking. Fading is a degradation of pigments in the film. Mineral pigments, such as iron oxide, are light stable; organic pigments tend to degrade. Loss of gloss causes the surface to become less smooth and the change in surface texture may influence the evaluation of fading. Evaluate gloss and fading often to determine rate of change; decreasing rate could indicate a juvenile failure.

Accelerated test methods may work well for UV-radiation-induced fading and loss of gloss, and these degradations may follow the "law of reciprocity." That is, one can shorten the test time by increasing the intensity of the radiation. For example, 100 h (hours) at one-sun intensity is equivalent to 50 h at two-suns or 25 h at four-suns.

The law of reciprocity may not hold for all polymer systems, but if it can be used, it can shorten test time. Water spray may wash away degradation products, thus adding mechanical abrasion as a contributing factor. Temperature may also affect degradation rate, but freeze/thaw is probably not a factor. The most important factors are radiation wavelength and its intensity, temperature, and abrasion by water spray. If accelerated tests are used, the 102 min. of radiation/18 min. of water spray (102/18 cycle) may be acceptable, but nothing is special about this cycle. In fact, to test finish/wood interactions, it is probably not appropriate. I have found that a schedule of 24 h UV radiation and 4 h water spray (spray during the light) each day causes greater dimensional change of wood than the 102/18 cycle and is more representative of the strains imposed on paint outdoors. If the mechanism of degradation is UV-radiation-induced degradation, I suggest maximizing the radiation to decrease total test time. Measure the UV radiation intensity and wavelength distribution (the intensity at several wavelengths) and integrate over time to obtain the dose. Obtain loss in performance (degradation) of gloss or fade versus dose, particularly the

degradation at several wavelengths if possible. This requires filters, which is difficult but possible. Quantify degradation in terms of radiation "dose" causing the degradation. By determining degradation in terms of dose, not time, you can compare different experiments and build a database. Don't be satisfied with a single experiment that merely gives a ranking of finishes for "that experiment," but rather develop data that can be compared with other experiments and with field-exposure data.

Gloss loss and fading indicate coating-surface degradation; therefore, substrate is not a factor in the degradation. However, substrate can affect the results. For example, surface changes of the substrate, such as raised grain, may show through the coating and affect the appearance (gloss). Highly colored wood substrates or those having knots can cause surface discoloration and interfere with evaluation of fading. So instead of using wood as a substrate, consider using metal, fiberboard, or products having a paper overlay for smooth stable surfaces for evaluating gloss or fading. If using wood, sapwood of a fine-grained species may be acceptable. Photograph panels before painting them and when evaluating them. Evaluate fade and gloss using automated systems; store photographs and evaluations along with all data on experimental conditions (such as time of wetness, relative humidity, temperature during exposure, radiation intensity and dose). These other factors become important when comparing different experiments.

Mildew Resistance (Appearance)

As with gloss and fade, mildew growth affects finish appearance. In most cases, the finish is not degraded; the mildew merely lives on the finish surface. However, in some cases, mildew on an infested wood substrate can grow through the finish. In fact, it may grow at the wood/finish interface, through the finish, and on the finish surface. This can be noticeable on clear or lightly pigmented finishes. Finish formulation and wood species affect mildew growth and may interact. For example, extractives in highly colored wood such as western redcedar and redwood may interact with linseed oil in a finish to produce severe mildew growth within several weeks of outdoor exposure, particularly during rainy, humid weather. Many people think mildew on wood is simply *Aureobasidium pullulans*; however, *Aureobasidium* spp. includes 14 species and many other types of molds, and other microorganisms colonize wood. These molds, such as *A. pullulans*, lack the enzymes to degrade wood or polymers in finishes. The important word here is polymer. Oil–alkyds for wood products are generally long-oil–alkyds (i.e., they have excess oil—free oil—not polymerized). Linseed oil is a food for mildew. Extractives in wood are not polymerized—more food. Mildew is always looking for a free lunch—and we often do our best to provide it:

- Linseed and tung oils—free lunch
- Oil–alkyds—free lunch
- Semitransparent stains—free lunch
- Oil-based solid-color stains—free lunch
- Latex-based solid-color stains—no free lunch, but porous; mold can grow through the film to get to the wood—free lunch
- Accumulated dust and pollen—free lunch
- Additives in finishes—?????—maybe more free lunch

Substrate may influence mildew growth; however, weather has a much greater effect on its growth. A finish may perform well for several years during dry weather, develop mildew during a wet year, and show less mildew growth when the weather becomes dry again. Mildew can occur quickly, but it shouldn't be considered a juvenile failure—the rate may not decrease over time.

Test protocols for evaluating mildew resistance of coatings are difficult. Outdoor tests don't work well because they are dependent on the weather. Both "good years" (a lot of mildew growth) and "bad years" (little mildew growth) occur, so comparing one year with another or one site with another is impossible unless you collect complete weather data, including time of wetness, and compare the changes in specimens with the weather conditions. Outdoor exposure tests for more than 50 years at sites near Madison, Wisconsin, and Gulfport, Mississippi, usually showed worse mildew near Gulfport. However, some years it was worse near Madison. *You just can't depend on the weather* or quantify the dose.

How does one measure the dose (i.e., quantify the factors causing mildew growth)? Is it the amount of rain, time of wetness, number of rainy days, or amount of time with RH above 70%, 80%, or 90%? How does one account for different microorganism species? Measuring the response (the amount of mildew) is not easy, either. Comparing one experiment with another and separating the effect of UV degradation on mildew growth is difficult. Conventional "wisdom" suggests that mildew grows more on the north side of structures than on the south side, but this is not true for all situations. Mildew grows where it can stay attached to the surface, particularly if the substrate absorbs water. For example, mildew is more prevalent on the grout between tiles than on the tiles in a shower; the grout is porous and absorbs water. Mildew often grows on surfaces roughened by photochemical degradation.

In contrast to the difficulties associated with field tests, laboratory methods may make it easier to use known organisms under controlled conditions, monitor growth photographically, and quantify results with image analysis. One can then compare results from one experiment with those from another. If tests are conducted on wood, mildew growth is a combination of factors from the finish and the wood. Researchers need to include several wood species and ensure that the test boards have heartwood. Western redcedar and redwood have traditionally been used, but one should include other species. Sapwood of spruce (*Picea* spp.) and pine contain free sugars and other foods that are readily available for mildew and other microorganisms such as blue stain (*Ceratocystis*- and *Leptographium*- type species). Blue stain may infect pine sapwood through pine beetle attack of living trees, log storage prior to sawing, or wood getting wet in service. As with *A. pullulans*, blue stain can be an appearance problem for clear and semitransparent finishes. Rather than using boards, consider tests using a sawdust/finish-resin medium prepared from several wood species, resin systems, and mildewcides; you may get results within several weeks. This type of test is easy to do, can include many replicates, and is repeatable. It doesn't depend on the weather.

Extractives Bleed (Appearance)

Extractives bleed is another appearance problem, but unlike fade and gloss, extractives bleed is dependent on wood species. Heartwood of many hardwoods and softwoods contains water-

soluble extractives; sapwood does not contain water-soluble extractives, but may contain water-insoluble resins. Western redcedar and redwood are two common softwoods that contain water-soluble extractives. Extractives give these species their attractive color and natural decay resistance, but they can also discolor paint. Discoloration shows in two ways: diffused and run-down extractives bleed.

Diffused extractives bleed is caused by (1) water from rain and dew that penetrates a porous or thin paint coating, (2) water that penetrates unsealed end grain of siding, railings, trim, or other components, and (3) absorption of water vapor in high humidity areas such as bathrooms, swimming pools, and greenhouses (Figure 13). *Finish formulation affects diffused extractive bleed.* Eliminate diffused extractives bleed by formulating primers that are chemically incompatible with water-borne extractives and slow diffusion of water. Blocking extractives bleed requires that the chemistry of the finish be incompatible with the chemistry of the extractives. Generally, this means “not soluble.” Stain-blocking primers were traditionally oil–alkyd formulations. One reason that latex-based primers aren’t as effective is that they are more permeable to water than oil–alkyds—even after they coalesce.

Figure 13. Diffuse extractives bleed on painted boards.

Run-down extractives bleed is caused by (1) wind-blown water that wets the back side of siding, (2) condensation of water vapor, originating inside the structure, on the back side of siding, and (3) water draining behind siding from roof leaks, faulty gutters, or ice dams. Water on the back side of the siding dissolves extractives and runs off the back side of the siding onto the front side of the siding below it, where it evaporates and leaves colored streaks (Figure 14). *Finish formulation has no effect on run-down extractives bleed.* Back-priming siding prior to installation, having wide roof overhang, and using rain-screen siding installation minimizes run-down extractives bleed.

Figure 14. Run-down extractives bleed on painted boards.

Stain-blocking primers have been developed to minimize diffusion of water-soluble extractives from western redcedar and redwood into finish topcoats. Other wood species may have a different mix of extractives (Figure 15). Figure 15 shows extractive bleed from the heartwood of radiata pine (*Pinus radiata*, Monterey pine) through an oil–alkyd primer and two latex topcoats. The extractives in radiata pine are probably soluble in organic solvents. Just as it is difficult to stop extractives bleed from knots because knots exude water-soluble and solvent-soluble extractives, extractives in the heartwood of pine, spruce, and fir may diffuse through primers designed to block water-soluble extractives from western redcedar.

Figure 15. Diffuse extractives bleed from heartwood of radiata pine.

Interest in tests for extractives bleed has increased in recent years because wood species traditionally used for exterior siding and trim are being replaced by imported wood species. As with testing for mildew, testing for extractives bleed may be more conclusive under controlled laboratory conditions. It may be possible to get results in several weeks using small wood wafers (e.g., 75 by 100 by 6 mm (3 by 4 by 1/4 in.), radial, longitudinal, tangential). Wafers could be mounted in a device similar to the blister box having high RH and temperature on the inside and low RH and temperature on the outside. Use several wood species, including some highly colored hardwoods, such as northern red oak (*Quercus rubra* L.) or black walnut (*Juglans nigra*). Keep in mind that you are developing a test to ensure a robust product; therefore, stress it in every way possible. As with other tests, keep complete records of test conditions to enable comparisons among tests. Use many replicates to ensure that results aren't swayed by unusual pieces of wood.

Cracking, Flaking, Peeling (Interphase)

Cracking, flaking, and peeling are failures of the finish and the interphase between finish and substrate, and when they occur, the protecting quality of the finish is compromised. In addition, fixing these degradations requires extensive substrate surface preparation and, in some cases, complete removal of the finish. These failures occur on film-forming finishes such as paints, solid-color stains, and semitransparent stains (if they form a film on the surface). Cracking, flaking, and peeling result from a combination of factors involving the substrate (e.g., species, growth-rate, density, grain-angle, and surface texture) and the finish (e.g., adhesive properties, toughness, flexibility, glass-transition temperature, coefficient of thermal expansion, and

thickness of the coating). The mechanisms of failure usually involve many of the following factors:

- Grain raise of an abrupt-transition species, particularly on the pith side of smooth flat-grain lumber
- Insufficient film build
- Brittle film
- Weathered wood surface
- Weathered or chalky film
- Water

How these factors interact could be the subject of a separate paper, so I will give the short version. For good paint performance, films need to be 4–6 mils (0.10–0.13 mm) thick and be flexible over a temperature range of –20 °C (–4 °F) to +50 °C (+122 °F). Films need to be applied to sound wood, and the wood should have gradual transition between early- and latewood. However to test paint, it's not this simple. At one extreme, paint vertical-grain saw-textured all-heartwood western redcedar using stain-blocking primer and two topcoats of acrylic latex (seal end grain with primer) and place on test fence vertically facing south. Do this early in your career—the paint will last more than 30 years (Figure 7). At the other extreme, place a single topcoat of a short oil–alkyd on flat-grain (pith side) of smooth southern pine and get your results the same week!

We need reasonable tests that give consistent results in a reasonable time. This may involve a series of different tests. I recommend testing free films of paint polymers with and without pigments and other additives. If, in addition, you place these finish formulations in field tests, you can develop an extensive database of film properties and outdoor finish performance. As the size of the database increases, it becomes a powerful tool for comparing film properties of new formulations with those in the database to save time and money and screen out marginal formulations prior to conducting lengthy field tests.

To develop a film-property/paint-performance database, use free films to determine properties (e.g., glass-transition temperature, coefficient of linear expansion, effect of pigments and other additives). Research on free films helps one to understand the limitations of the polymer system. Keep in mind, the dimensional changes in wood are large and vary with species, grain angle, and EW/LW. Use many replicates and several wood species. Note that as the November temperature in Minneapolis begins to approach –10 °C (14 °F) to –20 ºC (–4 °F), the wood is increasing in MC (the temperature is near the dew point, therefore the RH is near 100%). Wood outdoors swells in the winter, but the paint is contracting. The two materials are on a collision course (maybe a bit of an over-statement). Conversely, winter temperatures in Atlanta seldom are cold enough to stress paint films.

To get the most value from field tests, test paints where the weather is variable. You need four seasons, such as found in the upper Midwest in the United States, to stress paint films on wood. Develop databases on performance from a variety of different species, growth rates, and grain angles. Perform tests on preweathered wood having different grain angles. Choose a range of substrates. Don't try to match wood grain. It's not possible. Instead, use more replicates.

Photograph wood prior to finishing, immediately after the finish cures or coalesces, and periodically as the painted wood ages (monthly, if possible). Use color to show defects, particularly if the photographs will be analyzed using image analysis. Test paint adhesion periodically during exposure (after 1, 2, or 3 years, for example). Although the test is destructive, adhesion tests can give an indication of changes at the wood/coating interphase and can be used to estimate how long the film will remain intact.[6] Possible tests include 90° and 180° peel, tensile and shear, fracture mechanics, and peg-pull-off tests.[7,8,9,10]

Failures caused by cracking, flaking, and peeling should be evaluated using bathtub plot concepts. You may find juvenile failures caused by raised grain, inadequate film thickness, and defects in the film followed by an extended period with little noticeable change. End-of-life failures may not begin until many years after the painted wood is placed in test.

"To seal or not to seal end grain, that is the question." We often seal the end grain of painted boards for our tests and, of course, paint companies recommend that their customers seal the end grain. In the real world, maybe your customers actually do it. However, maybe they don't. If end grain of test boards is not sealed, peeling often occurs near the end of the boards; if boards aren't sealed in the real world, peeling often occurs near the end of the boards. (Amazing, isn't it?) You should consider this when developing your test protocol. Maybe you shouldn't seal the end grain. Unsealed end grain challenges the coating and may speed results. Lack of a sealer may permit juvenile failure, maybe it won't.

Film Integrity (Thickness)

Properties of free films may change with thickness of the film; determine properties for a range of film thickness representative of the spread rates on wood. Spread rates vary depending on species and surface texture and often vary from one board to another within the same species. Getting a consistent film thickness is difficult. One can finish a section of a board with a known amount of finish, but the finish absorbs differently into different boards to give different film-build. Alternatively, one can paint allowing the substrate to determine the amount to get similar film-build on different boards, but then you have different amounts of finish. Both methods give useful information. Some paint companies prepare both types of specimens. My preference is to let the substrate determine the amount of finish and record the amount applied. Second and third coats tend to be more consistent than the primer coat.

Finishes may form films or penetrate wood or both, and the extent to which they penetrate wood differs depending on finish formulation. All finishes can flow into the lumina of cut cells at the surface, but some can also infiltrate voids in wood-cell walls. Molecular weight of the resin (size of resin molecules) determines whether the resin infiltrates the cell wall or merely flows into the lumina. Oil and oil–alkyd resins can penetrate wood at two levels; they can easily flow into the cut lumina, and they are small enough to infiltrate wood-cell walls near the surface. The molecular weight of resins in latex paint is too large to allow latexes to infiltrate cell walls; these resins merely flow into cut lumina. Likewise, pigments are too large to infiltrate the cell wall, but they can be carried into the lumina along with oil–alkyd or latex finishes. Infiltration of oil–alkyds into cell walls may modify the wood at the wood–paint interphase, thus decreasing stress on the film. Decreased stress on the film may be why brittle oil–alkyd primers perform well.

Resins in oil-based semitransparent stains absorb into cell walls, leaving just enough resin to "glue" pigments to surface.

As you develop tests, take into account the different ways that finishes interact (e.g., raise grain, fill open cells, infiltrate cell walls) with the substrate surface to form films. This can lead to different modes of finish failure. For example, semitransparent stains may flake and peel if they are too thick. A test protocol for them should include a range of film thickness to determine maximum film thickness to avoid flaking. This may vary with wood species and polymer system.

Designing Experiments with Lasting Value

Many of the field studies I have conducted over the years have been single tests. I did little to compare data from one test to another, and in fact, for most of the tests, it was not possible. This has changed. Researchers at FPL now design experiments to reveal underlying principles and use computer systems to store and manipulate data. The databases include records of the weather during the tests and digital photographs of specimens taken periodically (monthly for one of our studies).

In our statistical designs, researchers at FPL consider within-board and board-to-board variability within a particular species. We design experiments so that we can compare data from different experiments. We select substrates according to test requirements. For example, we are determining effects of grain angle, growth rate, and specific gravity of loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*) on the performance of several paints. The object of this study is to evaluate a particular species. If we were testing paint, we would replicate this study with several other species (Douglas-fir, western redcedar, and red oak, for example). Each board has six finishes and each parameter (such as density, growth rate) has six to eight "replicates." We use boards having a range of wood properties to give a robust test that represents the range of growth rate and specific gravity typical for this species (Figure 16). Specific gravity of the boards ranges from 0.53 to 0.73, growth rate from 1 to 7 rings/cm (3 to 19 rings/in.). We photograph each section of each board (72 boards) monthly in the laboratory under consistent lighting (Figure 17). We are using only one wood species (*Pinus taeda*) for this study. The results entered into a standard database will enable us to compare the results with other wood species in future studies and other experiments currently under way.



Figure 16. Rings per inch with respect to specific gravity for loblolly pine.

Figure 17. Sam Williams (left) and Steve Lacher (right) photographing painted boards.

Accelerated Weathering Chambers

For decades, accelerated weathering chambers consisting of a UV radiation source and water spray have been used to test paint. They are a valuable tool for getting answers quickly for specific types of paint degradation. Keep in mind, however, that weathering chambers are just one of many tools available, and the data obtained from them is just part of the dataset. As mentioned previously, weathering chambers can be used to evaluate gloss and fading. To some extent, they can stress paint films to cause cracking, flaking, and peeling, particularly if a wood species having large dimensional change is used for the test and the duration of water spray is long enough to achieve a cyclic dimensional change. We have used 4 h water spray/day and this can stress paint films quite well. In my opinion, there is no “best” cycle. One should choose a

cycle to stress the wood–paint system to achieve the experimental goals. As with field tests, we shouldn't just hang stuff in the weathering chamber and see what we get.

In the previous section entitled Gloss, Fade (Appearance), I mentioned the 102/18 cycle (UV radiation/water spray). This is the most widely cited cycle in several standards, but it has no scientific basis. The cycle originated circa 1944 in a weathering apparatus developed by engineers at the National Carbon Company, who supplied carbon rods for generating the UV radiation and for a short time marketed a weathering device (the XC1). As with some present-day devices, the specimens rotated around the carbon arc on a drum to minimize effects of uneven radial radiation distribution. A complete revolution took 120 minutes, of which 18 minutes took the specimens past a water spray. As stated above, there was no scientific basis for choosing this cycle, and it was merely the solution to an engineering problem.

Keep in mind that the radiation intensity and water spray vary from one portion of the chamber to another, and measuring the irradiance that each specimen receives is not possible. Therefore, evaluating specimen response in terms of radiation dose and comparing different experiments is difficult.

Conclusions

Finished wood is a complicated materials system. Finish performance may depend on interactions between the finish and wood substrate. As one develops test methods, consider these interactions and use them to increase the robustness of your test, accelerate the degradation, or target a particular degradation mode (e.g., using heartwood of redwood and radiata pine to test stain-blocking qualities of a new primer). Supplement field tests with laboratory tests, and when possible, substitute laboratory tests for field tests. Think of each test as part of a larger program so that you develop a database containing all tests and supporting data. Eventually, you will be able to "mine" the database to augment data from later experiments and in some cases avoid doing extensive outdoor exposure tests.

Acknowledgment

I thank Alex Wiedenhoeft for Figure 3 and helping prepare Table 1.

References

1. Williams, R. S. and Feist, W. C. "The service life of semitransparent stain, solid color stain, and latex paint on yellow-poplar and sweetgum plywood and the effect of these finishes on wood durability," *Forest Prod. J*. 54(7/8): 96–101, 2004.

2. Bazovsky, Igor, *Reliability Theory and Practice*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1961. [republished by Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, NY, 2004.]

3. Gorman, T. M. and Feist, W. C. "Chronicle of 65 Years of Wood Finishing at the Forest Products Laboratory," General Technical Report, FPL-GTR-60, Madison, WI, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forest Products Laboratory, 81 p., 1989.

4. Wilkins, D. J., “The Bathtub Curve and Product Failure Behavior: Part One—The Bathtub Curve, Infant Mortality and Burn-in,” *Reliability Hot Wire*, Issue 21, November, 2002.

5. Wilkins, D. J., “The Bathtub Curve and Product Failure Behavior: Part Two—Normal Life and Wear-out,” *Reliability Hot Wire*, Issue 22, November, 2002.

6. Williams, R. S., Winandy, J. E., and Feist, W. C., “Correlation of adhesive strength with service life of paint applied to weathered wood,” Paper 161, In: *Proceedings 9th Durability of Building Materials and Components Conference*, Brisbane, Australia, March 17–20, 2002.

7. Williams, R. S., Winandy, J. E., and Feist, W. C., “Paint adhesion to weathered wood,” *J. Coatings Technol.* 59(749): 43–49, 1987.

8. Williams, R. S., Plantinga, P. L., and Feist, W. C., “Photodegradation of wood affects paint adhesion,” *Forest Prod. J.* 40(1): 45–49, 1990.

9. Knaebe, M. and Williams, R. S., “Determining Paint Adhesion to Wood Using Uniform Double-Cantilever Beam Specimens,” *ASTM Journal of Testing Evaluation*, 21(4): 172–279, 1993.

10. Knaebe, M. T., Williams, R. S., and Spence, J. W., “Field Study of the Effects of Acid on the Adhesion of Paint to Western Redcedar,” *J. Coatings Technol.*, 68(856): 27–30, 1996.

In: Third International Coating Wood and Wood Composites Conference: durable and sustainable--today and beyond. Proceedings, Sept. 22-23, 2009, Charlotte, NC. Washington, D.C. : National Paint & Coatings Assocation, 2009. 1 vol.