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DRIVE TOWARDS MASS WOOD TIMBER (MWT) BUILDINGS
CODE Changes

**Upcoming - Canada**
- 2020 National Building Code of Canada (NBCC) draft language plans to allow 12-story buildings that use mass timber (Ref. 3)
- Key phrase is *encapsulated mass timber construction (EMTC)* (Ref. 1)

**Complete - Canada**
- British Columbia has already adopted allowances for 12-story EMTC (Ref. 3). Relies on technical content from 2020 NBCC draft
- Alberta has allowed a pathway to 12-storey EMTC via a STANDATA document in February 2020

**Complete – U.S.**
- 2021 International Building Code has expanded the prescriptive capabilities of *Mass Wood Timber (MWT)* buildings in the U.S.
- Max 18 stories using the most stringent requirements for encapsulation of MWT
- Max 9 stories for exposed MWT (except for MWT used in exterior walls)
## Draft 2020 NBCC Highlights for EMTC – Minimum EMTC Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Wood Elements</th>
<th>Minimum Thickness, mm</th>
<th>Width x Depth, mm x mm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walls that are fire separations or exterior walls</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall that require a fire resistance rating, but are no fire separations</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floors or roofs</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beams, columns, and arches (2- or 3-sided fire exposure)</td>
<td></td>
<td>192 x 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beams, columns, and arches (4-sided fire exposure)</td>
<td></td>
<td>224 x 224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft 2020 NBCC Highlights for EMTC – Increased Fire Resistance to Separate Occupancies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group C from Group D</td>
<td>1 h</td>
<td>1 h</td>
<td>1 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C from Group A Division 2</td>
<td>1 h</td>
<td>2 h</td>
<td>2 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C from Storage Garages</td>
<td>1 h</td>
<td>1 h</td>
<td>2 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group D from Group A Division 2</td>
<td>1 h</td>
<td>2 h</td>
<td>2 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group D from Group E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group D from Group F Division 2 and 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Draft Language from 2020 NBCC Regarding EMTC Construction (Ref. 1)
New Test standard to evaluate encapsulation materials for EMTC

CAN/ULC-S146:2019

STANDARD METHOD OF TEST FOR THE EVALUATION OF ENCAPSULATION MATERIALS AND ASSEMBLIES OF MATERIALS FOR THE PROTECTION OF STRUCTURAL TIMBER ELEMENTS

1. Scope

1.1 This test method evaluates the temperature transmission performance of an encapsulation material or assembly of materials installed over a wood substrate when the test specimen is subjected to a standard fire exposure condition following the standard time-temperature curve as described in Section 6 (Test Conditions).

1.2 It is the intent that the encapsulation period established by this test method indicates the period of standard fire exposure when an encapsulated structural timber element is not expected to reach temperatures sufficient to cause charring or combustion, potentially resulting in contribution to fire severity, and shall not be construed as having determined the fire endurance period of the encapsulation material or assembly of materials, or of the structural timber element.

1.3 It is the intent that the encapsulation period established by this test method indicates performance only during the fire exposure period and shall not be construed as determining suitability for use after fire exposure.

Figure 2: Description of CAN/ULC-S146:2019 (Ref. 4)
MWT Projects proceed with Performance-based designs

• The reality is that prescriptive codes changes do not allow the types of MWT buildings that existed prior to the code changes taking effect.

• Performance-based designs will continue to play a major role
Performance-Based designs: Brock Commons

- Location: University of British Columbia
- Mixed-use residential complex including commercial and assembly spaces
- Houses 404 students
- Budget approved in 2015. Project completed in 2018

- The building’s footprint exceeds any proposed code allowances for EMTC
  - 18 stories
  - 162,700 sq. ft.

Figure 3: Rendering of Brock Commons Structural Frame (Ref. 2)
Performance-Based designs: Brock Commons

• The code requirements involved overlapping jurisdictions: University, local, provincial, and national.
  • Takeaway: complicated

• Fire performance: no project-specific testing was performed.
  • Design team chose conservative approach to encapsulate mass timber in 3-layers of Type X gypsum
  • Team consisted of an expert panel on fire safety

One key question: do 3 layers of type X gypsum board make a MWT assembly equivalent to a material already in listed firestop systems, such as concrete?
MASS WOOD TIMBER
PROJECTS
921 MWT Projects in the U.S. built or in design – 2013 to June 2020

This is before the 2021 IBC changes had been adopted. As in Canada, U.S. projects are relying on performance-based designs ahead of code updates.
MWT Projects in Canada, Any Stage, 2013 to YTD 2020, Using Constructconnect.

- B.C. clearly leads. May attribute to incorporation of 2020 NBCC EMTC guidelines in B.C.

- 108 Total projects

Figure 5: ConstructConnect MWT Project Count in Canada, Courtesy of Hilti Inc.
Dodge Data on MWT project through 2024

$13.1B in Project Value
California leads charge with over 90 projects
Washington = 57 projects
Oregon with 46
Texas has 43 starts coming
Utah + Florida have 20 projects coming
Canada starting 12 projects by 2022

Figure 5: Dodge Data for MWT Project Count in North America, Courtesy of Hilti Inc.
MWT Project Implications for Firestop

• MWT market value small compared to the overall market in coming years

• Each project carries the same life-safety concerns as any other
  • As MWT buildings get bigger, so does their social profile
  • There are stories of firestop systems without any basis in testing being used in MWT projects

• The potential for liability claims should also give the firestop industry pause
  • What is the industry customary standard? Answer: listings
  • What happens when the above can’t be met: Answer: custom systems based on testing
  • What happens when neither of the above has been satisfied?
MWT Project Implications for Firestop

• With so many MWT projects there are outstanding questions:
  • What firestop testing has been done?
  • Where are the firestop listings (a firestop system published by a 3rd party agency)?

• Listings are lacking as the more common listing/certification agencies have not provided a good pathway
  • Popular listing agency requiring MWT assemblies to be certified
  • Note that firestop system code requirements refer to tested systems, not listed systems.
    • Code compliance can be achieved for a non-listed firestop system based on testing to CAN/ULC S115
  • Attempts have been made to test certified CLT (UL designs M533 and L901), but despite successful results, no listings were promulgated.
FIRESTOP TESTING FOR MWT ASSEMBLIES
MWT industry has been proactive

• 2013 was the start of ramping firestop tests in MWT

• Significant investment made
  • Lead by MWT industry groups with support from key firestop industry participants

• The MWT industry wants to address fire safety
  • Basing firestops on testing may present inconveniences, but it will lead to the industry coming together to support

Test data & photos shared is publicly available.
## Firestop Tests in MWT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLT Panel</th>
<th>Exposed Side Protection</th>
<th>Penetrating Item</th>
<th>Penetrant Centered or Offset in Hole</th>
<th>F Rating</th>
<th>T Rating</th>
<th>Test Protocol</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Testing Lab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-ply (78mm 3.07&quot;)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1.5&quot; diameter data cable bunch</td>
<td>Centered</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>0.5 hour</td>
<td>CAN ULCS115</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Intertek March 30, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-ply (78mm 3.07&quot;)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2&quot; copper pipe</td>
<td>Centered</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>CAN ULCS115</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Intertek March 30, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-ply (78mm 3.07&quot;)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.5&quot; sched. 40 pipe</td>
<td>Centered</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>CAN ULCS115</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Intertek March 30, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-ply (78mm 3.07&quot;)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>6&quot; cast iron pipe</td>
<td>Centered</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>CAN ULCS115</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Intertek March 30, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Partial List of Fire Resistance Testing Complied by WoodWorks (Ref. 6)
Firestop Tests in MWT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firestopping System Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5 in diameter hole. Mineral wool was installed in the 1in. annular space around the data cables to a total depth of approximately 2 – 5/64in. The remaining 1in. annular space from the top of the mineral wool to the top of the floor assembly was filled with Hilti FS-One Max caulking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.375 in diameter hole. Pipe wrap was installed around the copper pipe to a total depth of approximately 2 – 5/64in. The remaining 1in. annular space starting at the top of the mineral wool to the top of the floor assembly was filled with Hilti FS-One Max caulking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.92 in diameter hole. Pipe wrap was installed around the schedule 40 pipe to a total depth of approximately 2 – 5/64in. The remaining 1in. annular space starting at the top of the pipe wrap to the top of the floor assembly was filled with Hilti FS-One Max caulking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.35 in diameter hole. Mineral wool was installed in the 1in. annular space around the cast iron pipe to a total depth of approximately 2 – 5/64in. The remaining 1in. annular space starting at the top of the pipe wrap to the top of the floor assembly was filled with Hilti FS-One Max caulking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Partial List of Fire Resistance Testing Compiled by WoodWorks (Ref. 6)

- WoodWorks is an industry group focused on MWT education.
  - Have compiled firestop test records of early efforts in 2016 & 2017
    - Publicly available online
Firestop Industry & Mass Timber Conference 2019 – Penetrations Comparison Study

- Test program compared three (3) CLT assemblies
- Identical through-penetrations & firestops
- Test duration was 1-1/2 hour (90 minutes) in accordance with UL 1479 4th Edition

**Goal:** Investigate firestop system attributes and develop means for data extension between MWT types

**Table 2: Attributes of CLT Floor Assemblies** (Ref. 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTE</th>
<th>FLOOR 1 – CLT1</th>
<th>FLOOR 2 – CLT2</th>
<th>FLOOR 3 – CLT3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THICKNESS</td>
<td>5”</td>
<td>6-7/8”</td>
<td>6-7/8”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOOD SPECIES</td>
<td>Austrian spruce</td>
<td>Spruce-pine-fir (90% black spruce)</td>
<td>Douglas fir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHESIVE</td>
<td>Polyurethane (PUR)</td>
<td>Formaldehyde</td>
<td>Formaldehyde</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 3: Penetration and Firestop System Details (Ref. 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>PENETRATION A</th>
<th>PENETRATION B</th>
<th>PENETRATION C</th>
<th>PENETRATION D</th>
<th>PENETRATION E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>4” Copper Pipe</td>
<td>4” Copper Pipe</td>
<td>6” Steel w/2” Glass Fiber</td>
<td>4” PVC (sch. 40, vented)</td>
<td>2” Polypropylene Random (PP-R) Pipe (SDR 7.4, closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACKING MATERIAL</td>
<td>Mineral Wool</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Mineral Wool</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEALANT</td>
<td>Intumescent</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Intumescent</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVICE</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Drop-in device with intumescent strips</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Drop-in device with intumescent strips</td>
<td>Drop-in device with intumescent strips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Firestop Industry & Mass Timber Conference 2019 – Penetrations Comparison Study

**Firestop Method 1: Drop-In Device with Intumescent Strips**

1. CLT floor assembly
2. Drop-in device
   - Secured to top of floor using 1” long wood screws
   - 2-7/8” height
   - Intumescent strips on outside and inside of device at bottom of device
3. Penetrating item
   - Copper, PVC, and PP-R were tested

Fig. 8: Section View, Drop-In Firestop System (Ref. 5)
Firestop Industry & Mass Timber Conference 2019 – Penetrations Comparison Study

Firestop Method 2: Intumescent Sealant Over Mineral Wool

1. CLT floor assembly
2. Penetrating item
   • Insulated steel and bare copper were tested
3. Pipe Insulation
   • 2” thickness of glass fiber
4. Mineral wool
   • Recessed 1” from bottom of floor
5. Intumescent Firestop Sealant
   • ¾” depth

Fig. 9: Section View, Sealant Firestop System (Ref. 5)
Firestop Industry & Mass Timber Conference 2019 – Penetrations Comparison Study

Fig. 10: CLT 1 Non-Exposed Side, Pre-Fire Endurance (Ref. 5)

Fig. 11: CLT3 Exposed Side, Pre-Fire Endurance (Ref. 5)
All penetrations, except 4” PVC, passed for all floors

4” PVC passed for CLT1 (5” thick) only
  - Depth of floor vs. depth of firestop

Passing Includes:
  - Fire Endurance
  - Hose Stream
  - 90 minute F-rating

Insulated 4” steel pipe achieved T-rating
  - 90 min. for CLT2/CLT3, 60 min. for CLT1
Fig. 13: CLT1 Exposed Side, Post Fire Endurance (Ref. 5)

Fig. 14: CLT2 Exposed Side, Post Fire Endurance (Ref. 5)

Fig. 15: CLT3 Exposed Side, Post Fire Endurance (Ref. 5)
Firestop Industry & Mass Timber Conference 2019 – Penetrations Comparison Study

Fig. 16: CLT 1 Exposed Side Post Hose Stream (Ref. 5)

Fig. 17: CLT2 Exposed Side, Post Hose Stream (Ref. 5)

Fig. 18: CLT3 Exposed Side, Post Hose Stream (Ref. 5)
Test Details

- Gypsum wall (steel stud) to underside of CLT
- 2-Hr rating goal
- ½” nominal joint width
- Class II Movement: 50% compression/extension
- Firestop: Intumescent top track installed over ceiling runner and filling joint
- Standard: UL 2079 5th Edition (applicable to CAN/ULC S115-18)
Key Learnings

- Material loss from CLT
- CLT degraded unevenly
  - Non-uniform delamination
- Delamination did not physically impair joint or wall
- Test setup modification
  - Insulate front, top and side of CLT

Fig. 20: Test Assembly Profile, Post Fire Endurance (Ref. 5)
Firestop Testing to 50Pa

- 2-Hr ratings
  - Up to 4” PVC (sch. 40)

- 1-Hr ratings
  - Up to 6” XFR-PVC

- Testing a plastic pipe through MWT at 50Pa is
  - Akin to having fuel in the pipe during the test
    - Effluents from MWT are combustible – think backdraft

Any 50Pa firestop system must be based on testing

Figure 21: Nonexposed side of a CLT test assembly during a CAN/ULC S115 penetration test at 50Pa. Photo courtesy of Hilti Inc.
CLOSING REMARKS
Closing Remarks

• Tested firestop solutions in MWT are available to keep pace with industry growth

• Industry stakeholders have taken initiative to address life-safety via fire tests of MWT assemblies

• It may be that listing & certification agencies are not the best resources during this time of rapid growth and innovation

• MWT projects will continue to become a more common

• Canada should soon have codified provisions for EMTC
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