

The program of research on building materials and structures, carried on by the National Bureau of Standards, was undertaken with the assistance of the Central Housing Committee, an informal organization of governmental agencies concerned with housing construction and finance, which is cooperating in the investigations through a subcommittee of principal technical assistants.

CENTRAL HOUSING COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TECHNICAL RESEARCH

WALTER JUNGE, Chairman, Federal Housing Administration. ARTHUR C. SHIRE, Vice Chairman, United States Housing Authority.

STERLING R. MARCH, Secretary

Albert G. Bear,	George E. Knox,
Veterans Administration.	Yards and Docks (Navy).
PIERRE BLOUKE,	VINCENT B. PHELAN,
Federal Home Loan Bank Board.	National Bureau of Standards (Com-
CARROLL W. CHAMBERLAIN,	merce).
Procurement Division (Treasury).	Edward A. Poynton,
JOSEPH M. DALLAVALLE,	Office of Indian Affairs (Interior).
Public Health Service (Federal Security	GEORGE W. TRAYER,
Agency).	Forest Service (Agriculture).
John Donovan,	Elsmere J. Walters,
Farm Security Administration (Agri-	Construction Division (War).
culture).	

CHAIRMEN OF SECTIONS

Specifications	Materials	Maintenance
CARROLL W. CHAMBERLAIN	Elsmere J. Walters	JOHN H. SCHAEFER
Mechanical Equipment		Methods and Practices

ROBERT K. THULMAN

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

STAFF COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION

HUGH L. DRYDEN, Chairman.

Mechanics and Sound

Phaon H. Bates,	
Clay and Silicate Products.	
HOBART C. DICKINSON,	
Heat and Power.	
WARREN E. EMLEY,	
Organic and Fibrous Materials.	

GUSTAV E. F. LUNDELL, Chemistry. ADDAMS S. MCALLISTER, Codes and Specifications. HENRY S. RAWDON, Metallurgy.

The Forest Products Laboratory of the United States Department of Agriculture is cooperating with both committees on investigations of wood constructions.

[For list of BMS publications and how to purchase, see cover page III]

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE · Harry L. Hopkins, Secretary NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS · Lyman J. Briggs, Director

BUILDING MATERIALS and STRUCTURES

REPORT BMS23

Structural Properties of a Brick Cavity-Wall Construction Sponsored by the Brick Manufacturers Association of New York, Inc.

by HERBERT L. WHITTEMORE, AMBROSE H. STANG, and DOUGLAS E. PARSONS



ISSUED AUGUST 31, 1939

The National Bureau of Standards is a fact-finding organization; it does not "approve" any particular material or method of construction. The technical findings in this series of reports are to be construed accordingly.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE • WASHINGTON • 1939 FOR SALE BY THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS, WASHINGTON, D. C. • FRICE IO CENTS

Foreword

This report is one of a series issued by the National Bureau of Standards on the structural properties of constructions intended for low-cost houses and apartments. Practically all of these constructions were sponsored by groups within the building industry which advocate and promote the use of such constructions and which have built and submitted representative specimens, as outlined in report BMS2, Methods of Determining the Structural Properties of Low-Cost House Constructions. The sponsor is responsible for the representative character of the specimens and for the description given in each report. The Bureau is responsible for the test data.

This report covers only the load-deformation relations and strength of the wall of a house when subjected to compressive, transverse, concentrated, impact, and racking loads by standardized methods simulating the loads to which the wall would be subjected in actual service. It may be feasible later to determine the heat transmission at ordinary temperatures and the fire resistance of this construction and perhaps other properties.

The National Bureau of Standards does not "approve" a construction, nor does it express an opinion as to the merits of a construction for the reasons given in reports BMS1 and BMS2. The technical facts on this and other constructions provide the basic data from which architects and engineers can determine whether a construction meets desired performance requirements.

LYMAN J. BRIGGS, Director.

Structural Properties of a Brick Cavity-Wall Construction Sponsored by the Brick Manufacturers Association of New York, Inc.

by HERBERT L. WHITTEMORE, AMBROSE H. STANG, and DOUGLAS E. PARSONS

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	11
I. Introduction	1
II. Sponsor and product	2
III. Specimens and tests	2
IV. Wall BD	2
1. Sponsor's statement	2
(a) Materials	2
(b) Description	3
(1) Four-foot wall speci-	
mens	3
(2) Eight-foot wall speci-	
mens	3

ABSTRACT

For the program on the determination of the structural properties of low-cost house constructions, the Brick Manufacturers Association of New York, Inc., submitted 15 specimens representing a brick cavitywall construction.

The specimens were subjected to compressive, transverse, concentrated, impact, and racking loads. The compressive loads were applied to the facing and backing of three specimens and to the backing only of three other specimens. For each of the loads, three like specimens were tested. The deformation under load and the set after the load was removed were measured for uniform increments of load, except for concentrated loads, for which the set only was determined. The results are presented graphically and in a table.

I. INTRODUCTION

In order to provide technical facts on the performance of constructions which might be used in low-eost houses, to discover promising constructions, and ultimately to determine the properties necessary for acceptable performance, the National Bureau of Standards has invited the building industry to cooperate in a program of research on building materials and structures for use in low-eost houses and apartments. The objectives of this program are described in report BMS1, Research on Building Materials

Page

IV. Wall <i>BD</i> —Continued.	
(c) Fabrication data	4
(d) Comments	4
2. Compressive load	5
(a) Load on facing and backing	5
(b) Load on backing only	- 6
3. Transverse load	$\overline{7}$
4. Concentrated load	- 9
5. Impact load	- 9
6. Racking load	11
V. Selected references	12

and Structures for Use in Low-Cost Housing, and that part of the program relating to the structural properties in report BMS2, Methods of Determining the Structural Properties of Low-Cost House Constructions.

As a part of the research on structural properties, six masonry wall constructions have been subjected to a series of standardized laboratory tests to provide data on the properties of some constructions for which the behavior in service is generally known. These data are given in report BMS5, Structural Properties of Six Masonry Wall Constructions. Similar tests have been made on wood-frame constructions by the Forest Products Laboratory of the United States Department of Agrieulture, the results of which will be given in a subsequent report in this series.

This present report describes the structural properties of a wall construction sponsored by one of the groups in the building industry. The specimens were subjected to compressive, transverse, concentrated, impact, and racking loads, simulating loads to which the walls of a house are subjected. In actual service, compressive loads on a wall are produced by the weight of the roof, second floor and secondstory walls if any, furniture and occupants, wind load on adjoining second-story walls, and snow and wind loads on the roof. Transverse loads on a wall are produced by the wind, concentrated and impact loads by furniture or accidental contact with heavy objects, and racking loads by the action of the wind on adjoining walls.

The deformation and set under each increment of load were measured because the suitability of a wall construction depends in part on its resistance to deformation under load and whether it returns to its original size and shape when the load is removed.

II. SPONSOR AND PRODUCT

The specimens were submitted by the Brick Manufacturers Association of New York, Inc., New York, N. Y., and represented a brick cavity-wall construction. The specimens consisted of a brick facing and backing separated by an air space and connected by steel wall ties. The joints were cement-lime mortar.

III. SPECIMENS AND TESTS

The wall construction was assigned the symbol BD, and the specimens were assigned the designations given in table 1.

TABLE	1.—Specimen	designations,	$wall \ BD$
-------	-------------	---------------	-------------

Specimen desig- nation	Load	Load applied
C1, C2, C3	Compressive	Upper end, 3.12 in. from the inside
C1a, C2a, C3a	do	Upper end, on backing only, cen- tered on backing.
T1. T2. T3	Transverse	Either face.
P1, P2, P3 a	Concentrated	D0.
I1, I2, I3	Impact	Do.
R1, R2, R3	Racking	Near upper end.

• These specimens were undamaged portions of the transverse specimens.

The specimens were tested in accordance with BMS2, Methods of Determining the Structural Properties of Low-Cost House Constructions, which also gives the requirements for the specimens and describes the presentation of the results of the tests, particularly the loaddeformation graphs.

For the compressive load, three specimens were tested with the load applied to the facing and the backing, one-third the thickness of the specimens from the inside face, and three additional specimens with the load applied to the backing only, centered on the backing.

For the transverse, concentrated, and impact loads, only three specimens for each loading were tested, because the wall was symmetrical about a plane midway between the faces, and the results for loads applied to one face of the specimens should be the same as those obtained by applying the loads to the other face.

The tests were begun July 21, 1938 and completed September 16, 1938. The specimens were tested 28 days after they were built. The sponsor's representative witnessed the tests.

IV. WALL BD

1. Sponsor's Statement

(a) Materials

Brick.—Clay brick, formed in sanded molds by the soft-mud process, and having frogs (depressed panels), 6 by 2 by $\frac{1}{8}$ in., on one side, with the raised letters "SSBCO." The average dimensions were 8.09 by 3.65 by 2.30 in. (about $8\frac{1}{16}$ by $3^2\frac{1}{22}$ by $2\frac{5}{16}$ in). Sutton & Sudderly Brick Co., Coeymans, N. Y.

The following properties of the brick were determined by the Masonry Construction Section of the National Bureau of Standards. When laid, the brick were damp. The absorption for 1-min partial immersion was determined for two bricks taken about every 30 min from the mason's scaffold. The physical properties of the brick, determined in accordance with the American Society for Testing Materials Standard C 67-37,⁴ are given in table 2.

TABLE 2.—Physical properties of the brick, wall BD

		Water absorption						
Com- pressive strength	Modu- lus of rupture	5-hr	24-hr	5-hr	Satura- tion coeffi-	1-min imme	partial rsion ^a	Weight, dry
	cold		B	$\frac{C}{\overline{B}}$	Dry	As laid	-	
lb/in.² 3, 240	<i>lb/in.</i> ² 540	Per- cent 13. 4	Per- cent 13. 8	Per- cent 18.7	0.74	Grams/ brick 41	Grams/ brick 15	/b/brick 4.13

^a Immersed on flat side in ¹/₈ in. of water.

¹ Am. Soc. Testing Materials Supplement to Book of ASTM Standards, 78-82 (1937).

Mortar.—The materials for the mortar were Medusa Cement Co.'s "Medusa" portland cement, lime putty made by slaking Standard Lime and Stone Co.'s "Washington" powdered quicklime, and Potomac River building sand.

The mortar was 1 part of cement, 0.42 part of hydrated lime, and 5.1 parts of dry sand, by weight. The proportions by volume were 1 part of cement, 1 part of hydrated lime, and 6 parts of loose damp sand, assuming that portland cement weighs 94 lb/ft³, dry hydrated lime 40 lb/ft³, and 80 lb of dry sand is equivalent to 1 ft³ of loose damp sand. The materials for each batch were measured by weight and mixed in a batch mixer having a capacity of 2/3 ft³. The amount of water added to the mortar was adjusted to the satisfaction of the mason.

The following properties of the mortar materials and of the mortar were determined by the Masonry Construction Section. The cement complied with the requirements of Federal Specification SS-C-191a for fineness, soundness, time of setting, and tensile strength. The lime putty contained 40 to 45 percent of dry hydrate, by weight, and had a plasticity of over 600, measured in accordance with Federal Specification SS-L-351. The sieve analysis of the sand is given in table 3.

TABLE 3.-Sieve analysis of the sand, wall BD

United States Standard sieve No.	Passing, by weight
8 16 30 50 100	Percent 100 88 53 9 1

The average water content of the mortar was 22.3 percent, by weight of dry materials. Samples were taken from at least one batch of mortar for each wall specimen, the flow determined in accordance with Federal Specification SS-C-181b, and six 2-in. cubes made. Three cubes were stored in water at 70° F, and three were stored in air near the wall specimen. The compressive strength of each cube was determined on the day the corresponding wall specimen was tested. The physical properties of the mortar are given in table 4.

TABLE 4.- Physical properties of the mortar, wall BD

		Compressive strength		
Specimen	Flow	Air storage	Water stor- age	
C1 C2 C3	Percent 106 108	lb/in.: 598 588	lb/in. ² 658 670 776	
C1a. C2a. C3a.	115 101 108	586 544 592	703 660 617	
T1. T2. T3.	$104 \\ 112 \\ 101$	560 699 576	683 751 666	
11 12 13	103 110 108	540 548 653	700 717 744	
R1	111	592 541 543 558	808 830 753 792	
R3	102 105	548 425	838 745	
Average	108	576	732	

Wall ties.—Steel, $\frac{1}{4}$ -in. diam, bent to a Z shape with 90° angles between the outstanding legs and the stem. The length of the stem was 6 in. and of the outstanding legs 3 in.

(b) Description

(1) Four-foot wall specimens.—The 4-ft wall specimens were 8 ft $2\frac{1}{2}$ in. high, 4 ft 0 in. wide, and $9\frac{3}{8}$ in. thick. The specimens were built with a brick facing, A, and backing, B, as shown in figure 1, separated by an air space, C, and connected by steel wall ties, D. There were 35 courses of brick in both the facing and the backing. Two wall ties, spaced 2 ft 0 in. on centers, were placed every sixth course starting with the joint between the third and fourth courses.

The bed joints were furrowed. The head joints were formed by applying the mortar cut from the bed joint at the face of the specimen to the outer edge of the brick and that from the cavity side to the bottom edge of the brick before placing. This resulted in solidly filled head joints.

The price of this construction in Washington, D. C., as of July 1937, was \$0.40/ft².

(2) Eight-foot wall specimens.—The 8-ft wall specimens were 8 ft $2\frac{1}{2}$ in. high, 8 ft 1 in. wide, and $9\frac{3}{6}$ in. thick. The specimens were similar to the 4-ft specimens. There were four wall ties, spaced 2 ft 0 in. on centers, placed every



FIGURE 1.—Four-foot wall specimen BD. A, facing; B, backing; C, air space; D, wall ties.

sixth course, starting with the joint between the third and fourth courses.

(c) Fabrication Data

The fabrication data, determined by the Masonry Construction Section, are given in table 5.

TABLE 5.—Fabrication data, wall BD

[The values per square foot were computed using the face area of the specimens]

Thickness of joints		Masonry	Mortar materials			Mason's
Bed	Head	units	Cement	Lime, dry hydrate	Sand. dry	time
in. 0.52	in. 0.38	Number/ft ² 12.1	$\frac{lb/ft^2}{2.87}$	$lb/ft^2 = 1.21$	<i>lb/jt</i> ² 14. 6	hr/ft [:] 0, 183

(d) Comments

Brick cavity walls are widely used in Europe, especially in England, where cavity-wall construction is commonly used for brick walls. Because the two sections of cavity walls are connected only by the small steel wall ties, any moisture which penetrates the facing will run down the inside of the facing. Consequently, provision must be made to catch this moisture at the bottom of the cavity or above openings,







FIGURE 2.—Flashing above and below windows, and dampproofing at bottom of cavity walls.

A, flashing; B, wall ties; C, dampproofing; D, weep holes.

and deflect it outward. This is usually done by means of flexible dampproofing or flashing, as shown in figure 2. Weep holes or open joints may be provided to allow collected moisture to drain from the bottom of the cavity.

Furring, lath, and plaster, or other insulation or finish may be applied to the inside face of cavity walls in the same manner as to solid walls. It has not been considered good practice, however, to place insulation inside the cavity.

2. Compressive Load

(a) Load on Facing and Backing

Specimens BD-C1, C2, and C3 were tested in accordance with BMS2. The compressive loads were applied to both the facing and the backing, 3.12 in. from the inside face.

Wall specimen BD-C2 under compressive load is shown in figure 3. The results for wall specimens BD-C1, C2, and C3 are shown in table 6 and in figures 4 and 5.



FIGURE 3.--Wall specimen BD-C2 under compressive load, load applied to both facing and backing.



FIGURE 4.—Compressive load on wall BD, load applied to facing and backing.

Load-shortening (open circles) and load-set (solid circles) results for specimens *BD-C1*, *C2*, and *C3*. Load applied 3.12 in. from the inside face. The loads are in kips per foot of actual width of specimen.



FIGURE 5.—Compressive load on wall BD, load applied to facing and backing.

Load-lateral deflection (open circles) and load-lateral set (solid circles) results for specimens BD-C1, C2, and C3. Load applied 3.12 in. from the inside face. The loads are in kips per foot of actual width of specimen. The deflections and sets are for a gage length of 7 ft 3 in., the gage length of the deflectometers.

TABLE 6.—Structural properties, wall BD

[Weight, 67.6 lb/ft²]

Load	Load applied	Speci- men desig- nation	Fail- ure of loaded face, height of drop	Fail- ure of oppo- site face, height of drop	Maxi- mum height of drop	Maxi- mum load
Compressive_	{Upper end, 3.12 in. from the inside face	$\left\{\begin{array}{c} C1\\ C2\\ C3\end{array}\right.$	ft	ft	ft	*Kips/ft 62, 6 61, 7 61, 9
	Average					62.1
Do	{Upper end on backing only, centered on backing	$\left. \begin{array}{c} C1a\\ C2a\\ C3a \end{array} \right.$				50. 9 48. 3 52. 5
	Average					50.6
Transverse	{One face; span, 7 ft 6 in.	$\left\{\begin{array}{c}T1\\T2\\T3\end{array}\right.$				$\frac{!b/ft^2}{22.0}\\ 30.0\\ 24.0$
	Average					25.3
Concentrated.	One face	$\left\{\begin{array}{c} P1\\ P2\\ P3\end{array}\right.$				<i>1b</i> • 1.000 646 • 1.000
	Average					
Impact	{One face; span, 7 ft 6 in.	$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} I1\\ I2\\ I3\\ I3 \end{array} \right.$	(c) 1.5 1.5	3.0 2.5 2.0	3.0 3.5 2.0	
	Average			2.5	2.8	
Racking	Near upper end	$\left\{\begin{array}{c} R1\\ R2\\ R3\end{array}\right.$				^a Kips/ft 4.95 6.03 6.00
	Average	~				5.66

^a A kip is 1,000 lb.

Specimen did not fail. Test discontinued.
There was a crack in the loaded face before the test.

The shortenings and sets shown in figure 4 for a height of 8 ft were computed from the values obtained from the compressometer readings. The gage length of the compressometers was 7 ft 4 in.

Specimens C1 and C2 failed by crushing of the brick and the mortar bed joints in two or three courses of the backing at about twothirds the height, followed by rupture of both backing and facing at this height. Specimen C3failed by crushing of a few bricks and the mortar bed joint in one course of the backing at about two-thirds the height.

(b) Load on Backing Only

Specimens *BD-C1a*, *C2a*, and *C3a* were tested in addition to the specimens required by BMS2. The compressive loads were applied to the backing only and centered on the backing.



FIGURE 6.— Wall specimen BD-C1a under compressive load, load applied to backing only.

This loading probably more nearly represents the load transmitted to the wall by the floor joists.

Wall specimen BD-C1a under compressive load is shown in figure 6. The results for wall specimens C1a, C2a, and C3a are shown in table 6 and in figures 7 and 8.

The shortenings and sets shown in figure 7 for a height of 8 ft were computed from the values obtained from the compressometer readings. The gage length of the compressometers was 7 ft 3 in.

Specimen C1a failed by crushing of a few bricks and the mortar bed joint in one course of the backing at about two-thirds the height, followed by rupture of both backing and facing. Specimen C2a failed by crushing of a few bricks in one course of the backing near the upper end of the specimen and cracking of the backing vertically at midwidth from about midheight to the upper end. Specimen C3a failed by crushing of one mortar bed joint of the backing at about two-thirds the height and cracking of the backing vertically.

3. TRANSVERSE LOAD

Wall specimen BD-T3 under transverse load is shown in figure 9. The results for wall specimens BD-T1, T2, and T3 are shown in table 6 and in figure 10.



FIGURE 7. Compressive load on walt BD, load applied to backing only.

Load-shortening (open circles) and load-set (solid circles) results for specimens *BD-Cla*, *C2a*, and *C3a*. Load centered on backing. The loads are in kips per foot of actual width of specimen.



FIGURE 8.—Compressive load on wall BD, load applied to backing only.

Load-lateral deflection (open circles) and load-lateral set (solid circles) results for specimens BD-Cla, C2a, and C5a. Load centered on backing. The loads are in kips per foot of actual width of specimen. The deflections and sets are for a gage length of 7 ft 3 in., the gage length of the deflectometers.



FIGURE 9.—Wall specimen BD-T3 under transverse load.

The deflections shown in figure 10 are the averages of the deflections of the loaded face and the opposite face, measured independently. The loaded face deflected the same amount as the opposite face within 0.01 in., the estimated error of measurement.

Each of the specimens failed by rupture of the bond between the brick and the mortar at one bed joint near a loading roller in both the loaded face and the opposite face. The rupture of the joint in the loaded face of specimen T1 occurred at a joint having ties. The opposite face of specimen T1 and both faces of specimens T2 and T3 failed at joints having no ties.



FIGURE 10.— Transverse load on wall BD.

Load-deflection (open circles) and load-set (solid circles) results for specimens BD-T1, T2, and T3 on the span 7 ft 6 in. The deflections and sets are for a gage length of 7 ft 3 in., the gage length of the deflectometers.



FIGURE 11.—Wall specimen BD-P1 under concentrated load.



FIGURE 12.—Concentrated load on wall BD. Load-indentation results for specimens BD-P1, P2, and P3.

4. Concentrated Load

Wall specimen BD-P1 under concentrated load is shown in figure 11. The results for wall specimens BD-P1, P2, and P3 are shown in table 6 and in figure 12.

The concentrated loads were applied to one face of each of specimens P1 and P2 at the center of the rectangle formed by four ties, the load being applied at the junction of a bed and a head joint for specimen P1 and on a head joint for specimen P2. The concentrated loads were applied to specimen P3 at midwidth on a brick in a course which was two courses above a bed joint having ties. The indentations after a load of 1,000 lb had been applied were 0.001 in. for specimens P1 and P3 and no other effect was observed. Specimen P2 failed at a load of 646 lb by rupture of the bond between the brick and the mortar at the bed joint below the course to which the load was applied.

5. IMPACT LOAD

Wall specimen BD-I3 under impact load is shown in figure 13. The results for wall specimens BD-I1, I2, and I3 are shown in table 6 and in figure 14.





The impact loads were applied to the center of one face of each specimen, the sandbag striking the face between wall ties. Specimen *I1* had a crack in a bed joint in the loaded face at four-fifths the height before the test and, therefore, no set readings for this specimen were taken. This crack probably occurred when the specimen was moved to the impact equipment. No other cracks were observed in this face during the test. The opposite face of this specimen failed by rupture of the bond between the brick and the mortar at a bed joint two courses above the crack in the loaded face. For specimen I2 at a drop of 1.5 ft, a bed joint near midheight in the loaded face cracked, and at 2.5 ft a bed joint three courses above in the opposite face also cracked. At the maximum drop the specimen failed by rupture of the bond between the brick and the mortar at the bed joints previously cracked. For specimen I3 at a drop of 1.5 ft a bed joint at two-thirds the height in the loaded face cracked. At the maximum drop the specimen failed by rupture of the bond between the brick and the mortar at this joint and at a joint at the same height in the opposite face.

6. RACKING LOAD

Wall specimen BD-R2 under racking load is shown in figure 15. The results for wall specimens BD-R1, R2, and R3 are shown in table 6 and in figure 16.

The deformations and sets shown in figure 16 for a height of 8 ft were computed from the measuring-device readings. The gage length of the vertical measuring device was 6 ft 4 in. The gage length of the horizontal measuring device was 5 ft 0 in.

Specimens R1 and R3 failed by rupture of both facing and backing approximately along a diagonal between the point of application of load and the stop. The cracks followed the joints in some places and passed directly through the brick in other places. Specimen R2 failed by rupture of the backing only. The failure of the backing was similar to that for specimens R1 and R3.



Height of drop-deflection (open circles) and height of drop-set (solid circles) results for specimens *BD*-*I*1, *I*2, and *I*3 on the span 7 ft 6 in.



FIGURE 15.—Wall specimen BD-R2 under racking load.





FIGURE 16.—*Radking load on wall BD*. Load-deformation (open circles) and load-set (solid circles) results for specimens *BD*-*R1*, *R2*, and *R3*. The loads are in kips per foot of actual width of specimen.

The drawings of the specimens were prepared by E. J. Schell, G. W. Shaw, and T. J. Hanley of the Bureau's Building Practice and Specifications Section, under the supervision of V. B. Phelan.

The structural properties were determined by the Engineering Mechanics Section, under the supervision of H. L. Whittemore and A. H. Stang, and the Masonry Construction Section, under the supervision of D. E. Parsons, with the assistance of the following members of the professional staff: C. C. Fishburn, F. Cardile, R. C. Carter, H. Dollar, M. Dubin, A. H. Easton, A. S. Endler, C. D. Johnson, P. H. Petersen, A. J. Sussman, and L. R. Sweetman.

V. SELECTED REFERENCES

- Edwin Gunn, Survey of modern building techniques domestic and similar structures, Architect and Building News (London), 152, 101-2 (1937).
- Notes from the Information Bureau of the Building Research Station, Architect and Building News (London), 153, 234 (1938); 156, 199-200 (1938);
 Master Builder (London), p. 806 (Nov. 1938).
- Leonard W. Burridge, Weatherproof brickwork, The British Clayworker, p. 119–31 (July 1938).
- London County Council, Construction of Buildings in London, p. 22 and 28 (June 1938).

WASHINGTON, April 6, 1939.

 \bigcirc





BUILDING MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES REPORTS

The following publications in this series are now available by purchase from the Superintendent of Documents at the prices indicated:

BMS1	Research on Building Materials and Structures for Use in Low-Cost Housing	10 e
BMS2	Methods of Determining the Structural Properties of Low-Cost House Constructions	10¢
BMS3	Suitability of Fiber Insulating Lath as a Plaster Base	10¢
BMS4	Accelerated Aging of Fiber Building Boards	10¢
BMS5	Structural Properties of Six Masonry Wall Constructions	15¢
BMS6	Survey of Roofing Materials in the Southeastern States	15¢
BMS7	Water Permeability of Masonry Walls	10¢
BMS8	Methods of Investigation of Surface Treatment for Corrosion Protection of Steel	10¢
BMS9	Structural Properties of the Insulated Steel Construction Co.'s "Frameless-Steel"	· ·
	Constructions for Walls, Partitions, Floors, and Roofs	10¢
BMS10	Structural Properties of One of the "Keystone Beam Steel Floor" Constructions Spon-	
	sored by the H. H. Robertson Co	10¢
BMS11	Structural Properties of the Curren Fabrihome Corporation's "Fabrihome" Construc-	
	tions for Walls and Partitions	10¢
BMS12	Structural Properties of "Steelox" Constructions for Walls, Partitions, Floors, and Roofs	
	Sponsored by Steel Buildings, Inc	15ϕ
BMS13	Properties of Some Fiber Building Boards of Current Manufacture	10¢
BMS14	Indentation and Recovery of Low-Cost Floor Coverings	10¢
BMS15	Structural Properties of "Wheeling Long-Span Steel Floor" Construction Sponsored by	
	the Wheeling Corrugating Co	10¢
BMS16	Structural Properties of a "Tilecrete" Floor Construction Sponsored by Tilecrete Floors,	
	Inc	10ϕ
BMS17	Sound Insulation of Wall and Floor Constructions	10¢
BMS18	Structural Properties of "Pre-Fab" Constructions for Walls, Partitions, and Floors	
	Sponsored by the Harnischfeger Corporation	10¢
BMS19	Preparation and Revision of Building Codes	15ϕ
BMS20	Structural Properties of "Twachtman" Constructions for Walls and Floors Sponsored by	
	Connecticut Pre-Cast Buildings Corporation	10ϕ
BMS21	Structural Properties of a Concrete-Block Cavity-Wall Construction Sponsored by the	
	National Concrete Masonry Association	10ϕ
BMS22	Structural Properties of "Dun-Ti-Stone" Wall Construction Sponsored by the W. E.	
	Dunn Manufacturing Co	10¢

How To Purchase BUILDING MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES REPORTS

On request, the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., will place your name on a special mailing list to receive notices of new reports in this series as soon as they are issued. There will be no charge for receiving such notices.

An alternative method is to deposit with the Superintendent of Documents the sum of \$5, with the request that the reports be sent to you as soon as issued, and that the cost thereof be charged against your deposit. This will provide for the mailing of the publications without delay. You will be notified when the amount of your deposit has become exhausted.

If 100 copies or more of any report are ordered at one time, a discount of 25 percent is allowed. Send all orders and remittances to the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

·