



FLORIDA SOLAR ENERGY CENTER®

*Creating Energy Independence*

# **Opportunities for Energy Conservation and Improved Comfort From Wind Washing Retrofits in Two-Story Homes - Part II**

FSEC-PF-450-10

September, 2010

## **Original Publication**

Withers, C. and Cummings, J. "Opportunities for Energy Conservation and Improved Comfort From Wind Washing Retrofits in Two-Story Homes – Part II", Seventeenth Symposium on Improving Building Systems in Hot and Humid Climates, August 24, 2010, in Austin, TX.

## **Authors**

Charles Withers  
James Cummings

Copyright ©2009 Florida Solar Energy Center/University of Central Florida  
All Rights Reserved.

1679 Clearlake Road  
Cocoa, Florida 32922, USA  
(321) 638-1000

[www.floridaenergycenter.org](http://www.floridaenergycenter.org)



A Research Institute of the University of Central Florida

## **Disclaimer**

The Florida Solar Energy Center/University of Central Florida nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the Florida Solar Energy Center/University of Central Florida or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the Florida Solar Energy Center/University of Central Florida or any agency thereof.

# Opportunities for Energy Conservation and Improved Comfort From Wind Washing Retrofits in Two-Story Homes - Part II

Charles R. Withers, Jr.  
Sr. Research Analyst

James B. Cummings  
Program Director

Florida Solar Energy Center, a research institute of the University of Central Florida, Cocoa, FL

## ABSTRACT

Wind washing is a general term referring to diminished thermal control caused by air movement partially or completely bypassing the thermal barrier. The primary focus of this paper relates to a specific type of wind washing where wind can push attic air into the floor cavity between first and second stories of the home through ineffective (or missing) air barriers separating attic space from the floor cavity. A second type of wind washing studied in this project involves insulation batts on knee walls where space between the batts and the wall board allow air movement against the gypsum wall board.

Through the summer of 2009, a field study tested thirty-two homes and found significant wind washing potential in 40% of the homes as discussed in Part I of this paper. Repairs and energy monitoring were completed in six of these homes to evaluate retrofit methods and cost effectiveness of retrofit solutions. These results are discussed here in Part II of this paper.

This paper reports average cooling energy savings measured in six homes of 15.3%. Savings were as high as 33.1% in one home. The paper also assesses the scope of these envelope problems, discusses improvements in comfort and durability, recommends retrofit solutions, and identifies energy savings potential for retrofit programs. While energy savings were only evaluated during summer weather, wind washing repairs should save energy during cold weather and be applicable throughout the nation.

## PROJECT BACKGROUND

While wind washing has been known and studied for years, most of the emphasis has been on cold climate. In a published article by Mark Sidall, he summarizes much of the work done over the years related to thermal bypass problems such as wind washing (Sidall 2009). Some of the earliest work on thermal bypass was published over 30 years ago (Bankvall, 1978). Even though previous published work has stated energy-related impacts in measures such as change in U-values or other parameters, none have quantified actual measured space cooling or

heating usage impacts in real homes, particularly in hot and humid climates (Anderson 1981, Harrje 1985, Lecompte 1990, Silerbsein 1991, Uvslokk 1996, Hens 2007, Janssens 2007). The primary goal of this project was to characterize methods and cost-effectiveness of retrofit solutions for wind washing in two-story homes. This information can then be used directly by utilities and property owners to evaluate opportunities for repairs.

## REPAIR RESULTS

Repairs were performed in six of the 32 tested homes discussed in Part I. Six repair homes were monitored for representative summer periods to characterize AC energy use and space conditions before and after repairs. Analysis has been performed to characterize cooling energy and peak demand savings. No energy analysis has been performed for the winter season.

Monitoring consisted of the following types of data.

- Power use of the AC system(s) (typically two) which serve(s) the house.
- Temperature measurements indoors, outdoors, in the attic, in the floor cavity between the first floor and the second floor of the house, and in the return and supply air of the AC systems.
- Relative humidity measurements indoors, outdoors, in the attic, and in the floor cavity between the first and second stories.

Data was collected in 15 minute time steps and stored in the memory of an on-site data acquisition system (DAS). Data was transferred daily from the DAS to the FSEC central computer system. The data was then retrieved for analysis through a program called WebGet 4.0.

## Testing Measurement Summary for Six Repaired Homes

While there were several measurements taken at each house, it was the house airtightness and duct leakage that were impacted the greatest from wind washing repairs. Table 1 below summarizes the air changes per hour at 50 pascals (Pa) (0.20 in WC), measured infiltration in air changes per hour (ach)

with the air handler unit (AHU) on, return leak fraction (RLF), and pressure pan as an indication of overall duct tightness. Testing methodologies are discussed in further detail in Part I of this paper.

**Table 1** House airtightness (ACH50), infiltration (ach) with AHU “on”, RLF, and average pressure pan readings before and after repairs.

| House # | ACH50<br>Pre<br>Post | ach<br>Pre<br>Post | RLF<br>Pre 1 <sup>st</sup> fl.<br>Post 1 <sup>st</sup> fl. | RLF<br>Pre 2 <sup>nd</sup> fl.<br>Post 2 <sup>nd</sup> fl. | P-Pan<br>Pre 1 <sup>st</sup> fl.<br>Post 1 <sup>st</sup> fl. | P-Pan<br>Pre 2 <sup>nd</sup> fl.<br>Post 2 <sup>nd</sup> fl. |
|---------|----------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|--|
| H10H    | 7.25<br>6.14         | 0.46<br>0.32       | 8.0%<br>2.2%   | 2.8%<br>1.1%   | 1.2<br>1.0   | 0.2<br>0.1   |
| H8Hd    | 9.38<br>8.56         | 0.49<br>0.30       | 0.4%<br>0.4%   | 1.1%<br>1.4%   | 0.7<br>0.3   | 0.4<br>0.2   |
| H16B    | 9.86<br>9.19         | 0.26<br>0.20       | 5.3%<br>5.3%   | 1.0%<br>1.1%   | 1.1<br>0.3   | 1.0<br>1.0   |
| H11C    | 9.65<br>9.40         | 0.73<br>0.64       | 11.5%<br>7.9%  | <i>No 2<sup>nd</sup> fl.<br/>A/C</i>                       | 2.0<br>2.2   | <i>No 2<sup>nd</sup> fl.<br/>A/C</i>                         |
| *H7G    | 12.21<br>9.52        | 0.86<br>0.31       | NA<br>2.0%   | 9.6%<br>1.1%   | 8.7<br>2.4   | 11.6<br>1.6  |
| *H14Y   | 11.26<br>11.15       | 0.59<br>0.54       | 4.0%<br>0.7%   | 1.2%<br>0.0%   | 12.7<br>1.0  | 1.2<br>1.3   |

\*post values are after duct repair and wind washing repair

Based on the six house average pre and post values, the impacts from all repairs are as follows:

- The house envelopes became 9.5% tighter.
- Infiltration with AHU “on” decreased by 32%.
- RLF decreased by 53%.
- Pressure pan values decreased by 72%.

The wind washing repair did not directly seal return leaks. Air would still leak into the return, but the repair results in the floor cavity becoming more like indoor space. With the floor cavity more isolated from the attic, there was reduced air exchange with the attic and less thermal penalty.

We find, therefore, that repair of wind washing denies duct leaks some of their opportunity to move air across the house envelope air boundary. Wind washing repair should also be considered a way to “repair” duct leaks that are inaccessible because they are located in floor cavities, and otherwise would not be repairable. Return leakage declined by 26% in the 1<sup>st</sup> story returns of the four houses in which no duct repairs were made. Return leakage declined by 41% in the 2<sup>nd</sup> story returns of the four houses in which no duct repairs were made. The 2<sup>nd</sup> story returns experienced a larger RLF reduction since these returns either run through the floor space or have plenums in contact with the floor cavity. The overall duct leakage (as indicated by pressure pan averages) declined by 23%. It is probable, therefore, that wind washing energy savings will be greater (depending

upon duct leak locations with respect to the house air envelope) in homes with large duct leaks.

#### Energy and Peak Demand Savings Analysis Method

As indicated earlier, all six homes were repaired in the same month (September) and in all cases, open-cell foam was applied to seal openings of the between-stories floor cavities. Specific details of the wind washing repairs and the impacts of those repairs are contained in the house by house descriptions that follow. In two homes (Houses H7G and H14Y), duct leak repairs were also separately implemented. We decided to correct these large duct leaks because they represent a large energy waste factor which could substantially impact the savings achieved by wind washing repairs. An energy monitoring period occurred before the duct repair or another monitoring period occurred before the wind washing repair. Because of this, we were able to identify cooling energy use in these two homes for three time periods; 1) before any repairs, 2) after duct repairs, and 3) after wind washing repairs.

Energy savings analysis was performed for each home in the following manner. A linear regression best-fit analysis was used to develop the best fit lines shown in a graph for each home. Daily cooling energy use for the house was plotted versus the temperature differential between outdoors and indoors for the day (dT). The linear equations from each period were then used with 10 year composite typical meteorological year (TMY2) data representing 4 major cities in Florida. The TMY2 data has hourly outdoor dry bulb temperature for each day of the year representing a geographical weighting of Florida Power and Light’s (FPL) residential consumers. Using the TMY data, daily energy use, for the pre-repair period and the post-repair period was calculated based on the daily temperature difference between indoors and outdoors. On cold days, the calculation results in negative cooling energy values, which have been excluded from the annual cooling energy usage. Cooling energy savings for each day of the year is summed to yield annual energy savings. Because we have not considered heating season savings, the savings estimates that we have provided under-represent the total benefit of wind washing repair.

In order to perform the peak demand analysis, five to ten of the hottest monitored days were chosen with comparable pre-repair and post-repair outdoor and indoor temperatures. Only the hours from 3 PM to 8 PM were used for this regression analysis. This five-hour period was chosen in order to obtain a better range in delta-T and provide a larger database.

Hourly energy use was plotted against the hourly average delta-T (outdoor temperature minus indoor temperature). Linear regression best-fit equations were developed separately for the pre-repair and post-repair periods, and the two best-fit equations were then used with the hourly TMY data to calculate pre and post kW for the TMY day of August 15, which had the hottest outdoor temperatures of the year from 3 PM to 6 PM. The peak kW was calculated for the hours ending at 3, 4, 5 and 6 PM, and the average for this four-hour period was used to represent the peak. The peak demand reduction was obtained by subtracting the calculated peak from the pre-repair equation from the calculated peak from the post-repair equation for that hot TMY day.

### RETROFIT DESCRIPTIONS AND MEASURED IMPACTS

This section provides a house by house discussion of the repairs and the measured wind washing repair impacts in each of six houses that were monitored.

#### House H10H and Repair Description

This 2,760 ft<sup>2</sup> slab-on-grade, frame construction residence was built in 1997. The first floor has 2,030 ft<sup>2</sup>. An attached two-car garage faces east. The second floor has 730 ft<sup>2</sup> including a small bonus room located above the unconditioned garage space. There is approximately 82.5 ft<sup>2</sup> of conditioned floor area above unconditioned space. The bonus room construction is traditional gypsum board on the interior, and is insulated with R-30 kraft-faced batts with the fiberglass side facing into the garage attic. The underside (floor cavity) of the bonus room is unsealed allowing hot air to move through the floor cavity.

The kneewall (between the garage attic and the second floor of the house) on either side of the bonus room was poorly covered with kraft faced batt and allowed airflow into the interstitial floor cavity. Numerous wires, refrigerant lines, and ducts penetrate into the floor cavity and very little effort was made during construction to effectively seal the kneewall. Figure 1 illustrates the open areas in the floor space and the floor cavity of the bonus room floor, which is open to the attic on the north side. The same problem exists on the south side (not seen in photo).

Foam insulation product was applied to the floor cavity openings and the kneewall separating the garage attic and the main house. Foam insulation was also applied to the walls of the bonus room and to the floor cavity openings beneath the bonus room. The

repairs required 2.25 man-hours (2 person crew for just over 1 hour) to cover 113 ft<sup>2</sup> of area.



Figure 1 View of kneewall and main floor space (far), and bonus room wall and floor cavity (left).

#### Pre and Post Wind Washing House Testing Results

Wind washing repair made the house envelope more airtight and reduced duct leakage from outdoors.

- After repair, the house was 15.3% more airtight.
- Implementation of wind washing repairs substantially reduced duct leakage to outdoors, even though no repairs were directly applied to duct leaks.
- RLF declined 69%.
- Average pressure pan values decreased indicating less duct leakage from outdoors, but the decrease was not greater than the accuracy of measurement at low pressures.
- After repair, the house infiltration rate with the AHUs operating was 32% lower.

#### Energy and demand savings from repairs

The linear regression of daily cooling energy versus dT was used to develop an equation. Using the TMY data weighted for FPL's four largest regional cities, the calculated annual cooling energy use for House H10H for the pre-repair and post-repair periods were 4,629 kWh and 3,793 kWh, respectively. The resulting annual cooling energy reduction is 836 kWh or 18.1%. At a typical cost of \$0.115 per kWh, this yields annual cooling energy cost savings of \$96.

Also previously described in greater detail, linear regression best-fit equations were developed separately for the pre-repair and post-repair peak demand periods. The two best-fit equations were then used with the hourly TMY data to calculate pre and post kW for the hottest outdoor temperatures of the

year from 3 PM to 6 PM. The average of this four-hour period was used to represent the peak. The peak demand reduction was obtained by subtracting the calculated peak from the pre-repair equation from the calculated peak from the post-repair equation. Based on this analysis, a reduction of 0.10 kW (from 2.10 to 2.00) in air conditioning electrical demand occurred at House H10H as a result of the wind washing retrofit. This is equivalent to a 4.5% reduction in peak demand.

### **House H8Hd and Repair Description**

This 4,175 ft<sup>2</sup> slab on grade, block and frame house is located along an inter-coastal waterway within a mile from the ocean. Soffits provide venting to the attic space located above the attached two-car garage. Beige barrel terra cotta tile provide roof coverage and limit solar heat gain on the building. The first floor has 2,450 ft<sup>2</sup> and the second floor has 1,725 ft<sup>2</sup>. There are approximately 1,653 ft<sup>2</sup> of first floor area located under the second floor interstitial floor space.



The HVAC system is made up of two high efficiency heat pumps, each serving one floor of the house. The first floor system AHU is located in the garage and the second floor system AHU is located in a second floor closet. Both systems have ducted returns and well-constructed plenums.

Prior to initial inspection, the homeowner had complained of condensation, mold, and warping on two pocket doors in the 2nd level bathroom on the north side. Our inspections also identified these moisture issues. The pocket doors are located in the east and west facing interior walls running perpendicular to the north facing exterior wall. It is also important to note that the homeowners prefer lower than average thermostat set points especially during summer evening hours. Based on our inspection, it appears that outdoor air enters through soffit venting, passes into the interstitial floor cavity,

and then flows into the interior wall cavities containing these pocket doors. The cold indoor temperatures enable the high moisture content air to condense on the surfaces of the pocket doors. Moisture condensation on supply registers had also caused damage to ceilings. The homeowners were aware of the wind washing issues in their home and had put effort into stopping this form of uncontrolled air flow prior to our inspection and testing. Ceiling surfaces had been repaired and some duct modifications had been made by a contractor about a year prior to our testing and monitoring.

The homeowner also brought to our attention warping and cracking of the grand staircase in the front foyer of the home. Upon inspection it became clear that the rear of this staircase could be well-connected to the interstitial floor cavities which are well-vented to the west-facing soffits. We hypothesize that prevailing winds (coming from the east from the nearby ocean) drive moist outdoor air into the interstitial floor cavities where it interfaces with the backside of the stair case promoting warping and separation of the wooden risers and treads as wood adsorbs moisture. Figure 3 illustrates cracking of the wooden risers. Wood moisture content was measured with a moisture meter before repair and



was found to vary from 13.1% moisture content at the top of stairs down to 9.5% moisture content towards the bottom of the stairs. The average moisture content of wood in the staircase before retrofit was 10.9%. By comparison, wood furniture inside the home had a moisture content around 7.5% to 8%, within expectations for wood located in a humidity controlled environment. The average wood moisture declined from 10.9% to 9.0% after retrofit. Cracks in the stairs, which were quite prominent prior to repair, had nearly closed within about 6 weeks of the wind washing repairs.

In addition to the staircase moisture issue, the owner also reported that supply registers on the first floor had experienced moisture condensation and

dripping in areas that were directly under the interstitial floor cavity that was experiencing wind washing. The owner also noted that ceiling drywall had been damaged in the kitchen and adjacent hallway from condensation on ductwork inside the floor cavity. This is clear evidence that wind washing air flows had penetrated into the depths of the building structure.

Prior to installation of the open-cell foam product, condensation-wetted fiberglass batts in the attic were removed. These batts had been recently installed by the homeowner (prior to our involvement with the house) in an attempt to stop air flow into the interstitial floor cavities. Where the batts were in contact with supply ducts, considerable moisture condensation had occurred (Figure 4).



Figure 4 Moisture condensed on flex ducts and accumulated on insulation materials placed in contact with the supply ducts by the homeowner. (Withers)



Figure 5 East side floor cavity isolated from the garage attic; a protective vapor barrier/thermal barrier sleeve isolates the foam from the exterior of the supply ducts to reduce the condensation potential. (Withers)

Moisture condensation on ducts is an especially common problem in homes where the homeowner

sets the thermostat to a low temperature continuously or even for a portion of the day, such as at this house. Colder supply air leads to a colder outer duct jacket, which in turn increases the rate of condensation. Figure 5 shows a portion of an insulated vapor barrier that was used to wrap around cold supply ducts to avoid condensation on ducts after sealing the open floor spaces. This is discussed in more detail in the MOISTURE ISSUES section.

Foam insulation product was also used to seal air pathways into the interstitial floor cavities on the north and west sides of the house. The application of foam on the north and west sides of the house was particularly difficult since it required removing the soffit face material and then building a foam barrier in the space between the top of the block wall and the roof deck, one bay at a time over a 40 foot length (Figure 6). A total of 10.0 man-hours were required to implement wind washing repair at this house, covering a total surface area of 108 ft<sup>2</sup>. The time required to remove and re-install soffits substantially increased the amount of time required for repair.



Figure 6 Foam application into west soffit area. (Withers)

#### Pre and Post Wind Washing House Testing Results

Wind washing repair made the house envelope more airtight and reduced duct leakage from outdoors. Duct leakage was, however, small to begin with.

- After repair, the house was 8.7% more airtight.
- Implementation of wind washing repairs reduced 1<sup>st</sup> floor supply duct leakage to outdoors (as indicated by pressure pan testing), even though no repairs were directly applied to duct leaks. Average pressure pan values for the 1<sup>st</sup> floor supplies declined by an average 57%.
- RLF did not change.
- After repair, the house infiltration rate with the AHUs running continuously was 39% lower.

### Energy and demand savings from repairs

Using the weighted TMY data and cooling energy versus dT linear equations, the calculated annual cooling savings for House H8Hd was 2,771 kWh (8.2%). At a typical cost of \$0.115 per kWh, this yields annual cooling energy cost savings of \$319. With an estimated repair cost of \$770, wind washing pays for itself in less than three years excluding any incentives that might be available.

Based on the hourly regression of kW versus dT, and the TMY hourly data, the 3 PM to 6 PM kW demand reduction for the hottest day of the year was 1.80 kW in air conditioning electrical demand as a result of the wind washing retrofit. This is equivalent to a 15.0% reduction in peak demand.

### House H16B and Repair Description

This 3,081 ft<sup>2</sup> slab-on-grade, wood frame home was built in 1990. Substantial improvements had been made to the exterior materials and windows over the past few years. It has 1,732 ft<sup>2</sup> on the first floor and 1,349 ft<sup>2</sup> on the second floor. Above the attached three-car garage is an attic with a maximum height of seven feet that follows the contours of the roof deck. There are 989 ft<sup>2</sup> of first floor area under the second floor and 360 ft<sup>2</sup> of second floor area over unconditioned space.

Additionally, the floor cavity between the first and second stories of the main part of the house was largely wide open to the garage attic space. This attic space vents to both the unfinished garage ceiling and the soffit surrounding the garage.

The infrared image in Figure 7 was taken in the attic during our field visit August 14, 2009 prior to repairs and shows cooler air displaced into the lower attic area next to the open floor space. Figures 8 and 9 show the floor cavity and knee wall prior to and after application of foam insulation. Figure 10 shows a relatively homogenous temperature plane across the foam.

### Pre and Post Wind Washing House Testing Results

Wind washing repair made the house envelope more airtight.

- After repair, the house was 6.8% more airtight.
- Wind washing repair had little impact on duct leakage.
- After repair, the house infiltration rate with the AHUs operating was 23% lower.



Figure 7 IR view inside the attic shows cool temperatures in the floor space and cooled surfaces low in attic. (Withers)



Figure 8 Photo of IR image above. The floor cavity at the bottom of the wall is open to garage attic. (Withers)



Figure 9 Technician finishes up kneewall and floor cavity insulation/air tightening. (Photo credit Ian LaHiff)




Figure 10 IR image from inside attic after repair.  
(Withers)

#### Energy and demand savings from repairs

Using the four-city weighted TMY data and cooling energy versus dT best-fit equations, the calculated annual cooling savings for H16B was 682 kWh (13.4%). At a typical cost of \$0.115 per kWh, this yields annual cooling energy cost savings of \$78.

Based on the hourly regression of kW versus dT, and the TMY hourly data, the 3 PM to 6 PM kW demand reduction for the hottest day of the year was 0.39 kW in air conditioning electrical demand as a result of the wind washing retrofit. This is equivalent to a 17.3% reduction in peak demand.

#### House H11C and Repair Description

This 2,410 ft<sup>2</sup> split-level, block and frame home was constructed in 1967. It contains 1,610 ft<sup>2</sup> on the first and second levels combined and 800 ft<sup>2</sup> on the top level (Figures 11-12). This open floor plan home has conditioned space adjacent to very small vented attic/soffit areas on both the front and back of the house. Essentially, there is no adjacent attic space allowing air flow into the interstitial floor cavities, rather air can enter these cavities from small ventilated eave spaces. Wind washing repairs were challenging since there was very limited access to open floor areas to be sealed on the north side of house.

The only access to the small attic section on the north side of the house was through the attached garage attic. Consequently, foam had to be shot through a very narrow attic space (above the front porch) which had about 16" of vertical clearance. The problem with shooting foam through narrow areas is that the product ejection spread is approximately 6" diameter at a distance of 8 feet. This means that you can only effectively reach about 10 feet away into this space before the foam product builds up and

seals off further access. Figure 13 shows wind washing repairs just underway on the opening of the floor cavity within the north side attic space.



Figure 11 Front of split level home faces north. There is a small attic space above the front porch and garage which is open to the interstitial floor cavities.



Figure 12 Back of home (facing south) with top story floor space cantilevered and vented over back patio.



Figure 13 Beginning of north side sealing. (LaHiff)

Sometimes the laws of unintended consequences work in your favor. In this case, the spray gun nozzle was beginning to clog for the second time that day. This produced a narrower than usual spray stream which could then be projected further into the small attic space, allowing better than expected coverage.

In spite of restricted access, foam could be applied to seal 75% to 80% of desired area on the north side of the house. If wind washing repairs become a common application in the future, it would be valuable to have various nozzle sizes and wand lengths that could allow application from a greater distance.



Figure 14 View from soffit vent looking inside towards floor space in area having no batts. (Withers)

Figure 14 shows the interior of the south side floor space after placing a camera into the soffit opening outside the house before sealing the floor opening. Open cell foam was sprayed inside the south vents to separate floor cavity from vented area. The south side was sealed 100%. Average foam insulation thickness was about 3 inches. We estimate that overall, the repair effort at this house resulted in sealing about 90% of openings to the interstitial floor cavities. Note that 100% sealing of wind washing leaks on one side alone can achieve much of the effectiveness of sealing both sides, because it eliminates the complimentary pathway through which wind can be pushed.

Evidence of wind washing

Project staff noticed that very cool dry air was felt at the south soffits prior to sealing the floor cavity. An infrared camera was used to observe surface temperatures (Figures 15-16). These images clearly indicate cool air from within the house being displaced from the leeward side of the house.

Monitored temperature and humidity data at six locations over a two-day period found dew point temperatures in both soffits that were much lower than outdoors much of the time. Figure 17 shows dew point temperatures in six locations (including

indoors, outdoors, eaves, attic, and floor cavities) plus AC power over two summer days. Interesting patterns were observed. The homeowner typically raised the thermostat setting during the day, and then lowered it in the early afternoon. This causes the AC system to remain off for an approximate 7 hour period starting in the morning. While the outdoor dew point temperature was in the range of 70°F to 72°F throughout this two-day period, indoor dew point temperatures were at 48°F when the AC had been operating for a consistent period, but then rises steadily to a spike of about 60°F after the AC has been off for 7 hours.




Figure 15 With 10 mph wind from the north, the north soffit vent shows interior surface temperatures about 78-80°F. Outside air temperature =80.1°F and interior air temperature=71.0°F. (Withers)




Figure 16 With 10 mph wind from the north, the south soffit vent shows average of 71.9 °F on interior surfaces in left bay and about 73.2 °F on right bay indicating cool house air being pushed through the house by means of the floor cavity and the force of the wind. (Withers)




Figure 17 Graph of H11C dew point temperatures and A/C energy over two days shows patterns between A/C runtime and cool dry air from indoors making its way out to the soffit eave areas. Right Y-Axis is cooling energy in Watt-hours.

Swings in dew point temperatures can also be (unexpectedly) seen in various building cavities and buffer zones that are not normally conditioned. First, we notice that the attic dew point temperature dropped substantially during the period that the AC system runs, declining from about 72°F to about 60°F. Similar patterns can be observed for the north eave and the south eave. Additionally, the floor cavity also modulates up and down, following a pattern that is part way between the conditions at the eave vents and indoors, illustrating the fact that the floor cavities are well connected to outdoors and to unconditioned buffer zones of the house.

It appears from this, that duct leakage is creating a mechanical driving force that displaces air through the floor cavities into the eaves and attic spaces. Additionally, it is known that the wind pushes air from the floor cavities into the eaves. On three different occasions, researchers felt and measured (temperature and RH) pulses of cool dry air that were being pushed into the south eave space. These pulses coincided with significant wind from the north at times when the air handler was off.

#### Pre and Post Wind Washing House Testing Results

Testing indicates that wind washing repair resulted in a slightly tighter house envelope. It also found mixed results regarding duct leakage from outdoors.

- After repair, the house was 2.6% tighter.
- Implementation of wind washing repairs produced no improvement to pressure pan duct leakage values.
- RLF decreased by 31%. After repair, the house infiltration rate with the AHUs operating decreased by 12.3%.

#### Energy and demand savings from repairs

Using the weighted TMY data and cooling energy versus dT best-fit equations, the calculated annual cooling savings for H11C was 565 kWh (12.0%). At a typical cost of \$0.115 per kWh, this yields annual cooling energy cost savings of \$65.

Based on the hourly regression of kW versus dT, and the TMY hourly data the 3 PM to 6 PM kW demand reduction for the hottest day of the year was 0.43 kW resulting from the wind washing retrofit. This is equivalent to a 21.3% reduction in peak demand.

#### House H7G and Repair Description

This two-story home is the middle unit in a triplex. The first floor has 1,502 ft<sup>2</sup>. A two-car garage is located at the front of the house facing west (Figure 18). The second floor has 929 ft<sup>2</sup>, including a “bonus room” located above the garage. There is a 3-foot high space between the ceiling of the garage and the

floor of the bonus room and this space was vented to outdoors by means of soffit vents on the west and south sides.




Figure 18 Front of home H7G faces west. Exterior wall surfaces reach 114°F. (Withers)

Insulation batts were located on top of the garage ceiling but no insulation had been applied to the floor of the bonus room. Additionally, the floor cavity between the first and second stories of the main part of the house (about 14 inches in height) was largely wide open to the 3' high cavity above the garage and beneath the bonus room, which was vented to outdoors. Finally, this 14" high floor cavity was also exposed to another attic space located to its south side, but most of the potential openings from floor cavity to the south attic space were blocked by batts with kraft paper backing so air sealing (wind washing repair) was determined to not be required except for one six-foot section.

Hot attic air could readily flow into the interstitial floor cavity located between the first and second stories. Where the heat penetrates into the house structure, it transfers heat into the ceiling of the first floor, the floor of the second story, and some stairwell walls (Figures 19-20).

Foam insulation product was applied to the floor of the bonus room and to the interface between the bonus room floor cavity and the floor cavity of the main part of the house. There was also a large opening between the large cavity below the bonus room and the south attic space; this was sealed to isolate the two spaces from each other. Figure 21 shows wind washing repair under the bonus room just before it was completed.

The wind washing repair took 4.6 man-hours to cover 510 ft<sup>2</sup> of area. This was the only retrofit where we received comments on the odor of the foam from

the homeowner. We hypothesize that it took longer for the odor of the foam material (which is typically a light odor) to dissipate out of the space between the garage ceiling and the bonus room because there was little ventilation to carry away the active ingredients, now that all venting was sealed. We suggested that the homeowner open the garage access into the bonus room floor space, with the garage bay door open, for a couple of hours each day to see if this helped. The homeowner reported that the odors had greatly diminished within a couple days.




Figure 19 IR image of floor space area at stairwell shows areas of elevated surface temperature before retrofit. Area in box "Ar1" is about 81.4°F while the indoor set point was 77.3 °F on average. (Withers)



Figure 20 Photo of previous image. (Withers)

Both AC systems had large return leaks. In order to distinguish the energy savings from duct repair and wind washing repair, duct repairs were implemented in the return plenums of both AC systems. Repair of both returns involved cutting open the support platform for access and installing R6 duct board inside the platforms with the foil facing inward. It was important for the foil to face inward since it represents the air barrier of the duct board. Mastic was used to complete the air barrier from one duct section to the next and refrigerant line penetrations

were sealed. Return leakage from the first floor system originated from the garage, where the AHU was located. Return leakage for the second story system originated from both the inter-story floor cavity and the attic.



Figure 21 Foam applied to wall and ceiling of the bonus room floor cavity (3' high). (Withers)

The second floor system was located inside a closet that had a solid door. This system had return leakage from two locations. Leakage from the floor cavity originated primarily through a large hole cut much bigger than needed for the refrigerant lines. (Note, however, that much of the air drawn from the floor cavity could originate from attic spaces above the garage and the first floor master bedroom.) The second location was from the attic above the second floor. Leakage from the attic came directly through a back wall section which was being used as part of the return plenum. The wall section did not have drywall, but was stuffed with insulation batts. Attic air could also come in to the system indirectly through the AHU closet due to leaks in the plenum and the AHU (furnace) drawing air from the closet. The closet, in turn, had air leakage at two locations. The first allowed attic air to enter the closet through the ceiling where the return duct penetrated. The second location was through a combustion/dilution vent from the closet to the attic (this vent was an intentional pathway to the attic to provide combustion/dilution air to the furnace). Air leaks in the furnace cabinet and the return plenum were sealed to address the greatest driving force for attic return leakage. The oversized duct penetration hole in the ceiling was also sealed. The combustion dilution vent was left open as required by code. Alternatively in this home, the owner would have been permitted by code to install venting from the closet to the house interior (such as installing a louvered closet door), and then seal the combustion/dilution vent.

The return leak fraction for the second story system decreased from 9.6% to 1.1% as a result of duct repair. A discussion of energy use reduction from duct repair is found in a later section of this paper. Prior to this repair, duct leakage was also measured by pressure pan. Average pressure pan supply register readings declined from 1.65 Pa to 0.92 Pa for the first floor system and from 2.18 Pa to 0.60 Pa for the second floor system, indicating substantial reduction in system duct leakage. These reductions in pressure pan readings include the effect of both duct repairs and wind washing repairs.

#### Pre and Post Wind Washing and Duct Repair Testing Results

Combined wind washing repair and return duct repair produced substantial changes in the house.

- After repairs, the house was 22% more airtight.
- RLF declined by 89% on the second floor system (from 9.6% RLF to 1.1% RLF). No pre-repair RLF was available on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor, but post RLF 1<sup>st</sup> floor was only 2.0%.
- Average return pressure pan values decreased by 82%.
- Average 1<sup>st</sup> floor supply pressure pan values decreased 44% from 1.65 Pa to 0.92 Pa. Average 2<sup>nd</sup> floor supply pressure pan values decreased 65% (from 2.18 Pa to 0.76 Pa).
- After repair, the house infiltration rate with the AHUs operating was 64% lower.
- We find, therefore, that combined repair of wind washing and return leakage caused a dramatic decline in duct leakage indicators.

#### Energy and demand savings from repairs

Duct repair and wind washing repairs each produced substantial energy savings. Based upon the annual energy analysis (using TMY data), duct repair produced 2,207 kWh in energy savings (24.7%; \$257) per year. Implementation of wind washing repairs produced another 2,232 kWh energy savings (33.1%; \$254) per year. Combined, the duct repair and the wind washing repair reduced annual space cooling energy use by 49.6% (Figure 22).

Based on the hourly regression of kW versus dT, and the TMY hourly data, the 3 PM to 6 PM kW demand reduction for the hottest day of the year was 0.24 kW in air conditioning electrical demand as a result of the wind washing retrofit. This is equivalent to a 9.9% reduction in peak demand.




Figure 22 H7G cooling vs. temperature difference for pre-repair, for post duct repair, and for post wind washing repair.



Figure 24 Floor cavity connected to attic space before repair. (Withers)

### House H14Y and Repair Description

This 1,415 ft<sup>2</sup> residence was constructed in 1903 making it the oldest in the study. The home was built using wood framing above a shallow crawlspace. The first floor has 821 ft<sup>2</sup> while the second floor has 594 ft<sup>2</sup>. The front of house faces east and is situated near an inter-coastal waterway within 10 miles of the Atlantic Ocean. Each floor is served by one air conditioning system. There is no garage in this residence and no second floor area over unconditioned space. Figure 23 shows the house south and west sides.



Figure 23 Back of residence.

At some point after the original construction, the house was renovated to add a kitchen to the rear side (west) of the house. The roofline over this area creates the only attic adjacent to conditioned space in the house. This small attic space is very difficult to access and could only be inspected by removing a recessed florescent light fixture in the kitchen.

### Duct Repair

This house had significant return duct leakage in the first floor system. Duct repairs were implemented in the return plenum of the first floor AC system. The purpose of the separate duct repair was to enable our analysis to distinguish savings from wind washing alone. Wind washing repair would, in our opinion, have eliminated a large portion of the duct leakage because return duct leaks were drawing air from the interstitial floor cavity between the two floors. Mastic was used to produce a continuous air barrier from the return grill through the plenum and into the air handling unit on the first floor. Refrigerant line penetrations and the mounting of the AHU to the plenum box were also sealed using rope caulk and silicone. The RLF for the first floor system was 4.0% before repair (both duct repair and wind washing repair) and 0.7% after duct and wind washing repair. The second floor system RLF was 1.2% before repair and 0.0% after both repairs.

The second floor system uses the AHU closet as a return plenum. The closet door is louvered. Because of the large net return area of the closet door, there was little depressurization in the AHU closet (-2.0 Pa wrt indoors). Therefore, even though the closet had small leakage pathways to unconditioned spaces, the operating return leakage was small. The elimination of return leakage for the second floor system can be attributed to the wind washing repair which isolated the floor cavity from the kitchen attic space.

### Wind Washing Repair

The most direct way to eliminate air movement into the floor cavity would have been to apply foam sealant directly over the floor cavity openings. However, there was very poor access to the attic space and supply ducts restricted access to the floor cavity openings. It is for this reason that it was

decided to modify the attic space above the kitchen from a hot and humid space to a warm and drier space to minimize the impact of hot attic air into the floor as well as attempt to seal the open floor spaces as much as practicable. Alternatively, it could be stated that we moved the air and thermal boundary so that the attic space above the kitchen was now inside the air and thermal boundary. Foam insulation product was applied to the exterior walls of the attic, to the roof deck within this attic, and to the small gable vents. Open space from the floor cavity to the unvented attic was also attempted to be sealed. Because of difficult access, we were only able to seal about 9 ft<sup>2</sup> or about 75% of the floor cavity opening. This repair required 4.0 man-hours to cover 209 ft<sup>2</sup> of surface area.

#### Pre and Post Wind Washing House Testing Results

Changes occurred as a result of both return duct repair and wind washing repairs.

- Prior to repair, the house airtightness was 11.26 ACH50. After repair, the house airtightness was 11.15 ACH50, indicating a tightening of 1%. This small change is not surprising given the age of the home and the fact that only small attic vents (above the kitchen) were sealed.
- RLF declined 82.5% on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor system from 4.0% RLF to 0.7% RLF. The 2<sup>nd</sup> floor system only had an initial RLF of 1.2% which was reduced to 0.0%.
- 1<sup>st</sup> floor return pressure pan values decreased dramatically from 23.0 Pa to 1.0 Pa after both repairs.
- Average 1<sup>st</sup> floor supply pressure pan values decreased 60% after all repairs (from 2.43 Pa to 0.96 Pa). Average 2<sup>nd</sup> floor supply pressure pan values remained unchanged at 1.2 Pa after all repairs.
- After both repairs, the house infiltration rate with the AHUs operating decreased by 8.5% from 0.59 ach to 0.54 ach.

We find, therefore, that the combined repair of wind washing and return leakage caused a dramatic decline in duct leakage indicators.

#### Energy and demand savings from repairs

Duct repair and wind washing repairs each resulted in measured savings. Based upon the annual energy analysis, duct repair provides annual savings of 296 kWh (9.5 %; \$34.04) per year. Wind washing repairs produced annual savings of 201 kWh (7.2 %; \$23.1) per year. Combined, the repairs save 497 kWh (16.0%; \$57) per year.

Based on the hourly regression of kW versus dT, and the TMY hourly data, the 3 PM to 6 PM kW demand reduction for the hottest day of the year was 0.18 kW (from 2.27 kW to 2.09 kW) as a result of the wind washing retrofit alone. This is equivalent to a 7.8% reduction in peak demand. No demand reduction was assessed for the duct repair.

We did not expect large savings from this home. The attic vent opening area was only 1% of the gross attic-to-floor cavity opening. The fact that there were only two small gable attic vents, meant that there was very limited opportunity for wind to drive attic air into the house interstitial cavities. Our available selection of houses to monitor during the summer of 2009 had not yet found houses with better savings potential by the time we had to begin monitoring efforts. Although the savings were modest and payback is over 11 years, the repair was just one of many efficiency improvements needed in this historic house which is over 100 years old. This home would also benefit from more 2<sup>nd</sup> story ceiling insulation, higher efficiency heat pumps, better 1<sup>st</sup> floor insulation under the crawlspace, and sealing of several small electrical and plumbing penetrations.

#### **THE COST OF WIND WASHING REPAIRS**

The actual cost of wind washing repair can vary greatly. The factors most greatly affecting cost are the level of difficulty in accessing the repair locations and the total area required to be sealed. Homes with garage attic space adjacent to second-story floor cavities generally have easy access and often require less than 40 ft<sup>2</sup> of material to seal and insulate the floor cavity from the attic. Unlike spaces with easy access, homes with open floor construction into very small attic or soffit areas require much more time. Working within these tight spaces can also limit the options of material used. For example, a very small attic area at a great distance from attic access would make working with rigid board stock very time consuming and difficult. While the rigid board stock might be inexpensive, the labor would be very expensive and require considerable skill and agility.

The six repaired homes in this study were all sealed using a blown, expanding low-density, and open-cell foam. Other options such as sealing some with rigid board stock were considered, but not used since repairs needed to be completed in a timely manner to avoid starting post retrofit periods too late into the summer. Foam application is fast. For example, one two-person crew was able to implement less-complicated wind washing repairs in three homes in one 8-hour day, including travel time and about 2-1/2 hours down time from equipment failure.

The research project paid a flat fee of \$650 per house for wind washing repairs, which may have been somewhat discounted from normal. Cost estimates from one foam manufacturer representative were, on average, \$750 per house. Based on this \$750 per house estimate, the average cost per square foot of applied material would be \$6.93/ft<sup>2</sup>. A cost of considerably less than \$750 would be expected for jobs having easy access and relatively small areas, such as Houses H10H and H16B. House H11C needed very little foam and took relatively little time on site, but access was much more difficult and resulted in only about 90% completion.

Clearly, wind washing repair costs will vary from one house to another. An effort has been made to estimate likely costs for each of the six houses based on time and material. The total amount of labor to complete the six retrofits was carefully monitored. The total surface area covered was also recorded for each house. Table 2 summarizes the repair material area, time, and cost/ft<sup>2</sup> for each house. The cost per ft<sup>2</sup> in Table 2 is shown using the manufacturer's estimate and separately using \$50/person-hour, \$2.50/ft<sup>2</sup>, and actual recorded time and material needed for each house.

**Table 2** Calculated cost of wind washing repairs compared to manufacturer's fixed price quote.

| House # →                                     | H10H   | H7G    | H14Y   | H8Hd   | H16B   | H11C    | Avg.   |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|
| Coverage (ft <sup>2</sup> )                   | 113    | 510    | 209    | 108    | 103    | 48      | 182    |
| Time (man hrs)                                | 2.25   | 4.60   | 4.0    | 10.0   | 3.75   | 3.10    | 4.62   |
| Calc. cost @ \$50/hr & \$2.50/ft <sup>2</sup> | \$395  | \$1505 | \$723  | \$770  | \$445  | \$275   | \$686  |
| Calc. cost per ft <sup>2</sup>                | \$3.50 | \$2.95 | \$3.46 | \$7.12 | \$4.32 | \$5.73  | \$4.51 |
| Manuf. Cost \$/ft <sup>2</sup> @ \$750/house  | \$6.64 | \$1.47 | \$3.59 | \$6.94 | \$7.28 | \$15.63 | \$6.93 |

Based on time and material, we calculated that the average cost would be \$686 per house, including travel time. This estimate is 8.5% less than the manufacturer's estimate.

It should be noted that there is a learning process involved in wind washing repair. At each of the repair sites, project researchers provided guidance and instruction to the foam application technicians, which added some time to the repair. In some cases, considerable time was required to examine different

options about how to gain access to the repair sites and determine the best way to apply the foam product. Since we used the same contractor and technicians for all six houses, the instructional time declined as experience was gained. Once wind washing repair becomes a mature industry, the time involved would no doubt decline significantly. It seems likely, therefore, that the repair costs for the six houses repaired in this project would eventually be in the \$500 to \$600 per house range. Since the average cooling energy reduction from wind washing repair has been found to be \$140 per house, the simple payback period would be on the order of 4 years excluding savings during the heating season and any program incentives that might exist.

### MOISTURE ISSUES

Wind washing can deliver air with high dew point temperatures into contact with building materials and cause significant damages, such as those discussed in house H8Hd. These include cracks developed in the staircase, sweating supply diffusers, and wet attic insulation from sweating ducts. This house also had other symptoms that developed about a year before our research involvement such as a warped pocket door in a wall connected to the north attic wall, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor wood flooring that warped and had to be replaced, and sweating ducts inside the floor space that dripped onto the kitchen ceiling. In response to the damaged ceiling, a consultant had identified the wind washing problem and suggested duct repair and sealing the floor space from the attic. Initial efforts to seal the floor space by the homeowner and a contractor did lessen the severity of sweating problems, but did not eliminate it. The owner chose to "seal" the attic-to-floor space opening in the garage using kraft-backed insulation batts, but nothing was done to seal open floor cavities on the west and north sides. Therefore, humid air could still move into the space. This highlights a very important point, that even while partial repairs may reduce the severity of moisture problems and decrease cooling energy loads, every attempt should be made to create complete air and thermal barriers to isolate the floor space and knee walls.

Care should also be taken when sealing around cold supply ducts that penetrate from the attic space into the floor cavity. Research staff had already anticipated the problem of moisture condensing on supply ducts that would be in contact with insulation. When the research staff discovered the wet batt insulation against the supply ducts in house H8Hd, this reinforced our dedication to avoiding such condensation problems. Project staff were aware that the open cell spray foam product that we intended to

use would allow vapor diffusion from the attic air to the duct surface, so we wanted to create a vapor barrier with a higher surface temperature between the duct and the foam insulation. Even if condensation was not occurring on the ducts prior to retrofit, it was likely that application of foam insulation (or other sealing materials) in contact with the duct would result in a cooler duct surface that could very likely become colder than the attic air dew point temperature. This problem was addressed by first wrapping a band of flexible but semi-rigid insulation (typically 1" thickness and R-3 thermal resistance; this product is visible in Figure 5) around the duct where the spray foam would contact. This band of insulation has a vapor barrier on both sides that helps block attic moist air from direct contact with the supply ducts. We carefully inspected the supply ducts a few weeks after the repairs for evidence of condensation on the duct surfaces (during a period of high dew point temperatures) and did not find any evidence of moisture accumulating on the duct surface. A research staff member inserted his hand into the space between the thin wrap and the flex duct and verified that the duct surface was dry since the hand came out with dry dust on it.

### CONCLUSIONS

Wind washing problems were found in approximately 40% of the 32 two-story homes examined. Of the first 16 homes tested, six were selected for monitoring and repair. Annual cooling energy savings were found to be quite substantial in these six homes, averaging 15.3% or \$140. Energy savings resulting from wind wash repairs at each house are summarized in Table 3. Duct leak repairs (all on the return side) in two homes produced average annual cooling savings of 17.1% or \$144 (Table 4). Cooling season peak demand reduction was 12.6% or 0.52 kW on average (summarized in Table 5). Based on testing results in the second group of 16 homes, where wind washing problems were assessed to be greater, it seems likely that wind washing cooling energy savings can exceed 15.3% on average. Based on monitored cooling energy savings and likely reductions in foam insulation application costs, cooling energy savings will pay for the retrofit costs in approximately four years. Wind washing diagnosis and repair appear, therefore, to be a cost-effective energy conservation measure and therefore a potentially viable utility (or other entity) energy conservation program.

It should be understood that this project was only able to evaluate impacts of wind washing during the cooling season. Therefore, homes will also have heating energy and peak kW savings that will be in

addition to the cooling savings shown for each house in Tables 3 and 4. The percentage savings of heating energy and winter peak demand (kW) reduction are likely higher than cooling season results since wind speeds and temperature differentials between indoors and outdoors are often higher during cold weather than during summer periods. Homes with electric resistance heating could see savings several times higher than those with heat pumps.

**Table 3** Annual cooling energy savings from wind washing repair

|                | Pre-repair annual kWh | Post-repair annual kWh | Annual kWh savings | Percent savings | Annual savings (@11.5 cents/kWh) |
|----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| H10H           | 4629                  | 3793                   | 836                | 18.1%           | \$96.14                          |
| H7G            | 6743                  | 4511                   | 2232               | 33.1%           | \$256.68                         |
| H14Y           | 2806                  | 2605                   | 201                | 7.2%            | \$23.11                          |
| H8Hd           | 33852                 | 31081                  | 2771               | 8.2%            | \$318.65                         |
| H16B           | 5103                  | 4421                   | 682                | 13.4%           | \$78.43                          |
| H11C           | 4710                  | 4145                   | 565                | 12.0%           | \$64.97                          |
| <i>Average</i> |                       |                        | <i>1214.5</i>      | <i>15.3%</i>    | <i>\$139.66</i>                  |

**Table 4** Annual cooling energy savings from duct repair in two homes

|                | Pre-repair annual kWh | Post-repair annual kWh | Annual kWh savings | % savings    | Annual savings (@11.5 cents/kWh) |
|----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|
| H7G            | 8950                  | 6743                   | 2207               | 24.7%        | \$253.80                         |
| H14Y           | 3102                  | 2806                   | 296                | 9.5%         | \$34.04                          |
| <i>Average</i> |                       |                        | <i>1251.5</i>      | <i>17.1%</i> | <i>\$143.92</i>                  |

Summer peak hour demand reduction from wind washing repairs are summarized in Table 5. Peak demand reduction resulting from wind washing repair was on average 12.6%, or 0.52 kW. If the electric utility's cost for constructing new peaking capacity is \$600 per kW, then this repair represents approximately \$300 that the utility does not have to spend on new facilities to meet peak demand.

**Table 5** Peak demand savings from wind washing repair in six homes

|                | Pre Retrofit Peak kW | Post Retrofit Peak kW | kW Reduction | % Reduction  |
|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|
| H10H           | 2.10                 | 2.00                  | 0.10         | 4.5%         |
| H7G            | 2.40                 | 2.16                  | 0.24         | 9.9%         |
| H14Y           | 2.27                 | 2.09                  | 0.18         | 7.8%         |
| H8Hd           | 11.9                 | 10.2                  | 1.80         | 15.0%        |
| H16B           | 2.25                 | 1.86                  | 0.39         | 17.3%        |
| H11C           | 2.02                 | 1.59                  | 0.43         | 21.3%        |
| <i>Average</i> |                      |                       | <i>0.52</i>  | <i>12.6%</i> |

The results of this study also have implications for new construction. The fact that wind washing retrofits reduced annual cooling energy consumption by 15.3% indicates that failure to construct homes with proper sealing of interstitial floor cavities is creating significant failures of the house air and thermal boundaries, and creating considerable energy waste. It seems reasonable, therefore, that buildings codes for Florida as well as other states should be examined and code enforcement practices evaluated in order to eliminate this breach in residential construction efficiency.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was sponsored by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Building America Program, and by Florida Power and Light. The support and encouragement of U.S. DOE program managers -- Mr. George James, Mr. Terry Logee, Mr. Ed Pollock and Mr. William Haslebacher is gratefully acknowledged. The encouragement and support of Dr. Subrato Chandra, the Project Leader for the Building America program at the Florida Solar Energy Center is appreciated. The support and encouragement of FPL program manager, Mr. Craig Muccio, is gratefully acknowledged. The authors would like to express appreciation to Ian LaHiff for assisting in house testing, database development, and project reporting; to Sabrina Liguori and Karen Sutherland in assisting in the effort of finding homes; to Bob Abernethy for assisting with house testing; and to Senior Engineer Dave Chasar for providing houses for testing and repair.

#### REFERENCES

- Anderson, B.R., and T.I. Ward. 1981. Measurements of Heat Loss Through an Insulated Roof. *Building Services and Research Technology* 2(2): 65-72.
- Bankvall, CG. 1978. Forced Convection: Practical Thermal Conductivity in an Insulated Structure Under the Influence of Workmanship and Wind. ASTM STP 660 pp.409-425.
- Harrje, D.T., G.S. Dutt, and K.J. Gadsby. 1985. Convective Loop Heat Losses in Buildings. *ASHRAE Transactions* 91(2): 751-760.
- Hens H, W. Janssens, J. Depraetere, J. Carmeliet, and J. Lecompte. 2007. Brick Cavity Walls: A Performance Analysis Based upon Measurements and Simulations. *Journal of Building Physics* 31, 95 – 123.
- Sidall, M. 2009. The Impact of Thermal Bypass. *Green Building Magazine* 19 (1),16-23.
- Janssens, A, and H. Hens. 2007. Effects of Wind on the Transmission Heat Loss in Duo-Pitched Insulated Roofs: A Field Study. *Energy and Buildings* 39, 1047–105.
- Lecompte, J. 1990. The Influence of Natural Convection On the Thermal Quality of Insulated Cavity Construction. *Building Research and Practice* 6, 349 – 354.
- Silberstein, A., E. Arquis, and D.J. McCaa. 1991. Forced Convection Effects in Fibrous Insulation. ASTM STP 1116, pp.292 – 309.
- Uvsløkk, S. 1996. The Importance of Wind Barriers for Insulated Timber Frame Constructions. *Journal of Thermal Insulation and Building Envelopes* 20, 40–62.