



THE JOURNAL OF LIGHT CONSTRUCTION

A Builderburg Group Publication

www.jlconline.com

Editor Sal Alfano
Managing Editor Don Jackson
Assistant Editors Dave Crosby
David Holbrook
Martin Holladay
Pete Young

Editorial Assistant/Proofreader Cindy Hoffman
Conference Coordinator Sherry Daniels
Contributing Editors Clayton DeKorne
Don Dunkley
Carl Hagstrom
Joe Stoddard

Corresponding Editors Michael Byrne
Henri de Marne
Paul Fisette
Bill Robinson

Columnists Paul Eldrenkamp
Quenda Behler Story

Art Director Theresa A. Emerson
Graphic Designer Barbara Nevins
Illustration Tim Healey
Photography Carolyn Bates
Bill Lorenz

Vice President/Sales Craig Savage
Sales Director Alicia R. Cipollaro
Sales Operations Manager Laurie Fielder
Sales Representatives Tami Svarfvar
Don Alter
Glenn Dunning
Regional Sales Carol Fielder
Advertising Coordinator Katina Walters

Expo Coordinator Donna Ladd
Exhibit Sales Carol Fielder

Circulation Director Paul Ruess
Circulation Manager Colleen Murphy
Direct Marketing Manager Kevin Spaulding
Customer Service Manager Angela Packard
Customer Service Joyce-Marie Birdsall

Editorial Director Steven Bliss
Publishers Terri Shanahan
Steven Bliss

Controller Debbie Moore
Operations Manager Randa Wright
Administrative Assistant Carol Grassano

The Journal of Light Construction (ISSN-1056-828X; USPS-001-659) is published monthly by Builderburg Partners, Ltd., 1025 Vermont Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20005. Periodicals-Class Postage paid at Richmond, VT, and additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes to *The Journal of Light Construction*, 932 West Main Street, Richmond, VT 05477. Copyright 1999 by Builderburg Partners, Ltd. All rights reserved.



JLC's

Letters

Wood as "Green" as It Gets

To the Editor:

In response to the article "Green Building at the Lumberyard" (*Notebook*, 4/99), I am continually amazed by some of the reasons for purchasing so-called "green" building materials. A case in point is the comparison of the new plastic decking products to traditional wood decking materials. While plastic decking can be made from recycled materials, most use virgin polymers and other nonrenewable, non-biodegradable resources that involve toxic manufacturing processes and high energy costs. Combine this with the fact that once these plastic materials are buried in a landfill they will stay there nearly forever. I fail to see how synthetic decking, or any other plastic building products, can be touted as "green" alternatives.

I still prefer the use of wood. It is 100% natural, nontoxic, renewable (many lumber companies are now growing trees on a sustained yield basis), and requires little energy to produce.

Dan Kepon
Fortuna, Calif.

15-lb. roof dead load, and 10-lb. ceiling dead load — a total of 70 lb. per square foot. Other cities require only the 25-lb. snow load and 20-lb. dead load for a total of 45 pounds — a big difference! The current code book doesn't differentiate between truss and stick-built roofs, so each city follows its own interpretation.

John Bacik, CPBD
via e-mail

Bridging Useless

To the Editor:

I'm glad to get more information on blocking and bridging (*On the House*, 4/99). I've read studies from as far back as the late '60s that show no appreciable benefit from blocking or bridging in floor joists. So why, when the needle of the compass points north, do so many builders follow the lemming leaders south? I haven't blocked or bridged for nine years and the only complaints I have are from other builders who claim I'm cutting corners.

Mike Guertin
East Greenwich, R.I.

Design Loads Vary by Locale

To the Editor:

I enjoyed the article on calculating dead and live loads (*Practical Engineering*, 3/99). In Cleveland, some of the local building inspectors require a 20-lb. live load (attic storage) for any top-floor ceiling when the roof pitch is over 3:12, trusses included. This is in addition to the 25-lb. snow load,

Payback for Energy-Efficient Windows

To the Editor:

The article "Choosing Energy-Efficient Windows" (1/99) was enlightening, but it omitted an important element: the cost/payback relationship. Using the graphs, the total annual energy savings in New York is approximately \$442 for Type II windows and \$408 for Type III windows — a net dif-

JLC Online:

Visit our Web site at www.jlconline.com. You'll find discussion forums, article archives, customer service and subscription information, conference programs, and links to other construction resources.

ference of \$34 per year. I contacted my local window supplier and we calculated the cost difference for 300 sq. ft. of window area between Type II and Type III windows as \$706. Dividing the cost difference by the annual savings differential yields a payback period of more than 20 years.

At this time, this wouldn't be a good investment, but we should continue to monitor the costs. As low-e glazing becomes more popular, the costs will probably come down and the payback period will be shorter. This has already happened with furnaces. Years ago, when furnace efficiencies increased from around 68% to around 80%, there was a 12-year payback period to upgrade from an 80%-efficient furnace to 90% efficiency — a marginal investment. A couple of years ago, the reduction in the cost of 90%-efficient furnaces reduced that payback period to only two to three years. I now install 92% furnaces as standard equipment in all of the houses I build.

Having built in south Texas for ten years, I know from experience that the climatic differences shown in your articles are real. Builders need to make their own calculations based on their local climate and window costs.

James E. McIntyre
via e-mail

Termite Concerns

To the Editor:

I read the article "Insect Infestations in Buried Foam" (10/98) with great interest. We are builders in the York, Pa., area and sometimes use Styrofoam insulation on our foundations. I am planning a home and was considering the Tuff-N-Dri system. Does the fiber-board insulation used with this system pose the same type of problem as foam board with regards to termites?

Kevin Sterner
via e-mail

Don Jackson responds: It depends whom you ask. According to Greg Baumann of the National Pest Control Association, the NPCA is "not aware of

any data that would prove that Tuff-N-Dri would prevent termite activity." That means that professional pest control applicators are not likely to give you a warranty if you have Tuff-N-Dri's board (called Warm-N-Dri) in place, because it would prevent them from getting the insecticide against the foundation where it's needed.

Michael Drake of Koch Materials, manufacturer of Tuff-N-Dri, insists that the system poses no termite problem, and points out that the CABO ban on below-grade rigid foam insulation in southern states does not apply to Warm-N-Dri, which is a compressed fiberglass product. He provided JLC with a summary of testing done at Owens-Corning, in which six 12x12x1/2-inch samples of the board were exposed to soil containing 300 termites per cubic inch. Wood debris was provided to feed the termites. Three of the samples were treated with insecticide, three were untreated. The termites in the container with the treated board all died within the first week. After four weeks, the untreated samples showed no visible signs of tunneling; one of the samples was sawn apart to inspect for tunnels, and none were found. While the report concludes that "initial testing would appear to indicate that Warm-N-Dri is resistant to termite damage," the study should not be considered definitive. More rigorous testing would be welcome — perhaps a test in which the food source was placed on the opposite side of the insulation board.

Meantime, given the persistence of termites, Drake suggests that a 6-inch vision strip is probably a good idea when using Warm-N-Dri.

Green Building Resource

The green building software mentioned in the March '99 *Notebook* column was developed by CREST (the Center for Renewable Energy and Sustainable Technology), *Environmental Building News*, and *Design Harmony*. The CD, which works on both IBM and Mac operating systems, costs \$179 and is available at 888/442-7378 or www.crest.org. 

JLC Information Directory

www.jlconline.com

Mailing Address:

Journal of Light Construction
932 West Main Street
Richmond, VT 05477
802/434-4747

Editorial: We welcome letters and article submissions from readers. Keep copies of all original materials. Contact us by mail at the address above, Attn: JLC Editorial Dept, or via e-mail at: jlc@bginet.com.

Subscriptions/Customer Service: To order a new subscription or renewal, call 800/375-5981. For customer service assistance, call 800/784-0290. Or you can e-mail us at cs@bginet.com, fax us at 802/434-4467, or mail us at the address above, Attn: Customer Service. Subscription rates for qualified readers in construction trades: \$39.95/1 year, \$64.95/2 years; \$89.95/3 years. Canada and International: add \$15 per year. Non-qualified readers: \$59.95 per year. Appropriate sales tax included. Group rates available on request. Back issues/single article requests: \$5 each plus \$5 s&h per order.

Advertising: For rate information, call the JLC Advertising Dept. at 800/644-4596 ext. 300, fax to 802/434-7202, e-mail to aliciac@bginet.com, or mail to the address above, Attn: Advertising Dept. For custom reprints of articles (quantities of 500 or more) call 802/434-7222.

Conferences & Seminars: For information about attending a JLC conference or seminar call 800/261-7769; for exhibitor information call 802/456-7470 VM ext. 301.

JLC Bookstore: To place an order or obtain a free catalog, call 800/859-3669, fax us at 802/434-4467, mail us at the address above, Attn: JLC Bookstore, or visit us online at www.jlconline.com/bookstore