

**Oregon
Interpretive Ruling No.93-62**

VAPOR BARRIER APPLICATION – WALLS

Requested By: PPPI MANUEL REVIEW COMMITTEE

QUESTION

Interpretation of Section 5503(f)1a to answer:

1. Where should the vapor barrier flanges be stapled?
2. If side stapling is acceptable, should the vapor barrier also be stapled to top and bottom plates?
3. Is an additional vapor barrier required if flanges are stapled to the sides of framing members as shown in Figure 3?
4. Do the requirements for exterior walls also apply to Roof/Ceiling Section 5303(f)3?

APPLICABLE CODE SECTIONS

1993 Oregon Structural Specialty Code (OSSC), Chapter 53 and 1993 Oregon One and Two Family Dwelling Specialty Code (Dwelling Code), Chapter 53.

BACKGROUND

1. Figures 1,2,3 and 4 show systems which satisfy the code. Figures 2 and 4 produce superior vapor barriers compared to Figures 1 and 3, but are troublesome to sheetrock installers and preclude gluing of gypsum board.
2. Stapling top and bottom is recommended. However, if the insulation and vapor barrier are tightly fitted (without undue compression) it will comply without stapling.
3. No. As mentioned above, the code permits a "non-continuous vapor barrier." Figure 3 meets this criteria if the work is carefully done to avoid tears, fish mouths and gaps.
4. No. The requirement in Section 5303(f)3 on roofs is more severe due to the vapor barrier effect of roofing on the cold outside. The ceiling barrier is intended to prevent vapor from passing into the roof cavity to give the ventilation of the roof cavity a chance to dissipate moisture. Notice the 0.5 perm rated barrier in ceilings is required to be twice as effective as walls, and flanges must have the flange stapled on the face of the joist. Figure 2 or 4 would satisfy this requirement; Figures 1 and 3 would not. Foil- back gypsum would also meet code.

FINDINGS

This interpretation is authorized by ORS 455.060, Rulings on Acceptability of Materials, Designs or Methods of Construction and Attorney General's Opinion OP-5208 issued October 1,1981, which advised the statute permits authoritative interpretations of existing code requirements.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The answers to questions 1 through 4 above are still current and applicable to code enforcement. Interpretive Ruling 93-62 replaces PPPI-4069.

(signed November 17, 1993)

John Talbott
Structural Code Advisory Board

The recommendations and findings of the Structural Code Advisory Board are accepted and the conclusions are adopted.

(signed November 19, 1993)

Gary J. Wicks.
Administrator Building Codes Division