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Abstract

An evaluation is made of the effect of cross grain on the transit time of longitudinal compression stress waves in Douglas-fir 2 by 8 lumber. Cross grain causes the stress wave to advance with a front or contour skewed in the direction of the grain angle, rather than to advance with a front normal to the long axis of lumber. Thus, the timing of the stress wave in lumber with cross grain is complicated. Based on the static bending modulus of elasticity of the lumber evaluated, an average of transit times for determining a stress wave modulus of elasticity (E) was better than two other timing bases. Another timing basis, however, was best in accounting for stress-wave measurements on 2 by 4's cut with a 4.4° slope of grain bias from the 2 by 8's. These results should aid in the development of lumber stress grading systems using E measurements based on stress waves.
Effect of Cross Grain on Stress Waves in Lumber.

Introduction

Electromechanical machines are the primary means for machine stress grading lumber, although some specialty grading is done on a long span basis using longitudinal compression stress waves. As in all technological developments of this type, stress-wave grading systems can be made more efficient as measurement interactions with lumber characteristics are better understood. Such efficiency could be advantageous as stress waves offer several potential advantages over mechanical stress raters, including a more rapid throughput, lower induced fiber stress, and lower cost.

In applying longitudinal stress wave theory to wood (1, 2), common practice assumes that the stress-wave front is normal to the direction of travel, as in a long slender rod, and that the elementary stress-wave equation (from 6)

\[ E = \frac{\rho c^2}{c^2} \]

where \( E \) is modulus of elasticity, \( \rho \) is density, and \( c \) is speed of the stress wave, reasonably applies to wood. The theory also assumes homogeneous material. Wood is not homogeneous. As \( E \) parallel to the grain is commonly more than ten times the \( E \) perpendicular to the grain, stress-wave speed parallel to the grain should be more than three times that perpendicular to the grain. Consequently, for a given period of time, a stress wave should travel much farther along the grain than across the grain, implying that the wave front would not remain normal to the long axis of lumber containing sloping grain.

Therefore, as stress-wave stress grading systems are developed, a fundamental understanding of stress-wave interactions with lumber characteristics such as knots, cross grain, moisture content, and growth rings is desirable. Subjects previously studied include the interaction of stress waves with moisture content (5) and annual growth rings (4) and a comparison of two types of instruments for measuring stress-wave speed in lumber (3). This paper presents an evaluation of the effect of cross grain (fiber or grain angle) on longitudinal compression stress waves in lumber. The type of warp known as cup is also considered as it was an unintentional variable that tended to interact with the type of stress-wave apparatus used.

Materials and Methods

Specimens

Five Douglas-fir 2 by 8’s, flatsawn and 8 feet long, were selected for this study. They each contained spiral grain, a type of cross grain that appears on the wide faces of flatsawn lumber (8). The specimens were knot-free with annual growth rings generally parallel to the long axis (less than 2.4° or 1 in 24 deviation). They were conditioned to equilibrium at 73°F and 50 percent relative humidity prior to testing. Dimensions and weight of each piece were measured after equilibrium. Also, the cupping characteristic of each piece was noted as this was soon observed to be an important variable due to the type of stress-wave apparatus used. Positive cup implied a concave warped bark side surface, negative cup the opposite.

Figure 1 shows specimen marking on the bark side prior to measurements of grain angle, modulus of elasticity (E) in static bending, and stress-wave transit time. The midpoints of the eight 1-foot increments are identified by the numbers 1 through 8. These numbers also identify the cross sections (CX) that are made at the foot increment midpoints. Another set of numbers 1 through 8 are used to identify the locations of grid points spaced 15/16 inch apart on the cross sections corresponding to CX3, CX4, CX5, and CX6, making 32 grid points in all.

Grain Angle

Grain angle was measured relative to the long axis of the lumber at the midpoints of the foot increments on both bark side and pith side. The
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induced in the end of a specimen by
a steel horn clamped to the hammer end of the specimen. Two acceler-
eters are fastened to the specimen to sense passage of the induced stress wave. The accelerometer
nearer the hammer end starts a
microsecond counter; the second ac-
celerometer stops it, thus providing the time for the impact stress wave to go
from the first to the second ac-
celerometer. In this study the start or
reference accelerometer was clamped on the bark side within 1/4 inch of
midwidth (accelerometer clamp did
not allow reaching to actual mid-
width) 6 inches from the hammer end. The second accelerometer was
fastened to each of the barkside grid
points in random sequence. Thus, the
time for an induced stress wave to
reach each grid point was measured relative to a common start ac-
celerometer position. Similarly, the
position that gave the shortest transit
time of the stress wave, that is, the
"fastest point" on each cross section
containing grid points, was deter-
mimed by trial and error searching
with the stop accelerometer.
Seven sets of stress-wave times were measured to the 32 grid points on the 2 by 8 (fig. 4). Each set con-
stituted one run. Runs 1 and 3 were
made with the end nearer foot incre-
ment 1 (number 1 end) toward the
hammer, and runs 2 and 4 were made
with the end nearer foot increment 8
(number 8 end) toward the hammer.
Runs 5, 6, and 7 were oriented in the
same direction as runs 1 and 3; but
before each of these latter three runs
was made, a 6-inch length was sawn
off the number 1 end. Thus, by run 7
each specimen had been shortened
by 1-1/2 feet as shown schematically
in figure 4.
Following run 7, two specimens
were cut from each 2 by 8. One was a
6-inch section for determining
moisture content (ovendry method)
and annual growth rate. The other
was a 4-foot long 2 by 4 cut from the
number 8 end of each 2 by 8 and
oriented to obtain a 4.4° increase in
slope of grain (fig. 4). In specimen DF-
XG-5, however, the slope was in-
advertently decreased by 4.4°. Four
grid points spaced 1 inch apart were
marked on the bark side of the 2 by
4's at each cross section cor-
responding to CX5 and CX6 on the 2
by 8's, with the slight adjustment
needed to make them 1 foot apart.
Stress-wave times were measured to
each of the 8 grid points on the 2 by 4's with the start accelerometer 6
inches from the end nearer foot incre-
ment 8.

Results

Physical Properties

The angle of spiral grain varied
along the length and from wide face
to wide face of each specimen as
well as between specimens (table 1).
Four of the specimens had slopes

---

Figure 1.—Markings on the bark side of each specimen—The numbers 1 through 8 identify the midpoints of the 1-foot increments, which also mark the location of cross sections. Another set of numbers 1 through 8 identifies the locations of grid points set 15/16 inch apart on the cross sections. M 148 201

Figure 2.—Schematic of a beam with uniform bending moment over central 54-inch length. Frog with dial gage shown at CX3 to CX4 measures the deflection of the centerpoint relative to CX3 and CX4. M 148 203
caused by left-handed (as in a left-handed screw) spiral grain relative to the bark side; the other (DF-XG-2) had right-handed spiral grain. The maximum grain angle measured on the wide faces of each specimen ranged from 6.7° to 9.5° (1 in 8.5 to 1 in 6.0 equivalent slope), while the minimum ranged from 1.9° to 3.5° (1 in 30 to 1 in 16 equivalent slope). Within the seventh 1-foot increment of DF-XG-5, however, there was a steep local deviation to the annual rings, as would occur at a local crook or bulge in a tree.

Several of the other physical properties also varied (table 2). There was considerable variation between the specimens in specific gravity and growth rate and to some extent in static-bending E. Within-specimen variation in static-bending E was small. Moisture content was approximately 11 percent for all specimens. Three of the specimens had positive cup and two negative cup.

Impact Stress-Wave Contours

Cup

Before evaluating the results of stress-wave measurements, it is necessary to consider the difficulty of inducing a uniform contoured longitudinal stress wave into a wide lumber specimen. The interaction between the steel horn clamp of the stress-wave apparatus and specimen cup resulted in a nonuniform induced stress wave. Because a specimen is clamped against a lip (6-in. maximum width) extending from the steel horn, and the end of the specimen is not held tight against the horn, most of the energy of the stress wave must be induced through the lip of the horn. If a specimen is not cupped and not very wide, the induced stress wave should be nearly uniform across the width of the piece at the start. For a wide, cupped specimen, however, the stress wave will be induced at the point of contact between the horn lip and specimen surface. With bark side...
The stress-wave contours in figure 5 are consistent with the slope of grain in both specimens.

Table 1.—Grain angle characteristics on the wide faces of the five Douglas-fir 8-foot long 2 by 8's containing spiral grain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen number</th>
<th>Flat sawn surface</th>
<th>Grain angle in degrees at specimen foot increment numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF-XG-1</td>
<td>Bark side</td>
<td>3.8 4.1 5.6 3.2 3.1 8.7 7.9 8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pith side</td>
<td>3.6 4.6 4.0 5.2 6.3 6.7 6.3 8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF-XG-2</td>
<td>Bark side</td>
<td>6.0 6.9 8.3 5.1 4.6 5.5 5.4 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pith side</td>
<td>4.4 4.6 3.5 3.9 5.0 3.6 3.8 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF-XG-3</td>
<td>Bark side</td>
<td>7.1 7.1 8.7 6.3 5.9 5.2 8.1 6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pith side</td>
<td>6.0 8.7 7.6 5.4 7.1 6.9 3.8 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF-XG-4</td>
<td>Bark side</td>
<td>6.2 5.0 2.9 4.4 4.8 5.7 5.1 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pith side</td>
<td>6.7 3.5 3.2 4.6 5.2 5.2 4.6 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF-XG-5</td>
<td>Bark side</td>
<td>4.2 5.4 4.4 5.7 9.1 4.4 6.3 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pith side</td>
<td>4.8 5.2 3.0 5.4 6.9 4.1 8.1 8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 A possible three-dimensional effect suggested by the differences in grain angle on bark side and pith side was not evaluated in this study.
2 Specimen 2 had right-handed spiral grain relative to the bark side, all others had left-handed.

Contours at CX3 relative to specimen shortening.

As both positive and negative cupping were encountered (table 2), stress-wave transit time contours leading or lagging along the centerline were both observed as suggested by the examples shown in figure 5. The stress-wave time contours of figure 5 are based on data gathered in runs 1, 5, 6, and 7 at CX3 of specimens DF-XG-4 and DF-XG-5 and were estimated from

\[ D_i = d(t_{i1}) \]  

where \( t_{i1} \) is measured transit time to a grid point on CX3, \( t_1 \) is the average of the \( t_i \)'s for CX3 which is at distance \( d \) from the reference accelerometer, and \( D_i \) is the calculated distance from the reference (start) accelerometer for a transit time of \( t_1 \). Run 7, with CX3 located 6 inches from the reference accelerometer (12-in. from the hammer end), best demonstrates the effect of positive cupping in DF-XG-4 and negative cupping in DF-XG-5 on the induced stress wave. Figure 5 shows that the stress wave led near midwidth in DF-XG-4 but lagged near midwidth in DF-XG-5 in run 7. These leading and lagging characteristics diminished the farther CX3 was from the hammer end, apparently due to the influence of cross grain. In run 1, with CX3 at 30 inches from the end, the stress-wave contours in figure 5 are consistent with the slope of grain in both specimens.

Table 2.—Physical properties of the five Douglas-fir 8-foot long 2 by 8's containing spiral grain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen number</th>
<th>Moisture content</th>
<th>Specific gravity</th>
<th>Growth Rate, ( r^2 ) per inch</th>
<th>Cup</th>
<th>Static bending E, 10⁴ psi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between cross sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF-XG-1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF-XG-2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF-XG-3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF-XG-4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF-XG-5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Test volume, oven dry weight basis.
2 Positive implies concave bark side surface, negative implies convex.
3 Uniform bending moment basis.
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Pitch pockets
Even small pitch pockets may have an apparent effect on the stress-wave contour, particularly if the stress-wave sensing element falls on wood overgrowing the pocket. DF-XG-2 contained two shallow growths over small pitch pockets—one at CX4, the other at CX5—resulting in longer transit-time readings, and consequent lags in stress-wave contours near midwidth at the two CX's (figure 6).

Different impact end
Based on data obtained in run 2 with the lumber end opposite to that for run 1, that is, with the number 8 end toward the hammer, the stress-wave contours shown in figure 7 reflect somewhat different slope-of-grain characteristics than those in figure 6. The slope of grain was steeper toward the number 8 end than toward the number 1 end in DF-XG-1 and DF-XG-5, but the stress-wave contours only reflect that trend in DF-XG-1. In DF-XG-5 the local steep slope of annual rings at CX 7 had a much greater effect than the spiral grain, producing a very noticeable lag in the stress-wave contour along the lower 15/16-inch grid numbers at CX 6 (30 in. from the hammer end). The other three specimens tended to have shallower spiral grain on the number 8 end; their stress-wave contours show the effect of lesser slope at 30 inches from the hammer end in figure 7, as compared to figure 6, consistent with the angle of cross grain.

Matched Run Comparisons
Run 3 yielded results very like run 1, and run 4 very like run 2; however, some differences did exist between matched runs. These differences are reflected in the data of table 3, which are the standard deviations of grid point differences in transit time between matched runs expressed as a percent of the average of measured times to a cross section. The coefficients in table 3 average out to 1.0 percent, but the general increasing trend of coefficients with CX number for matched runs 2 and 4 implies that the relative error of measurement decreased with increasing transit distance. However, no such trend is apparent for matched runs 1 and 3. The maximum microsecond (μs) difference in time measurements to any one grid point between matched runs was 13 μs (less than 6 percent error), which occurred in matched runs 1 and 3 of DF-XG-4.

Fastest Point of Stress Wave
Some small inconsistencies in transit-time data are also apparent in that the fastest point of the stress wave determined by trial and error searching with the accelerometer differs somewhat from the fastest point on the contour calculated from grid-point data. Examples of these inconsistencies are most pronounced in some of the contours for DF-XG-4 in figures 5 and 6, for DF-XG-1 and DF-XG-2 in figure 6, and for DF-XG-5 in figure 7 where the trial and error fastest points (+) do not coincide with the contour fastest points.

Another item to be noted is that the position of the fastest point of the contours tends toward the edge of a specimen consistent with the direction of grain, except for runs 2 and 4 on DF-XG-5 where it tended to stay near midwidth. The exception is apparently due to the steep local growth ring deviation toward the number 8 end of DF-XG-5.
Figure 7.—Calculated stress-wave contours centered about cross sections 3, 4, 5, and 6 as in figure 6 but with opposite end to the impact end. M 148 392

Stress-Wave Timing Bases

Because of the nonuniformity observed in the stress-wave contours, three different bases of timing the stress wave are evaluated: (1) fastest point at a CX; (2) average based on the average of times to the eight grid points of a CX; and (3) centerline based on the average of times to the two grid points near midwidth of a CX.

Stress-wave times for the 3 feet of transit distance between CX3 and CX6 presented in table 4 demonstrate that the shortest transit times occurred for the fastest point basis in all runs for all specimens except for runs 2, 4, and 7 on DF-XG-5. The longest times occurred for the centerline basis except for most of the runs on DF-XG-5 and runs 2, 4, and 7 on DF-XG-3. The different behavior of DF-XG-5 apparently was due to the negative cup on the number 1 end, which caused an early lag in the stress-wave contour near midwidth for run 7, and to the local growth ring slope toward the number 8 end, which apparently had a pronounced effect on the fastest point of the stress wave in runs 2 and 4. The data in table 4 also show that matched runs generally yielded the same times for the 3-foot transit distance with a maximum difference of 5 μs between runs 1 and 3 of DF-XG-2 for the centerline basis. A third point of interest in table 4 is that the times for the 3-foot transit distance depended to some extent on which end of the lumber was impacted. This third point is apparent by comparing runs 1 and 3 with runs 2 and 4 where the absolute differences due to impact end vary from 1 to 9 μs. The general tendency in the end effect is toward higher absolute differences for the centerline timing basis and lower absolute differences for the fastest point basis. Finally, as evidenced by comparing the data for the various bases, are summarized basis. As static bending E did not vary greatly over the 3-foot length between CX3 and CX6 (table 2), the average static E given in table 2 for each specimen was used as the basis for comparing E's derived from specimen density and from the stress-wave data of table 4, which covers the same 3-foot length as for static E. Stress-wave E's were calculated from equation (1) where c was obtained by dividing the 3-foot distance by the stress-wave transit time.

The stress-wave E's, derived for the various runs and for the three different timing bases, are summarized in figure 8 as a percent of static bending E. Except for DF-XG-5, stress-wave E's tend to be greatest for the fastest point timing basis and least for the centerline timing basis. Again, except for DF-XG-5, the stress-wave E's based on average time tended to be closer to the static bending E's than either of the other two bases. In fact, the average relative stress-wave

Modulus of Elasticity (E)

As static bending E did not vary greatly over the 3-foot length between CX3 and CX6 (table 2), the average static E given in table 2 for each specimen was used as the basis for comparing E's derived from specimen density and from the stress-wave data of table 4, which covers the same 3-foot length as for static E. Stress-wave E's were calculated from equation (1) where c was obtained by dividing the 3-foot distance by the stress-wave transit time.

The stress-wave E's, derived for the various runs and for the three different timing bases, are summarized in figure 8 as a percent of static bending E. Except for DF-XG-5, stress-wave E's tend to be greatest for the fastest point timing basis and least for the centerline timing basis. Again, except for DF-XG-5, the stress-wave E's based on average time tended to be closer to the static bending E's than either of the other two bases. In fact, the average relative stress-wave

2 by 4 Results

The 2 by 4's were cut to achieve a 4.4° increase in grain angle from that in the 2 by 8's (except for the inadvertent decrease in angle in DF-XG-9). The stress-wave contours for the 2 by 4's at CX6 and CX5 exhibited a more pronounced effect due to grain slope
than did the 2 by 8’s. The effect was observed as a strong leading tendency along the edge in the direction of the sloping grain and a lagging tendency along the opposite edge. Due to the increase in grain angle, stress-wave times for the 1-foot transit distance in the 2 by 4’s were somewhat higher than those for the 2 by 8’s; however, these times did not favor any one particular timing basis as they did for the 3-foot transit distance in the 2 by 8’s.

A theoretical effect of a change in grain angle on stress-wave transit time can be calculated based on equation (2) and the equation from March (7)

$$\frac{1}{E_0} = \frac{\cos^4 \theta}{E_0} + \frac{\sin^4 \theta}{E_0} + \frac{1 - 2\nu}{G} \sin^2 \theta \cos^2 \theta$$

(4)

where \( \theta \) is the grain angle, \( G \) is shear modulus, \( \nu \) is Poisson’s ratio, and subscripts 0 and 90 refer to parallel and perpendicular grain directions, respectively. \( E_0 \) can be solved if the constants of equation (5) are known, or \( E_0 \) can be solved with respect to \( E_0/EG \). However, the time ratios if the \( \nu \) and \( E_0/EG \) are known, the latter approach, that is \( E_0/EG \), was taken using \( E_0 = 0.050E_0 \) and \( G = 0.078EG \). Actually, \( \nu \) and \( E_0/EG \) do not have much effect on \( E_0 \) in the range of grain angles encountered in the present lumber sample. Using the above ratios it is possible to calculate an effect on \( E_0 \) of changing grain slope from \( \theta_1 \) to \( \theta_2 \). Then, because \( E_0 \) is inversely proportional to the square of transit time, (equation 1), it follows that

$$T_0^2/T_1^2 = \frac{E_0/EG}{E_0/EG}$$

(5)

where \( T \) is stress-wave transit time over a specified distance. The actual ratios based on timing of the stress wave between CX5 and CX6 by the fastest point basis agree very favorably with the theoretical ratios based on equations (4) and (5) (Table 5). Actual ratios based on average or centerline timing compare less favorably with the theoretical ratios than do the ratios for the fastest point timing basis. The time ratios by the average timing basis would agree more favorably with the theoretical time ratios if the \( G/E \) ratio was closer to 0.11 than 0.078. An even larger \( G/E \) ratio would be needed to make the centerline timing basis ratios more agreeable with theory.

**Conclusions**

Because stress waves travel faster along the grain than across, longitudinal stress waves in wood tend to lead in the direction of the grain slope. The timing of a stress wave transmitted a certain distance in lumber containing cross grain is somewhat complicated by that trend in that different methods of timing may yield somewhat different results; no differences would be expected if the stress-wave contour remained normal to the direction of transit. Of the three timing bases evaluated, the average basis yielded a stress-wave

---

**Table 4.—Stress wave times for a 3-foot transit distance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen number</th>
<th>Timing basis</th>
<th>Transit time in ( \mu )s between CX3 and CX6 for run numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DF-XG-1</td>
<td>Fastest point</td>
<td>173 175 172 170 168 171 176 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>177 179 176 178 174 180 179 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centerline</td>
<td>176 182 180 187 187 191 186 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF-XG-2</td>
<td>Fastest point</td>
<td>182 181 177 178 180 179 182 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>187 187 184 184 181 184 184 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centerline</td>
<td>198 193 186 184 186 188 186 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF-XG-3</td>
<td>Fastest point</td>
<td>202 203 205 204 205 206 206 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>212 213 212 212 212 212 212 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centerline</td>
<td>215 214 214 214 214 214 214 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF-XG-4</td>
<td>Fastest point</td>
<td>172 172 169 170 170 170 170 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>177 180 175 174 174 174 174 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centerline</td>
<td>178 180 180 177 182 176 176 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF-XG-5</td>
<td>Fastest point</td>
<td>166 168 170 166 172 171 171 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>173 175 174 173 170 167 166 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centerline</td>
<td>174 178 174 172 164 168 166 166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fastest point implies timing of earliest arrival of stress wave at CX3 and CX6. Average is based on timing of stress wave to eight grid points at CX3 and also at CX6. Centerline is based on average of stress-wave timing to the two centermost grid points at CX3 and also at CX6.*
modulus of elasticity (E) closest to the static E of the 2 by 8 lumber, while the fastest point basis yielded a stress-wave E more than the static E, and the centerline basis yielded a stress-wave E less than the static E. On the other hand, results of the fastest point timing basis most closely agreed with the theoretical effect of a 4.4° change in slope of grain. Finally, depending on the apparatus and the presence of positive or negative cup in the specimen, the stress-wave contour induced in the end of lumber may not be normal, particularly in wide specimens, but may lead along either the centerline or near the edges, affecting the shape of stress-wave contours some distance away from the end.

Table 5.—Transit time ratios (2 by 4 μs/2 by 8 μs) due to a 4.4° change in grain angle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen number</th>
<th>Theoretical</th>
<th>By Fastest point</th>
<th>By Average</th>
<th>By Centerline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DF-XG-1</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF-XG-2</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF-XG-3</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF-XG-4</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF-XG-5</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Based on stress wave transit from CX8 to CX5 in the 2 by 8's and in the 2 by 4's cut to effect a 4.4° change in grain angle.
2 Based on average of results from runs 2 and 4 at CX5 and CX6 on 2 by 8's and the run on 2 by 4's at CX 5 and CX 6.
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