



CODE REVIEW COMMITTEE

SACRAMENTO VALLEY ASSOCIATION OF BUILDING OFFICIALS

Committee Chair: Don Little PH: 916-774-5336
Vice Chair: Bob Stetson PH: 916-781-6600

Code Review Committee Question/Survey for July Results and Committee Supported Responses

Subject: Window Change Outs

1a. Does your jurisdiction require a permit for window/fenestration change outs that are the same size and style (like for like)?

	YES		NO
18	64%	10	36%

1b. For like-for-like window/fenestration change outs, does your jurisdiction verify California Energy Standards Commission minimum requirements at final inspection by way of a completed CF-6R form (Installation Certificate) being posted and/or made available to the field inspector?

	YES		NO
6	21%	22	79%

Comments by Spokespersons

- 1a.) A permit is needed for Historic District window change outs.
- 1a.) Permits are required for like-for-like change outs - to verify like-for-like and not significantly reduce egress opening dimensions.
- 1b.) Window change outs must use a minimum U=.75 per 2005 CEC.
- 1b.) We verify min .57 "U" value requirements for energy compliance. No other certification forms.
- 1b.) The manufacturers listing is checked at the time of permit application to ensure energy compliance. Only homeowners and/or contractors are permitted to install windows in the City of Red Bluff. Either the homeowner or the contractor is required to obtain the proper permits for inspections. We work closely with the State Contractors Board to weed out all non-contractors trying to do work with out permit. Do to the cost of the project this involves the State Contractors Board laws. The area contractors are fully on board and help in our endeavor to protect our citizens from non-qualified persons doing work with out permits.

Code Review Committee Supported Responses

- 1a. Yes, a permit should be required, so that you can get the best outcome possible. Not requiring permits for like-for-like does not give the average consumer enough information and often results in windows replaced in the same framed opening that have less net clear opening than before the change. Some things to consider when contemplating these issues are:
 - Egress windows were not required prior to the adoption of the 1970 UBC, which allowed min. 5 square feet, no dimension less than 22 inches and a max. of 48 inches off the finished floor.
 - 1976 UBC changed to 5.7 square feet 24 inches tall by 22 wide minimum, and 44- inch sill height.
 - The current Historical Building code allows 3.3 square feet and 18 inch minimum height and width for qualifying historical buildings.
 - Your jurisdiction may want to consider the replacement of non-operational single hung wood windows that were not required to meet egress at the time they were installed, with windows that may be slightly smaller, but more efficient and fully operational.
- 1b. The committee recommends some record of the installation certificate such as the CF-6R for residential window change-outs. California Code of Regulations Sec. 10-103(a)3 and 4, allows the

Building Department to request additional information (completion of the CF-6R) to verify compliance with the minimum standards. Per the code section, a completed CF-6R must be given to the owner and made available on request to the Building Department. To verify compliance, it is reasonable to expect the Building Department to hold the applicant responsible to provide a copy of these forms to the Building Department at time of final inspection.

As noted in a previous response, an important change with the 2005 energy requirements is that replacement windows must meet the U-factor and SHGC requirements of Package D, even if the fenestration area does not increase (see 2005 Residential Compliance Manual 8.3.3). A permit and inspection is the only way to ensure that this State requirement is met. A CF-6R is not technically required but some form of documentation should be retained by the Building Department.

Subject: Snow Loads

2. Would your jurisdiction require an engineered lateral force analysis when the ground snow load exceeds 40 lb per square foot for single-family dwellings in seismic zone 3, based on Section 2320 of the 2001 CBC?

N/A		YES		NO	
13	46%	11	39%	8	29%

Comments by Spokespersons

- 2.) Our snow load does not exceed 20#.
- 2.) Not Applicable in the City of Redding. We have a 30psf roof snow load requirement and do not require a combined snow load and lateral.
- 2.) When the roof snow load exceeds 30 psf, a portion of the snow load (25% Min) must be included in determining the seismic forces. Therefore it may be clearer to specify a maximum roof snow load rather than a ground snow load when an engineered design would be required.
- 2.) City of Red Bluff has no snow loads. If we did have snow loads, the given question concerning snow load would require engineering. It would start with the roof structures design and follow the tension/compressions path to the foundation to ensure compliance.
- 2.) I do not live/work in seismic zone 3 and do not have snow loads, but it appears that the code would require a designed lateral force resisting system.

Code Review Committee Supported Responses

- 2. No, an engineer analysis is not required in seismic zone 3. However, if your jurisdiction has areas subject to snow loads that should be addressed during design, then a local ordinance would be an appropriate method to establish policy to define the maximum allowable snow load for conventional construction without requiring an engineered lateral force analysis.