


050761



City of Gainesville
Code Enforcement Division

306 NE 6th Avenue
Gainesville, FL 32602-0490
Phone: 352.334.5030
Fax: 352.334.2239

To: Community Development Committee

From: Jim Garrett, Code Enforcement Manager 

VIA: Tom Saunders, Community Development Director

Date: January 17, 2007

Re: Directive to make energy/housing code comparisons

You directed staff at your last meeting to research the subject of energy requirements for the purpose of comparing international codes with the City minimum housing code. The International Existing Building Code published by International Code Congress provides requirements to meet energy conservation measures if certain conditions are met. Those conditions are:

• **Level 1 Alterations which are defined as:**

- Alterations include the removal and replacement or the covering of existing materials, elements, equipment, or fixtures using new materials, elements, equipment, or fixtures that serve the same purpose and are permitted without requiring the entire building or structure to comply with the energy requirements of the International Energy Conservation Code or International Residential Code.

• **Level 2 Alterations which are defined as:**

- Alterations include the reconfiguration of space, the addition or elimination of any door or window, the reconfiguration or extension of any system, or the installation of any additional equipment and are permitted without requiring the entire building or structure to comply with the energy requirements of the International Energy Conservation Code or International Residential Code.

- **Level 3 Alterations which are defined as:**

- Alterations apply where the work area exceeds 50 percent of the aggregate area of the building. Level 3 alterations to existing buildings or structures are permitted without requiring the entire building or structure to comply with the energy requirements of the International Energy Conservation Code or International Residential Code. The alterations shall conform to the energy requirements of the International Energy Conservation Code or International Residential Code as they relate to new only.

In addition the U.S. Department of Energy web site has a comparative chart which identifies the energy conservation efforts each state is or isn't making. Please note in the attached document that Florida has adopted the 2004 Florida Building Code which establishes energy conservation requirements for new construction, additions to existing buildings and manufactured homes, renovations to existing buildings and to the installation or replacement of building systems and components with new products for which thermal efficiency standards are set.

I have attached section 13-101.0 of the 2004 Florida Building Code which defines local government's ability to modify the application of this code to being no more stringent or lenient than the applications noted in the paragraph above. Given these restrictions it is my belief that implementing any requirements to chapter 13 of the housing code that would require retroactive upgrades to existing housing would be in direct violation of this requirement.

After review of the International Existing Building Code and 2004 Florida Building Code it is my belief that the retro application of energy efficiency standards is not a recognized industry practice. The City's housing code is consistent with the codes I have reviewed with respect to not addressing energy conservation in existing buildings and I would not recommend adding any reference regarding this practice at this time.

2004 Florida Building Code Excerpt

SECTION 13-101

SCOPE

13-101.0 General.

This code is a statewide uniform code and shall not be made more stringent or lenient by local government. The code provides for a uniform standard of energy efficiency by, at a minimum, setting forth minimum requirements for exterior envelopes, lighting, electrical distribution, and selection of heating, lighting, ventilating, air conditioning and service water heating systems. It shall apply to all new buildings, to additions to existing buildings and manufactured homes, to renovations to existing buildings, both public and private, with certain exceptions, to changes of occupancy type, to the site-installed components and features of manufactured homes at their first set-up, and to the installation or replacement of building systems and components with new products for which thermal efficiency standards are set by this code. New buildings, with the exception of those exempted below, and in accordance with the specific exceptions of individual sections shall be designed to comply with Subchapter 13-4 or 13-6 of this code.

[Home](#)

U.S. Department of Energy - Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy

Building Energy Codes Program

[Back to Energy Codes Site](#)

Residential State Codes

	Residential Code:	RI/Scheck shows compliance	Enforcement Status:	Approximate Stringency:	Residential Code Notes:
Alaska	State Specific Code	No	Voluntary With Amendments	As stringent as the 95 MEC	The Building Energy Efficiency Standard (BEES) is the mandatory minimum energy efficiency standard for construction using state financing programs.
Alabama	State Specific Code	No	Voluntary With Amendments	As stringent as the 2000 IECC	Residential Energy Code for Alabama (RECA), a voluntary state developed code equivalent to the IECC 2000 without SHGC 0.40 is contingent upon local adoption. Four jurisdictions have adopted the International codes, including IECC 2000 without tampering with the low solar heat gain low-e window requirements.
Arkansas	State Specific Code	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	Less stringent than the 2003 IECC	Amendment excludes compliance to the .40 SHGC in hdd areas less than 3,500
American Samoa	None	No	None Without Amendments	No Information	None.
Arizona	2000 IECC	Yes	Voluntary Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2000 IECC	
California	State Specific Code	No	Mandatory With Amendments	More stringent than the 2003 IECC	State-developed code, Part 6 of Title 24, which exceeds 2003 IECC is mandatory statewide as of Oct. 1, 2005.
Colorado	93 MEC	Yes	Voluntary Without Amendments	As stringent as the 93 MEC	1993 MEC for hotels, motels, and multifamily dwellings, mandatory in any area that does not adopt or enforce local codes
Connecticut	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	
District of Columbia	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	
Delaware	2000 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2000 IECC	
Florida	State Specific Code	No	Mandatory With Amendments	More stringent than the 2000 IECC	State-developed code (Chapter 13 of the Florida Building Code), which exceeds 2000 IECC is mandatory statewide
Georgia	2000 IECC	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	As stringent as the 2000 IECC	2000 IECC with Georgia State Supplements and Amendments 2003, 2005 and 2006. Also an Errata to the Amendment package.
Guam	93 MEC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 93 MEC	1993 MEC.
Hawaii	None	Yes	Voluntary Without Amendments	No Information	Honolulu and Maui County require R-19 or equivalent in roofs of new residences. Hawaii County requires R-19 in the roofs and R-11 in the walls for homes that are centrally air conditioned. Kauai County currently does not have residential energy code provisions.
Iowa	2006 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2006 IECC	
			Mandatory	As stringent as	

Idaho	2003 IECC	Yes	Without Amendments	the 2003 IECC	2003 IECC
Illinois	None	Yes	Voluntary Without Amendments	No Information	None - The state of Illinois supports a Home Energy Rating System
Indiana	State Specific Code	No	Mandatory With Amendments	As stringent as the 92 MEC	Indiana Energy Conservation Code (1992 Model Energy Code with Indiana amendments)
Kansas	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	2003 IECC or energy-efficiency disclosure form
Kentucky	2000 IECC	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	As stringent as the 2000 IECC	2000 IECC for exterior building envelope only
Louisiana	2006 IRC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2006 IRC	Effective 01/01/2007 2006 IRC with direct reference to 2006 IECC. Can use REScheck to show compliance to the 2006 IECC
Massachusetts	State Specific Code	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	More stringent than the 95 MEC	1995 MEC with amendments
Maryland	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	
Maine	2003 IECC	No	Mandatory With Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	
Michigan	State Specific Code	No	Mandatory With Amendments	Less stringent than the 92 MEC	Michigan Uniform Energy Code Part 10 Rules, less stringent than 1992 MEC.
Minnesota	State Specific Code	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	More stringent than the 95 MEC	Minnesota State Building Code, based on the 1995 MEC
Missouri	None	No	None Without Amendments	No Information	None statewide. State-owned single-family and multi-family residential buildings must comply with the latest edition of the MEC or ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 90.2-1993
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	State Specific Code	No	Mandatory Without Amendments	No Information	State-developed code, which adopts the 1989 CABO One- and Two-Family Dwelling Code is mandatory for all new and remodeled residential buildings
Mississippi	PRIOR 92 MEC	No	Voluntary Without Amendments	Less stringent than the PRIOR 92 MEC	State energy code, based on ASHRAE Standard 90-1975, is adopted by local jurisdictions
Montana	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	2003 IECC with amendments (1) Basement wall insulation may be delayed until space is finished (2) Log walls are exempt from R-value requirements (3) All residential buildings must have an energy component label, listing insulation levels, window and heating and water heating efficiencies to be placed in on the electrical panel
North Carolina	State Specific Code	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	State-developed code, modeled on the 2003 IECC with amendments & Chapter 11 of 2003 IRC with amendments. Prescriptive statewide requirements of SHGC 0.40 & U-value of 0.4 or better, trade-off between building envelope and HVAC equipment not allowed
North Dakota	93 MEC	Yes	Voluntary Without Amendments	As stringent as the 93 MEC	1993 MEC is contingent on adoption by local jurisdiction
Nebraska	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	
New Hampshire	2000 IECC	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	As stringent as the 2000 IECC	2000 IECC
New Jersey	95 MEC	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	As stringent as the 95 MEC	1995 CABO MEC with New Jersey modifications. As of September 5, 2006, a proposal has been submitted to adopt a modified version of the 2006 IECC. The State is looking for a January 2007 adoption.
New Mexico	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	July 1, 2004 IECC 2003 became effective.
			Mandatory		The cities of Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Henderson, Mesquite, Boulder City, and Clark County have adopted the 2003 IECC with an

Nevada	2003 IECC	Yes	Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	effective date of August 1, 2005. Washoe County, Reno and Sparks will enforce the 2003 IECC for residential and commercial buildings as of July 1, 2005. Carson City County has adopted and is enforcing the 2003 IECC as of January 1, 2005.
New York	2001 IECC	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	As stringent as the 2001 IECC	2001 IECC w amendments
Ohio	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	Chapter 13 of the 2005 Ohio Building Code.
Oklahoma	2003 IECC	Yes	Voluntary Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	2003 IECC is mandatory for jurisdictions without codes and for all state owned and leased facilities
Oregon	State Specific Code	No	Mandatory With Amendments	More stringent than the 2000 IECC	State-developed code that exceeds 2000 IECC is mandatory statewide
Pennsylvania	2006 IECC	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	As stringent as the 2006 IECC	2006 IECC and/or 2006 IRC, Chapter 11. Allowed prescriptive include: (1) The prescriptive methods for detached residential buildings contained in the current version of the "International Energy Conservation Code" compliance guide containing State maps, prescriptive energy packages and related software published by the United States Department of Energy, Building Energy Codes Program or (2) "Pennsylvania's Alternative Residential Energy Provisions."
Puerto Rico	State Specific Code	No	Mandatory With Amendments	Less stringent than the 95 MFC	The Code for Energy Conservation in Puerto Rico, based on ASHRAE FENSA 90.1-1989, is mandatory for the entire island of Puerto Rico.
Rhode Island	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	
South Carolina	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	
South Dakota	None	No	None Without Amendments	No Information	None.
Tennessee	92 MFC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 92 MFC	Local codes jurisdictions have the option of upgrading the energy efficiency code to 2000 IECC with 2001 Amendments.
Texas	2001 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2001 IECC	2000 IECC with 2001 Supplement
Utah	2006 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2006 IECC	
Virginia	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	
U.S. Virgin Islands	None	No	None Without Amendments	No Information	None.
Vermont	State Specific Code	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	As stringent as the 2000 IECC	Based upon the 2000 IECC and Vermont's amendments
Washington	State Specific Code	No	Mandatory With Amendments	More stringent than the 2003 IECC	State-developed and implemented code. Most recent updates effective July 1, 2005. Exceeds 2003 IECC standards for most homes. The Council is currently in the process of reviewing the Washington State Energy Code and adopting amendments for the 2006 Washington State Energy Code, which will be effective July 1, 2007
Wisconsin	State Specific Code	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	More stringent than the 95 MFC	State-developed code (COMM 22), which meets or exceeds 1995 MFC for 1-2 family dwelling (can use RFScheck when use of WI code is designated). Multi-family dwellings must meet compliance with 2000 IECC (can use RFScheck when use of 2000 IECC code is designated)
West Virginia	2003 IRC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IRC	2003 IRC with reference to 2003 IECC for compliance
Wyoming	None	No	Voluntary Without Amendments	As stringent as the PRIOR 92 MFC	The ICBO Uniform Building Code, which is based on the 1989 MFC, may be adopted and enforced by local jurisdictions

Commercial State Codes

	Commercial Code:	COMcheck shows compliance	Enforcement Status	Approximate Stringency	Commercial Code Notes
Alaska	None	No	None Without Amendments	No Information	None statewide. All public facilities must be designed to comply with the thermal and lighting energy standards adopted by the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities under AS44.42.020(a)(14).
Alabama	None	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the ASHRAE 90.1	The Alabama Building Energy Conservation Code (ABECC) is a mandatory building code for state government buildings, administered by the Alabama Building Commission. The latest version of the Code (ABECC 2004), which is based on ASHRAE/IESNA 90.1-2001, was adopted in March 2005 and was implemented by the Alabama Building Commission in September 2005.
Arkansas	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	ASHRAE/IESNA 90.1-2001, which is referenced by the 2003 IECC.
American Samoa	None	No	None Without Amendments	No Information	None.
Arizona	ASHRAE 99	Yes	Voluntary Without Amendments	As stringent as the ASHRAE 99	State-owned or -funded buildings, must comply with ASHRAE/IESNA 90.1-1999.
California	State Specific Code	No	Mandatory With Amendments	More stringent than the ASHRAE 90.1	State-developed code, Part 6 of Title 24, which meets or exceeds ASHRAE/IESNA 90.1-2001, is mandatory statewide as of Oct. 1, 2005.
Colorado	2003 IECC	Yes	Voluntary Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	Voluntary state provisions are based on 2003 IECC with reference to ASHRAE 90.1-2001.
Connecticut	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	2003 IECC with reference to ASHRAE 90.1-2001.
District of Columbia	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	including reference to ASHRAE 90.1-1999.
Delaware	ASHRAE 99	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the ASHRAE 99	ASHRAE 90.1-1999 provided that the respective county and municipality government shall exclude agricultural structures from the provisions.
Florida	State Specific Code	No	Mandatory With Amendments	More stringent than the ASHRAE 90.1	State-developed code, which meets or exceeds ASHRAE/IESNA 90.1-2001 is mandatory statewide.
Georgia	2000 IECC	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	More stringent than the 2000 IECC	2000 IECC with Georgia State Amendments to include ASHRAE 90.1-2004 with Georgia Amendments became effective Jan. 1, 2006.
Guam	ASHRAE 89	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the ASHRAE 89	ASHRAE/IESNA 90.1-1989.
Hawaii	None	Yes	Voluntary Without Amendments	No Information	Honolulu, Maui, and Kauai County require compliance with ASHRAE 90.1-1999. Hawaii County requires compliance with ASHRAE 90.1-1989.
Iowa	2006 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2006 IECC	2006 IECC with reference to ASHRAE 90.1-2004.
Idaho	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	2003 IECC.
Illinois	2001 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2001 IECC	2000 IECC with the 01 Supplement.
Indiana	State Specific Code	No	Mandatory With Amendments	stringent than the 90/90B	Indiana Energy Conservation Code (1992 Model Energy Code with Indiana amendments).
Kansas	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	2003 IECC.
Kentucky	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory With	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	

			Amendments		
Louisiana	ASHRAE 01	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	As stringent as the ASHRAE 01	No economizers are required. IECC 2000 is applicable to low-rise multi-family residential buildings 3 stories or less.
Massachusetts	State Specific Code	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	More stringent than the 2001 IECC	Elements from both the ASHRAE IESNA 90.1-1999 and the International Energy Conservative Code (IECC), with state specific amendments.
Maryland	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	
Maine	ASHRAE 01	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	As stringent as the ASHRAE 01	ASHRAE IESNA 90.1-2001
Michigan	ASHRAE 99	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	As stringent as the ASHRAE 99	ASHRAE 90.1-1999 is the current standard. The new rules were effective March 13, 2003.
Minnesota	State Specific Code	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	More stringent than the ASHRAE 89	Minnesota State Building Code, based on ASHRAE IESNA 90.1-1989
Missouri	None	No	None Without Amendments	No Information	None, except state-owned buildings must comply with ASHRAE IESNA 90.1-1989
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	State Specific Code	No	Mandatory Without Amendments	No Information	State-developed code, which adopts the 1991 Uniform Building Code is mandatory for all new and remodeled multi-family and commercial buildings.
Mississippi	None	No	None Without Amendments	No Information	90-1975 is mandatory for state-owned buildings, public buildings, and high-rise buildings only
Montana	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	2003 IECC with reference to ASHRAE 90.1-2001
North Carolina	State Specific Code	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	More stringent than the 2000 IECC	State-developed code, modeled on the 2003 IECC with amendments including ASHRAE IESNA 90.1-2004.
North Dakota	ASHRAE 89	Yes	Voluntary Without Amendments	As stringent as the ASHRAE 89	ASHRAE IESNA 90.1-1989 is contingent on adoption by local jurisdiction
Nebraska	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	2003 IECC with reference to ASHRAE 90.1-2001
New Hampshire	2000 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2000 IECC	2000 IECC with reference to ASHRAE 90.1-1999
New Jersey	ASHRAE 99	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the ASHRAE 99	ASHRAE IESNA 90.1-1999 with no modifications. As of September 5, 2006, a proposal has been submitted to adopt a modified version of the 2004 ASHRAE 90.1. The State is looking for a January 2007 adoption.
New Mexico	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	July 1, 2004 IECC 2003 became effective
Nevada	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	
New York	2001 IECC	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	As stringent as the 2001 IECC	2001 IECC w/ amendments
Ohio	ASHRAE 04	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the ASHRAE 04	ASHRAE 90.1-2004 became effective Sept. 6, 2005. Can show compliance to either 2003 IECC or 90.1-04
Oklahoma	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	2003 IECC is mandatory for jurisdictions without codes and for all state owned and leased facilities.
Oregon	State Specific Code	No	Mandatory With Amendments	More stringent than the ASHRAE 99	State-developed code that meets or exceeds ASHRAE IESNA 90.1-1999 is mandatory statewide.
Pennsylvania	2006 IECC	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	As stringent as the 2006 IECC	2006 IECC with reference to ASHRAE 90.1-2004

Puerto Rico	State Specific Code	No	Mandatory With Amendments	Less stringent than the ASHRAE 89	The Code for Energy Conservation in Puerto Rico, based on ASHRAE/HESNA 90.1-1989, is mandatory for the entire island of Puerto Rico.
Rhode Island	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	With reference to ASHRAE 90.1-2001
South Carolina	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	2003 IECC with reference to ASHRAE 90.1-2001
South Dakota	None	No	None Without Amendments	No Information	None.
Tennessee	90A90B	No	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 90A90B	Local codes jurisdictions have the option of upgrading the energy efficiency code to 2000 IECC with 2001 amendments.
Texas	2001 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2001 IECC	2000 IECC with 2001 Supplement
Utah	2006 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2006 IECC	with reference to ASHRAE 90.1-2004
Virginia	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	2003 IECC with reference to ASHRAE 90.1-2004 effective November 2005
U.S. Virgin Islands	None	No	None Without Amendments	No Information	None.
Vermont	State Specific Code	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	More stringent than the 2004 IECC	Based on 2004 IECC with amendments to include ASHRAE 90.1-2004
Washington	State Specific Code	No	Mandatory With Amendments	More stringent than the ASHRAE 01	State-developed code that meets or exceeds ASHRAE/HESNA 90.1-2001. Most recent updates effective July 1, 2005 The Council is currently in the process of updating the code and the 2006 Edition is slated to be effective July 1, 2007
Wisconsin	State Specific Code	Yes	Mandatory With Amendments	As stringent as the 2000 IECC	2000 IECC w amendments; can use COMcheck-EZ for building envelope, but not for HVAC or lighting. Set the code to be used with the "2000 IECC". Multi family buildings (3 stories or less, 3 dwellings or more) are considered commercial buildings in Wisconsin. REScheck may be used with these buildings if program is set for use with the "2000 IECC".
West Virginia	2003 IECC	Yes	Mandatory Without Amendments	As stringent as the 2003 IECC	
Wyoming	None	No	Voluntary Without Amendments	As stringent as the PRIOR 90A90B	The ICBO Uniform Building Code, which is based on the 1989 MEC, may be adopted and enforced by local jurisdictions.

- Setting the Standard

Technical Support

- Code Notes

Related Links

Florida DOE Status of State Energy Codes

Residential

Residential Code:

State Specific Code

State Amendments:

Yes

Can use REScheck to show compliance:

No

Enforcement Status:

Mandatory

Notes on the State's Residential Code:

State-developed code (Chapter 13 of the Florida Building Code), which exceeds 2000 IECC is mandatory statewide.

Approximate Stringency:

More stringent than the 2000 IECC

Current Status Comments:

Chapter 13 of the FBC is the statewide uniform standard for energy efficiency in the thermal design and operation of all buildings in the state of Florida. As such, the energy code is uniform throughout the state and cannot be made more lenient or stringent by local government. It applies to all new buildings; additions to existing buildings and manufactured homes; renovations to existing buildings, both public and private, with certain exceptions; changes of occupancy type; and site-installed components and features of manufactured homes for initial setup. New building systems added to existing buildings (heating, cooling, water heating, lighting, motors) must also meet minimum code requirements. This does not include buildings for which federal mandatory standards preempt the state energy code.

State Website(s):

Chapter 13 of the Florida Building Code, Building volume <http://www.floridabuilding.org>

Primary Technical Contact:

Ann Stanton

Energy Analyst

Building Codes and Standards

Florida Department of Community Affairs

2555 Shumard Oak Blvd.

Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100

PH: (850) 488-0964

Commercial

Commercial Code:

State Specific Code

State Amendments:

Yes

Can use COMcheck to show compliance:

No

Enforcement Status:

Mandatory

Notes on the State's Commercial Code:

State-developed code, which meets or exceeds ASHRAE/IESNA 90.1-2001 is mandatory statewide.

Approximate Stringency:

More stringent than the ASHRAE 01

FX: (850) 414-8436

State Agency/Office Head:

Florida Department of Community Affairs

PH: (850) 488-8466

Other Contact(s):

Mo Madani, Planning Manager

Building Codes and Standards

PH: (850) 487-1824 Ila Jones, Administrator

Florida Building Codes and Standards

PH: (850) 487-1824

Additional State Information (certification, adoption, compliance, enforcement, history, grants)

My Account Order By Phone Shopping Basket Help

Search

- T
- Bo
- Const
- Ene
- Fo
- Medical
- W
- Othe
- Corpor
- API
- ASCE
- ASME
- ASTM
- AWS
- AWWA
- BSI
- CSA
- DIN
- ICC
- IEC
- IEEE
- ISO
- NFPA

Welcome **James**
(logout)

Product of the Month: ANSI/IEEE C2-2007 - National Electrical Safety Code

HACKER SAFE

Confirm Navigation Bar

Do you have a coupon or promotional code?

Enter Code:

IMPORTANT: Your order will not be sent until you click on "Place Order".



Shipping Address:

James Garrett
City of Gainesville
PO Box 490
Station 10A
Gainesville FL 32602
US
352-334-5030



Billing Address:

James Garrett
City of Gainesville
PO Box 490
Station 10A
Gainesville FL 32602
US
352-334-5030



Payment Method: *Credit Card*

Credit Card: VISA
Card *****2691
Number: DEC/2007

This will appear on your credit card as a charge from Techstreet.

Please click only once

It may take several moments to process your order



Item	Qty	Format - Language - Price	Total
ICC IEBC-2006 <small>Availability Immediate Download</small>	1	PDF (English) \$ 48.00 USD	\$ 48.00 USD
Shipping Charge for Web Delivery:			\$ 0.00
ORDER TOTAL:			\$ 48.00



Please click only once

It may take several moments to process your order



Summary of the City Commission Meeting of January 8, 2007

Chief Norman Botsford

Citizen Comment – Moses Reese – Mr. Reese, 819 SE 5th Avenue, appeared before the City Commission to register a complaint about the disruption of his life due to alleged drug dealers living at 814 SE 5th Avenue, Apartments 3 and 17. Please have staff meet with Mr. Reese and review and implement all options to eliminate drug related activity at the aforementioned locations. Please provide an update report to the City Manager with the results of staff's review

Chief Norman Botsford

Citizen Comment - Commissioner Donovan moved to refer safety issues addressed by Moses Reese and Kali Blount to the Public Safety Committee. Mr. Blount presented to the City Commission photographs of what appeared to be teenagers brandishing automatic weapons in front of a Gainesville subsidized apartment complex. Please agenda these items for discussion during the February Public Safety Committee Meeting.

Lee Ann Lowery

Mayor Hanrahan requested that staff prepare an item that would discuss the financial commitments made to the Early Start, Head Start Program for Gainesville residents. The Commission requested that staff identify the gap in funding for these projects and how the City of Gainesville may help in alleviating this gap. Please prepare a City Commission agenda item for the February 12th meeting that summarizes the programs' goals and outcomes, provides an analysis of the funding provided by the federal, state, and local governments – including the School Board and Alachua County, and identify if the programs have a gap, and if so, what are the options for fulfilling the financial gap for service provision.

Becky Rountree

#060861 Commissioner Jack Donovan – GRU Manager Selection Process – Selection of the Manager of Utilities As part of the Commission's discussion of the modification of the process for the General Manager of Utilities, the Commission indicated that they wanted to ensure that all members of the Commission were agreeable and committed to the process to select the General Manager on January 22nd. Please work with Scott Fry and the City Manager to establish a preferred method, as well as an alternative method, for selection of the General Manager, which we can share with Commissioners, both individually and through a Commission Consent Agenda item for January 22nd.

Tom Saunders

#060830 Removing Property from Liens in Certain Circumstances: Removal of Lien Affecting 222 Southeast 9th Street – the City Commission discussed the removal of the lien from property that has recently been renovated at 222 SE 9th Street. The Commission ultimately voted to approve the removal of this lien while maintaining a lien for code enforcement fines on other properties that are owned in common by the previous owner of 222 SE 9th Street. The Commission also moved a policy for future releases of liens on individual properties which are a part of a larger group of holdings of a property owner in which liens have been placed. Tom, please work with Jim Garrett to ensure that we have institutionalized the City Commission's new policy. I am sure that some day in the future, we will face a similar issue and we will all be scratching our heads as to how to handle this issue. By documenting the policy within Code Enforcement's records, we will have the ability to pave a path to address an issue of this nature.

Citizen Comment – Mr. Tom Kennedy, a landlord in the University Context Area, came before the City Commission during public comment to express his concerns regarding the increase in landlord permit fees. To assist the Commission and staffs in the Zoning Department and the City Manager's Office, please prepare a one page sheet on the increases in the landlord permit fees, where they are applicable, and a very brief rationale for the increases to the fees. Please submit this information as soon as possible so that the staff can appropriately respond to questions that they receive regarding the fees.

#060733 PUD Amendment University Corners – the City Commission approved the Petition for the PUD and PD for University Corners. As part of this discussion, Marion Radson asked the City Commission if they would like to address phasing exterior materials and to identify the minimum amount of retail/commercial that would be built as part of the project in the first ordinance to be adopted on the First Reading. The City Commission approved moving this item forward to develop an ordinance for First Reading and asked staff to address these issues in the ordinance. Tom, please work with Anthony Lyons, the Developer, and the designated staff from the City Attorney's Office to address these issues in the implementing ordinance.

**FY2006 Electric Turn-Ons
Residential Only**

