

2007/2008 INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE Means of Egress Code Development Committee

Dave Frable - Chair

Senior Fire Protection Engineer
U.S. General Services Administration,
Public Building Services
Geneva, IL

William J. Lynn

Fire Subcode Official
Township of South Hackensack
South Hackensack, New Jersey

Stephen Thomas – Vice Chair

President
Colorado Code Consulting, LLC
Denver, CO

Cary D. Redman

Fire Protection Consultant
TVA Fire & Life Safety
Atlanta, GA
Rep: Georgia Fire Inspectors
Association

Jason D. Averill

Fire Protection Engineer
National Institute of Standards and
Technology
Gaithersburg, MD

Brad Schiffer, AIA

Architect
Brad Schiffer/TAXIS Inc.
Naples, FL

Christopher W. Bryant

Principal
Spg3 Architects
Philadelphia, PA

John Stovall

NSArchitects
Rockville, MD
Rep: National Association of Home
Builders (NAHB)

Jim Budzinski

Fire Chief/Fire Marshal
Tamarac Fire Rescue
Tamarac, FL
Rep: Florida Fire Chiefs Association

Andrew Stuffer

Chief Building Official
City of Ventura
Ventura, CA

Patricia Coats

Architect/Code Consultant
Patricia Coats Architect, PC
Huntsville, AL

Joseph H. Versteeg

Principal
Versteeg Associates
Torrington, CT

Stephen Feustel

Chief, Prairie Township Fire Department
Columbus, OH
Rep: Franklin County Fire Chiefs
Association

Soy L. Williams

President
Soy Williams Consulting Inc.
Palmetto Bay, FL

James C. Hodgens

Deputy Chief
New York City Fire Department
Brooklyn, NY

Staff Secretary:

Kimberly Paarlberg, RA
Senior Staff Architect
International Code Council

INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE MEANS OF EGRESS COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS

E1-07/08

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language is too general. In addition, it would allow stairways and other building elements to not meet the life safety requirements that they should meet (e.g., Sections 1003.6 and 1008.1).

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IFC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that all exits, including non-required exits, should comply with the minimum requirements of Chapter 10.

Assembly Action: **None**

E2-07/08

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language would leave how to handle any additional means of egress undefined and in limbo as far as requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IFC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: For consistency with the action taken on code change E1-07/08, Part II, which the committee felt better expresses the intent of the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

E3-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The reference to Section 404 in the *International Fire Code* would result in consistency between jurisdictions in the application of Fire and Safety Evacuation Plans. This is an important part of the means of egress system.

Assembly Action: **None**

E4-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The specific reference in E3-07/08 provides better guidance.

Assembly Action: **None**

E5-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The revised definitions clarify applicability and coordinates with Standard ICC 300 *Bleachers, Grandstands and Folding and Telescopic Seating*.

Assembly Action:

None

E6-07/08

Errata: Replace the definition of "Exit Passageway" to read as follows.

EXIT PASSAGEWAY. An exit component that is separated from all other interior spaces of a building or structure by fire-resistance-rated construction and opening protectives, and provides for a protected path of egress travel in a primarily horizontal direction to ~~the~~ an exit discharge or ~~the~~ a public way.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The term "primarily" is undefined and confusing.

Assembly Action:

None

E7-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1021.4 (IFC [B] 1021.4) Openings and penetrations. Exit passageway opening protectives shall be in accordance with the requirements of Section 715.

Except as permitted in Section 402.4.6, openings in exit passageways other than ~~unprotected~~ exterior openings shall be limited to those necessary for exit access to the exit passageway from normally occupied spaces and for egress from the exit passageway.

Where interior exit enclosures are extended to the exterior of a building by an exit passageway, the door assembly from the exit enclosure to the exit passageway shall be protected by a fire door assembly complying with the requirements in Section 715.4. Fire door assemblies in exit passageways shall comply with Section 715.4.4.

Elevators shall not open into an exit passageway.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The further modification to Section 1021.4 was to delete 'unprotected'. The topic is exterior openings, therefore, this is a fire separation distance issue, so deleting the current term 'unexposed' as well as the proposed 'unprotected' is more consistent with the language in the code. The entire proposal was approved because consistency between Sections 1020 and 1021.

Assembly Action:

None

E8-07/08

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal will correlate sections throughout the code with the definition of 'level of exit discharge'. This would be consistent with the committee action on E5-06/07 which revised the definition.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IFC

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: For consistency with the action taken by the IBC-MOE and IEBC Committees. The proposal eliminates the previously existing confusion in establishing a correct point of measurement that these sections posed.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III – IEBC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This code change picks up language that correlates with a previous code change (E5-06/07) in the 2006/2007 Code Change Cycle.

Assembly Action: **None**

E9-07/08

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART II – IFC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

E10-07/08

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The revision clarifies how to use the definitions for 'level of exit discharge' and 'exit discharge.' The revisions in E8-07/08 to Section 1020.1, Exp 1.1 and 1.2 would still be applicable.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IFC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: For consistency with the action taken by the IBC-MOE Committee on Part I of this proposal and to provide correlation between the IBC Chapter 10 and the IFC egress provisions for existing buildings. The changes add clarity to the provisions.

Assembly Action: **None**

E11-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal correlates with the height for means of egress throughout parking garages. This is not a conflict with ICC A117.1 because of the reference in Section 406.2.2 for the accessible portion of the parking garage.

Assembly Action: **None**

E12-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal correlates with the height for mezzanines. There is no need to supersede the provision for a whole floor based on means of egress and the proposed additional exception clarifies that.

Assembly Action: **None**

E13-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal will prevent a condition where a non-ambulatory person would have to negotiate a condition other than a ramp.

Assembly Action:

None

E14-07/08

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Occupant evacuation elevators are a good idea that needs to be moved forward very soon; however, further development is needed for this proposal. The reduction in exit capacity is a grave concern if the elevators have lost power or have gone into Phase I recall. The committee sponsored by ASME A17.1 has not completed their hazard analysis – this information needs to be incorporated. The method to keep water out of the elevator system must be detailed. The number of elevators and travel distance must be included in the requirements. Exit enclosures may need further investigation. Section 3008.12.2 for lobby enclosure requires a smoke barrier which is in conflict with Section 707.14.1 which requires a fire partition. Having this as a voluntary system is a good idea.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IFC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: For consistency with the action taken by the IBC-MOE Committee on Part I of this proposal. The proposed IFC reference to IBC Section 3008 is moot without approval of Part I.

Assembly Action:

None

E15-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This issue is already covered in the International Fire Code, Section 401.5. There may be conflicts with the different language. The term 'security' in the heading is not included in the text. Why the exception for theatrical performances if this section is intended to address security systems only?

Assembly Action:

None

E16-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The 5 square feet is a design occupant load and intended for minimal areas within a space – not a maximum occupant load. Nothing in the code prohibits someone for designing for a higher occupant load than the table. The net effect of this change could result in a decrease of the width or number of exits from a space.

Assembly Action:

None

E17-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The reduction in occupant load would affect exit width, corridor width, toilets, HVAC. The means of egress must be designed for worst case – not the ideal office environment. What would be the effect on existing buildings with other maintenance codes such as the IFC or NFPA 101? The supporting information was based on only 23 buildings – a revision must have a larger study.

Assembly Action:

None

E18-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The intent in the existing language is clear. Changing just this one section would create conflicts. The idea to clarify 'width' and 'capacity' in the code should be addressed holistically.

Assembly Action:

None

E19-07/08

Errata: Modify tables and reason statements as follows:

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

**TABLE 3410.6.11(1) [IEBC TABLE 1306.11.1(1)]
EGRESS WIDTH PER OCCUPANT SERVED**

OCCUPANCY	WITHOUT SPRINKLER SYSTEM		WITH SPRINKLER SYSTEM ^a	
	Stairways (inches per occupant)	Other egress components (inches per occupant)	Stairways (inches per occupant)	Other egress components (inches per occupant)
Occupancies other than those listed below	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.15
Hazardous: H-1, H-2, H-3 and H-4	Not permitted	Not permitted	0.3	0.2
Institutional: I-2	Not permitted	Not permitted	0.3 0.3	0.2

For SI: 1 inch – 25.4 mm.

- a. Buildings equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

REASON: PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

IBC Table 1005: The intent of this code change is to revise the egress width factors in Table 1005.1 such that the concept of determining egress capacity for the components of the means of egress within a building is not a function of whether or not a building is protected throughout by an automatic fire sprinkler system. Not all building emergencies that necessitate occupant egress either out of a building or within a building to a safe area are dependent on a fire sprinkler system. Please also note that the occupancy factors are still unchanged for I-2 and H occupancies since all I-2 and H occupancies are required to be protected by an automatic fire sprinkler system.

3403.5/IEBC 302.5: The intent of this code change is to ensure coordination of requirements within the IBC. This action will ensure coordination with the proposed new egress width factors in Table 1005.1 such that the impact of such revisions to Table 1005.1 of the IBC will not be detrimental to existing building stock across the country when making alterations in accordance with the requirements within the IBC and IEBC.

3410.6.11/IEBC 1306.11: The intent of this code change is to ensure coordination of requirements within the IBC. This action will ensure coordination with the proposed new egress width factors in Table 1005.1 such that the impact of such revisions to Table 1005.1 of the IBC will not be detrimental to existing building stock across the country when making alterations in accordance with the requirements within the IBC and IEBC.

PART II – IFC

**TABLE 1027.2
EGRESS WIDTH PER OCCUPANT SERVED**

OCCUPANCY	WITHOUT SPRINKLER SYSTEM		WITH SPRINKLER SYSTEM ^a	
	Stairways (inches per occupant)	Other egress components (inches per occupant)	Stairways (inches per occupant)	Other egress components (inches per occupant)
Occupancies other than those listed below	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.15
Hazardous: H-1, H-2, H-3 and H-4	Not permitted	Not permitted	0.3	0.2
Institutional: I-2	Not permitted	Not permitted	0.3 0.3	0.2

For SI: 1 inch – 25.4 mm.

- a. Buildings equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

REASON: PART II - IFC

IFC 1027.2 - The intent of this code change is to ensure coordination between the requirements in the IBC and the IFC. This action will ensure coordination with the proposed new egress width factors in Table 1005.1 of the IBC (see PART I) such that the impact of such revisions to Table 1005.1 will not be detrimental to existing building stock across the country when enforcing the requirements of the IFC.

PART III – IEBC

**TABLE 604.2
EGRESS WIDTH PER OCCUPANT SERVED**

OCCUPANCY	WITHOUT SPRINKLER SYSTEM		WITH SPRINKLER SYSTEM ^a	
	Stairways (inches per occupant)	Other egress components (inches per occupant)	Stairways (inches per occupant)	Other egress components (inches per occupant)
Occupancies other than those listed below	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.15
Hazardous: H-1, H-2, H-3 and H-4	Not permitted	Not permitted	0.3	0.2
Institutional: I-2	Not permitted	Not permitted	0.3 0.3	0.2

For SI: 1 inch – 25.4 mm.

- a. Buildings equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with the *International Building Code* Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

PART III - IEBC

IEBC 604.2: The intent of this code change is to ensure coordination between the requirements in the IBC and the IEBC. This action will ensure coordination with the proposed new egress width factors in Table 1005.1 of the IBC (see PART I) such that the impact of such revisions to Table 1005.1 will not be detrimental to existing building stock across the country when enforcing the requirements of the IEBC.

IEBC 912.4.1: The intent of this code change is to ensure coordination between the requirements in the IBC and the IEBC. This action will ensure coordination with the proposed new egress width factors in Table 1005.1 of the IBC (see PART I) such that the impact of such revisions to Table 1005.1 will not be detrimental to existing building stock across the country when enforcing the requirements of the IEBC.

IEBC 912.4.2: The intent of this code change is to ensure coordination between the requirements in the IBC and the IEBC. This action will ensure coordination with the proposed new egress width factors in Table 1005.1 of the IBC (see PART I) such that the impact of such revisions to Table 1005.1 will not be detrimental to existing building stock across the country when enforcing the requirements of the IEBC.

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Occupants may need to egress buildings during non-fire events where sprinklers systems do not provide additional protection. Therefore, the increase in corridor and stairway width, and thus egress capacity, is justified.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IFC

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1027.2 Minimum required egress width. The means of egress width shall not be less than as required by the code under which constructed but not less than as required by this section. The total width of means of egress in inches (mm) shall not be less than the total occupant load served by the means of egress multiplied by the factors in Table 1027.2 and not less than specified elsewhere in this section. Multiple means of egress shall be sized such that the loss of any one means of egress shall not reduce the available capacity to less than 50 percent of the required capacity. The maximum capacity required from any story of a building shall be maintained to the termination of the means of egress.

(Portions of Part II of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: For consistency with the action taken by the IBC-MOE Committee on Part I of this proposal and to provide correlation between IBC Chapter 10 and the existing building egress provisions of the IFC. The modification provides a more reasonable approach to existing buildings by allowing compliance with the original code of construction of the building as long as it is comparable to the new section.

Assembly Action:

None

PART III – IEBC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal would require changes in egress width when minor alterations are made. This is an unreasonable trigger.

Assembly Action:

None

E20-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The additional language clarifies that the permitted projections are a maximum rather than an absolute.

Assembly Action:

None

E21-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is a lack of specification and standardization for the motion sensors. This creates a potential conflict with the photo luminescent requirements in the new Section 1027 in the 2007 Supplement. Having the lights off in all locations could be a security concern in areas of high crime.

Assembly Action:

None

E22-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is a concern that this requirement would discourage proper maintenance of means of egress lighting. This section is for means of egress lighting, not just emergency lighting (Section 1006.3) therefore, this provision would apply to all means of egress lighting throughout a building. The minimum foot candles proposed is arbitrary.

Assembly Action:

None

E23-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The triple redundancy (e.g. means of egress lighting, emergency lighting and photo luminescent strips) may be too much; however, studies or documentation should be presented that demonstrate what system combinations would provide an equivalent level of safety for lighting and egress path identification during emergency situations. The effectiveness and reliability of photo luminescent markings has not been proven, therefore, emergency lighting is required for redundancy. An exception for having the lights off would make the stairways less safe due to possible obstructions that would not be visible with just photo luminescent strips.

Assembly Action:

None

E24-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal would conflict with ADAAG and the ADA/ABA Accessibility Guidelines for the accessible means of egress requirements for areas permitted to use the accessible route exception.

Assembly Action:

None

E25-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The terms 'means of egress' vs. 'exits' is confusing. The requirements listed are already addressed in the general means of egress requirements and are therefore applicable to accessible means of egress.

Assembly Action: **None**

E26-07/08

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Accessible means of egress is not required for existing buildings by the ADAAG. The proposal is over restrictive and would be very difficult for existing buildings to comply.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IEBC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would set triggers for compliance at an unreasonably low level.

Assembly Action: **None**

E27-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would conflict with ADAAG and the ADA/ABA Accessibility Guidelines for the accessible means of egress requirements for areas permitted to use the accessible route exception.

Assembly Action: **None**

E28-07/08

Errata: Revise proposed new Exception 4 to Section 1007.1 as follows.

4. ~~An~~ Accessible means of egress are not required from accessible spaces that are not required by Section 1104 to be provided with accessible route.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would conflict with ADAAG and the ADA/ABA Accessibility Guidelines for the accessible means of egress requirements for areas permitted to use the accessible route exception.

Assembly Action: **None**

E29-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The term facility as currently defined is vague. The deletion in the exceptions will make it clear that the entire building must be sprinklered for the exceptions to be applicable.

Assembly Action: **None**

E30-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed language has many voids and technical problems. The terms used are not enforceable language. The proposal is not coordinated with other elements of the code. There was no technical justification provided or identified hazards showing the area of refuge is needed in sprinklered buildings. There was no justification for the one hour smoke control separation in Section 1007.3, Exception 3.2.2. The ADAAG allows for the exception for an area of refuge in sprinklered buildings. Section 1007.3, Exception 3.1 provides criteria for buildings with 3 stories or less, and Section 1007.3, Exception 3.2.1 provides criteria for a 5 story building or higher – thus there is no criteria for a 4 story building. Section 1007.4, Exception 2 has a typographical error in the types of construction – Type IIIA was not included.

Assembly Action:

None

E31-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: With Section 1007.3, Exception 3 back in the code and Group R required to be sprinklered, there is no need to use Exception 7. It is not clear if the occupant load of 10 trigger is per apartment or per floor. There is nothing to tie the required rating back to the fire partition and opening protective requirements in Chapter 7.

Assembly Action:

None

E32-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The basis provided for the proposed pressurization was from the current text for shaft pressurization – these requirements which may not work for this situation. In addition, there is a proposal to revised those pressurization numbers citing that these numbers are very difficult to achieve. Smoke partitions are not required to provide a smoke leakage rating, therefore, this separation in conjunction with the smoke control seems contrary.

Assembly Action:

None

E33-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was overly restrictive by requiring this for all stairways instead of those stairs that are part of the accessible means of egress. The proposal was disapproved because of the committee action on E34-07/08.

Assembly Action:

None

E34-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1007.9.1 (IFC 1007.9.1) System requirements. Two-way communication systems shall provide communication between each required location and the fire command center or a central control point location approved by the fire department. Where the central control point is not constantly attended, a two way communication system shall have a timed automatic telephone dial-out capability to a monitoring location or 911 ~~is permitted to be provided by a controlled access to a public telephone system.~~ The two-way communication system shall include both audible and visible signals.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The modification will provide a clearer direction on how the phone system is expected to perform. The requirement for a two-way communication system at an elevator lobby does allow occupants to reach emergency responders to request assistance. This is important for persons with disabilities as well as

others who may not be able to evacuate using the stairways. The lobby is an appropriate location since this is the point where most people will go since that is the area they are familiar with. Requirements should be addressed for multi-story buildings where elevators were not provided.

Assembly Action: **None**

E35-07/08

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed text provides necessary information for exiting direction.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IFC

Committee Action: **Withdrawn by Proponent**

E36-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The concerns of the proponent are already addressed in the existing code.

Assembly Action: **None**

E37-07/08

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows. Maintain the current 80" door opening height.

1008.1.1 (IFC [B] 1008.1.1) Size of doors. The minimum width of each door opening shall be sufficient for the occupant load thereof and shall provide a minimum clear width of 32 inches (813 mm). Clear openings of doorways with swinging doors shall be measured between the face of the door and the stop, with the door open 90 degrees (1.57 rad). Where this section requires a minimum clear width of 32 inches (813 mm) and a door opening includes two door leaves without a mullion, one leaf shall provide a clear opening width of 32 inches (813 mm). The maximum width of a swinging door leaf shall be 48 inches (1219 mm) nominal. Means of egress doors in a Group I-2 occupancy used for the movement of beds shall provide a clear width not less than 41.5 inches (1054 mm). The minimum clear height of door openings shall be less than ~~80~~ 78 inches (~~2032~~ 1984 mm).

Exceptions:

1. The minimum and maximum width shall not apply to door openings that are not part of the required means of egress in Group R-2 and R-3 occupancies.
2. Door openings to resident sleeping units in Group I-3 occupancies shall have a clear width of not less than 28 inches (711 mm).
3. Door openings to storage closets less than 10 square feet (0.93m²) in area shall not be limited by the minimum width.
4. Width of door leaves in revolving doors that comply with Section 1008.1.3.1 shall not be limited.
5. Door openings within a dwelling unit or sleeping unit shall not be less than 78 inches (1981 mm) in height.
6. Exterior door openings in dwelling units and sleeping units, other than the required exit door, shall not be less than 76 inches (1930 mm) in height.
7. In other than Group R-1 occupancies, the minimum widths shall not apply to interior egress doors within a dwelling unit or sleeping unit that is not required to be an Accessible unit, Type A unit or Type B unit.

Committee Reason: The 80" clear height of door openings should be maintained because the standard door heights are 80" and a reduction to 78" would cause confusion. The 78" inches in the ICC A117.1 is for door closers, not the entire door. The remainder of the proposal adds clarity to the code text.

Assembly Action: **None**

**PART II – IRC-B/E
Committee Action:**

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed language clarifies the requirements of the International Residential Code in regard to the measurement of door size and provides consistency with the International Building Code. The new language provides better guidance to the building official on how the door measurement is to be taken.

Assembly Action: **None**

E38-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There must be further consideration for other situations not intended to be covered with this requirement. The text does not indicate that the proposed language is for a pair of doors. Automatic doors do not need the 83" clear width. When movement of beds in the corridor is only in one direction, such as within a suite, the double width is not needed. In addition, the code already addresses this issue in the previous sentence if the doors are intended for means of egress in two directions.

Assembly Action: **None**

E39-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Section 1008.1.2 is a clarification that pivoted and side hinged are both acceptable. The committee had concerns with new Section 1008.1.2.1. It is unclear if the 100 person occupant load is cumulative from both sides, from each side or from the total floor. The viewing panels may be privacy issue in double acting doors used in patient rooms or bathrooms. The location of the viewing panel needs to be stated so that they will achieve their purpose.

Assembly Action: **None**

E40-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Vertical sliding doors are not easily recognizable as egress doors as required by Section 1008.1. Egress doors that have a fire resistance rating are there to resist the movement of fire and smoke. This door would remain open and could not be used in fire rated construction. There are concerns that the break away option for vertical sliding doors provide the same level of safety as a break away for a horizontal door.

Assembly Action: **None**

E41-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal to add Group I-2 to allow access controlled egress doors allows for improved security in hospital areas, such as at the entrance to a maternity ward. This type of lock is already being used throughout Group I-2 facilities.

Assembly Action: **None**

E42-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While the concern for high wind areas is understandable, the proposed language has some problems. The current language would allow for a 4-1/2" threshold rather than a 1/2" threshold with a 4" step down. This would conflict with the Fair Housing Act. The revisions to Exception 3 would allow this in an entire Group R-2 rather than just within the units. A definition for threshold as part of the door hardware may be appropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

E43-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While there is a direct conflict with Section 909, the correct fix would be to revise Section 909 to address access for people with mobility impairments.

Assembly Action: **None**

E44-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While this area does need to be addressed, the term "without delayed egress" is confusing for enforcement. This allowance may be appropriate for areas other than 'mental' hospitals within Group I-2. This should be addressed in conjunction with requirements for areas for dementia patients. The term "clinical staff with keys" may be an enforcement issue.

Assembly Action: **None**

E45-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies when surface bolts can be used on non-active leafs of doors. The inactive leaf is not needed for means of egress and the no hardware requirement will make sure this is not considered part of the door. The automatic fire suppression system provides additional compensation. This proposal may need to be expanded to other occupancies such as Group A or M.

Assembly Action: **None**

E46-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal allows design flexibility and functionality. The 50 person limit provides for an additional level of safety. The inactive leaf is not needed for means of egress and the no hardware requirement will make sure this is not considered part of the door. This proposal may need to be expanded to other occupancies such as Group A or M.

Assembly Action: **None**

E47-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While the need for this allowance is understood, there are some problems with the proposed language. The language needs to be expanded to say that no hardware is permitted on the door so that it is not perceived as a door. A needed clarification is that the remaining door leaf must meet the egress width of 41-1/2" inches. Language similar to what was approved for E45 and E46 may provide guidance.

Assembly Action: **None**

E48-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved the special locking arrangements for closets and bathrooms in Group R-4 because it was needed for safety of the individuals. The MOE committee disapproved a similar proposal for Group I-1 patient rooms and bathrooms in G81-06/07. The committee would like to see these requirements coordinated to address the concerns for the occupants in these similar types of facilities.

Assembly Action: **None**

E49-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: While this is important for the needs of patients in these facilities it needs to have further study. The proponents for the proposal for locking arrangements for care facilities should work with the Code Technologies Committee's Care Facility task group to come forward with a combined package. The language is inconsistent for protection requirements – e.g., “smoke detection” in the base paragraph and “fire detection” in Item #1. Item #4 creates a problem with locking and unlocking the door.

Assembly Action:

None

E50-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: While this is important for the needs of patients in these facilities it needs to have further study. The proponents for the proposal for locking arrangements for care facilities should work with the Code Technologies Committee's Care Facility task group to come forward with a combined package. The proposal will allow for unlimited number of delayed and controlled locks in egress systems. It is not limited to the types of facilities that would have staff trained in emergency egress controlling the keys. Item 2 could retard the fire department ability to search during an emergency.

Assembly Action:

None

E51-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval based on the committee actions to E44-07/08 and E49-07/08. They intend to work with the Code Technologies Committee Care Facility task group to address this issue.

Assembly Action:

None

E52-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The requirements in Chapter 4 for Group I-3 do not address a campus type setting. The proposed language fills that void.

Assembly Action:

None

E53-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies the difference between panic and fire exit hardware. Fire exit hardware is panic listed for fire door assemblies. This coordinates with NFPA 80. The reorganization puts scoping before technical requirements which makes more sense.

Assembly Action:

None

E54-07/08

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard UL-305 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows. Maintain current Exception 2 as new Exception 4.

1008.1.9 (IFC [B] 1008.1.9) Panic and fire exit hardware. Where panic and fire exit hardware is installed, it shall comply with the following:

1. Panic hardware shall be listed in accordance with UL 305.
2. Fire exit hardware shall be listed in accordance with UL 10C and UL 305.
3. The actuating portion of the releasing device shall extend at least one-half of the door leaf width.
4. The maximum unlatching force shall not exceed 15 pounds (67 N).

Each door in a means of egress from a Group A or E occupancy having an occupant load of 50 or more and any Group H occupancy shall not be provided with a latch or lock unless it is panic hardware or fire exit hardware.

Exception: A main exit of a Group A occupancy in compliance with Section 1008.1.8.3, Item 2.

Electrical rooms with equipment rated 1,200 amperes or more and over 6 feet (1829 mm) wide that contain overcurrent devices, switching devices or control devices with exit access doors shall be equipped with panic hardware and doors shall swing in the direction of egress.

If balanced doors are used and panic hardware is required, the panic hardware shall be the push-pad type and the pad shall not extend more than one-half the width of the door measured from the latch side.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The modification to keep the current Exception 2 for the 15 pounds force should be maintained in the code for several reasons. If UL305 is revised, the building code would still control the force required for panic hardware. The code official may not have a copy of UL305. The International Fire Code is partially a maintenance code, so they need the pounds force in the text. Putting the UL 305 specification into the code provides good guidance in the code for panic hardware requirements. See E53-07/08 for reorganization of this section.

Assembly Action:

None

E55-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed language clarifies that panic hardware is required at intervening doors as well as doors leading from spaces.

Assembly Action:

None

E56-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1009.1 General Scope. The provisions of this section shall apply to all stairways. Exterior exit stairways shall also comply with Section 1023.

~~**Exception:** Existing stairways being altered or replaced shall be permitted to comply with Section 3403.4.~~

1009.3 Stair treads and risers. Stair riser heights shall be 7 inches (178 mm) maximum and 4 inches (102 mm) minimum. Stair tread depths shall be 11 inches (279 mm) minimum. The riser height shall be measured vertically between the leading edges of adjacent treads. The tread depth shall be measured horizontally between the vertical planes of the foremost projection of adjacent treads and at a right angle to the tread's leading edge. Winder treads shall have a minimum tread depth of 11 inches (279 mm) measured at a right angle to the tread's leading edge at a point 12 inches (305 mm) from the side where the treads are narrower and a minimum tread depth of 10 inches (254 mm).

Exceptions:

1. Alternating tread devices in accordance with Section 1009.9.
2. Spiral stairways in accordance with Section 1009.8.
3. Aisle stairs in assembly seating areas where the stair pitch or slope is set, for sightline reasons, by the slope of the adjacent seating area in accordance with Section 1025.11.2.
4. In Group R-3 occupancies; within dwelling units in Group R-2 occupancies; and in Group U occupancies that are accessory to a Group R-3 occupancy or accessory to individual dwelling units in Group R-2 occupancies; the maximum riser height shall be 7.75 inches (197 mm); the minimum tread depth shall be 10 inches (254 mm); the minimum winder tread depth at the walk line shall be 10 inches (254 mm); and the minimum winder tread depth shall be 6 inches (152 mm). A nosing not less than 0.75 inch (19.1 mm) but not more than 1.25 inches (32 mm) shall be provided on stairways with solid risers where the tread depth is less than 11 inches (279 mm).
5. See Section 3403.4 for the replacement of existing stairways.

Committee Reason: The modification is to maintain an exception for existing stairways in Section 1009.3 and not move it to the scoping section. Existing stairways should only be exempted from tread and riser dimensions when the length of the stair is limited. Changing language for stairways is necessary to clarify that the provisions are applicable to all stairways, not just means of egress stairways. This provides good direction to the user of the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

E57-07/08

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language is ambiguous. Indicating that the minimum clearance is required for the full length of the stairway would be clearer.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC-B/E

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal adds clarity on how to measure headroom in relation to stairways in relation to established walk lines. Further, the committee supported the new exception that provides a new method for addressing guards and railings on open sides of stairways.

Assembly Action: **None**

E58-07/08

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that Section 1009.3 for the 'walk line' is a definition and would be better placed in Section 1002. The current way to measure the stairs has been used for years and is precise. The proposed language in Section 1009.4 would add ambiguity. The measurements proposed in Section 1009.4 does not specify which angle to which tread, so it is unclear

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC B/E

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language does not improve the current code language for stairways. The committee felt that the definition for walk line should be placed in Section 202. Further, the committee felt the language appeared to be more consistent with commentary rather than code charging text.

Assembly Action: **None**

E59-07/08

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal to be consistent with the actions taken on E58-07/08.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IRC-B/E

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal to be consistent with the actions taken on E58-07/08. Further, the committee felt that the language on reverse treads needs additional work.

Assembly Action:

None

E60-07/08

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The allowance to measure riser and tread depth without consideration of the carpeting could result in stairs that exceed the tolerances between the adjoining risers and treads.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IRC-B/E

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed language provides for accurate measurements of the stair tread and riser profiles. Further, establishing that all dimensions and surfaces are measured exclusive of carpets, rugs or runners gives the building official a clear place to measure to.

Assembly Action:

None

E61-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The term “Accessible units” is defined in Chapter 11 and includes all units designed in accordance with ICC A117.1. Therefore, this language would prohibit this exception for Accessible units, Type A units and Type B units.

Assembly Action:

None

E62-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The exception for Group I-3 is in recognition of the unique environment – limited occupant load with people familiar with the space. The code already allows for alternating tread devices. The proposal would allow for a safer means of access and egress.

Assembly Action:

None

E63-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Occupants of sleeping units may be unfamiliar with the space, such as in a hotel environment. There should be more specific limits on the applicability.

Assembly Action: **None**

E64-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The 9/16" dimension recognizes actual construction with a full half round on the front of the tread on a stairway. The proposal recognizes a safety issue that needed to be addressed for riser slope.

Assembly Action: **None**

E65-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal is too restrictive. There is no supporting argument that this has been a problem in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

E66-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal is appropriate for Group I-3 for areas where direct line of site is important for security reasons.

Assembly Action: **None**

E67-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The allowance for open risers on spiral and alternating tread devices is appropriate for safe construction and current practice for these types of stairways.

Assembly Action: **None**

E68-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: An alternating tread device is not a stairway, so it should be allowed the same as a ladder. Since this is not a stairway, a landing is not required at any height, so the additional exception would provide that clarification.

Assembly Action: **None**

E69-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While it is recognized that this may be a construction problem for spiral stairways, it would be more appropriate to provide a limit for maximum rise between landings or an exception for landing size. Alternating tread devices were addressed in E68-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

E70-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the committee action on E63-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

E71-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The spiral stairway is unsafe for persons unfamiliar with the space and makes a difficult means of egress. The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the committee action on E63-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

E72-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed language would provide a controlled way to measure treads and risers in alternating tread devices.

Assembly Action: **None**

E73-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language is confusing. The term "edge opposite of nosing" is unclear. Is the intent that the tread depth be 8-1/2" or 5"?

Assembly Action: **None**

E74-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Ships ladders are undefined terms. This could be misapplied to other locations where this type of access would not be appropriate. This should be limited to Group I-3.

Assembly Action: **None**

E75-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The placement of the handrails on both sides of the stair are essential elements for occupant safety regardless of stairway width.

Assembly Action:

None

E76-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1009.12 (IFC [B] 1009.12) Stairway to elevator equipment. Roofs and penthouses containing elevator equipment that must be accessed for maintenance are required to be accessed by a stairway.

~~**1009.12.1 (IFC [B] 1009.12.1) Penthouse or roof access.** Where the stairway provides access to the penthouse or roof, access shall be provided through a penthouse complying with Section 1509.2.~~

Committee Reason: The proposed Section 1009.12.1 was deleted because it was unclear if the stairway access to the roof was required to be through a separate roof structure or through the elevator penthouse. In addition, there are hatches that provide safe roof access; therefore a stair penthouse is not needed.

Section 1009.12 was approved to provide coordination with the elevator standard, ASME A17.1.

Assembly Action:

None

E77-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: While the intent is good, the proposed language is vague and enforcement would be inconsistent.

Assembly Action:

None

E78-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The additional exit signage is needed for clarity for occupant egress. The proposed language would clarify if exit signs are needed within exit stairways or exit passageways.

Assembly Action:

None

E79-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed language would clarify and coordinate with the fire operation and the safety plans for Group I-3 occupancies. Signage may need to be removed in these areas for security concerns about the signs being used as potential weapons.

Assembly Action:

None

E80-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Low level exit signage is not needed in new construction. Through the years the codes have progressed such that smoke generation will not be significant enough to require this signage. In addition, Groups A, E and I have many large open areas where this proposal would require nothing, and at the same time require confusing signage in areas where there were corridors. The language in Section 1011.7 would require supplemental exit signage in all corridors, including those within an individual dwelling unit. The proposal does not indicate any references to any standards for installation. The proponent may want to investigate incorporating this requirement where smoke is an issue in existing building or in conjunction with the new Section 1027 for photo luminescent exit markings.

Assembly Action:

None

E81-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the concern was addressed with the committee action on E82-07/08.

Assembly Action:

None

E82-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1012.5 (IFC [B] 1012.5) (Supp) Handrail extensions. Handrails shall return to a wall, guard or the walking surface or shall be continuous to the handrail of an adjacent stair flight. Where handrails are not continuous between flights the handrails shall extend horizontally at least 12 inches (305 mm) beyond the top riser and continue to slope for the depth of one tread beyond the bottom riser. At ramps where handrails are not continuous between runs, the handrail shall extend horizontally above the landing 12 inches (305 mm) minimum beyond the top and bottom of ramp runs. The extensions of handrails shall be in the same direction of the stair flights at stairways and the ramp runs at ramps.

Exceptions:

1. Handrails within a dwelling unit ~~or sleeping unit~~ that is not required to be ~~accessible~~ Accessible ~~unit or a Type A unit~~, need extend only from the top riser to the bottom riser.
2. Aisle handrails in Group A and E occupancies in accordance with Section 1025.13.
3. Handrails for alternating tread devices may terminate at a location vertically above the top and bottom risers. Handrails for alternating tread devices are not required to be continuous between flights or to extend beyond the top or bottom risers.

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies that the required handrail extension should not bend to maintain safety for persons with mobility impairments as well as the general public. This would coordinate with ICC A117.1 and the ADA/ABA Guidelines. The modification is to maintain the language in Exception 1. The term 'accessible' is broad enough that it will prohibit the exception for the handrail extension in Accessible units, Type A units and Type B units.

Assembly Action:

None

E83-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

E84-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the proponents concern is addressed with the committee action on E85-07/08.

Assembly Action:

None

E85-07/08

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal comprehensively revises guard requirements and clarifies where they are required. It also directs users to the appropriate structural provisions.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IRC B/E

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the rewording of this section which includes fixed seating as a measuring point for guard rails and new language on how to measure open sided walking surfaces at any point within 36 inches horizontally to the edge of the open side significantly improves the existing code language. The committee felt this new language helps to address a significant amount of issues with where guards are to be located and how they are to be measured while bringing the *International Residential Code* closer to the current language in the *International Building Code*.

Assembly Action:

None

E86-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the proponent's concern is addressed with the committee action on E85-07/08.

Assembly Action:

None

E87-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

E88-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The language in Section 1013 and 1025.14.1 already adequately addresses this issue.

Assembly Action:

None

E89-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The reason did not provide incidents or justification for the requirement. The reason only talks about highrise residential, however, as written the proposal would be applicable to all areas that required guards such as stairs, ramps and atriums. This would be a conflict with the ramp edge protection in Section 1010.9.1, 2007 Supplement.

Assembly Action:

None

E90-07/08

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard ANSI/ASSE Z359 and US DOL-29 CFR indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Errata: Revise proposed new Section 422.2 as follows:

421.2 422.2 Compliance with other codes and standards. Elimination, prevention or control of fall hazards shall comply with the provisions and requirements of ~~American National Standards Institute, ANSI/ASSE Z359-Fall Protection Code~~, ANSI/ASSE A1264.1 and DOL-29 CFR Part 1910, Subpart D.

Revise reference to standard in Chapter 35 (IFC Chapter 45) as follows:

~~American National Standards Institute~~ **American Society of Safety Engineers**

ANSI/ASSE Z359-0, 1, 2, 3 and 4 (2007) Fall Protection Code

Z359.0-2007 Definitions and Nomenclature Used for Fall Protection and Fall Arrest

Z359.1-2007 Safety Requirements for Personal Fall Arrest Systems, Subsystems and Components

Z359.2-2007 Minimum Requirements for a Comprehensive Managed Fall Protection Program

Z359.3-2007 Safety Requirements for Positioning and Travel Restraint Systems

Z359.4-2007 Safety Requirements for Assisted-Rescue and Self-Rescue Systems, Subsystems and Components

ANSI/ASSE A1264.1-2007 Safety Requirements for Workplace Walking/Working Surfaces and Their Access; Workplace, Floor, and Wall and Roof Openings; Stairs and Guardrails Systems

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The requirements are excessive, too complicated and lack specificity.

Assembly Action:

None

E91-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The additional language clarifies the intent of the organization of Chapter 10 exit access requirements.

Assembly Action:

None

E92-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed language assists in understanding the intent for egress through other spaces. Egress should be permitted when the areas are related to each other and basically the same space. The phrase "to the area served" has been misinterpreted to prohibit an office area from exiting through a warehouse.

Assembly Action:

None

E93-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies the intent of the exception for small tenant spaces within a larger mercantile space.

Assembly Action:

None

E94-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based on the proponent's request and committee action on E95-07/08.

Assembly Action:

None

E95-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1002.1 (IFC [B] 1002.1) Definitions. The following words and terms shall, for the purposes of this chapter and as used elsewhere in this code, have the meanings shown herein.

SUITE. A group of patient treatment rooms or patient sleeping rooms within Group I-2 occupancies where staff are in attendance within the suite, for there is direct and constant visual supervision of all patients within the suite; and the suite is in conformance with the requirements of Section 1014.2.2 through 1014.2.6.

1014.2.3 (IFC [B] 1014.2.3) (Supp) Suites in patient sleeping areas. Patient sleeping areas in Group I-2 Occupancies shall be permitted to be divided into suites with one intervening room ~~where~~ if one of the following conditions is ~~are~~ met:

1. The intervening room within the suite is not used as an exit access for more than eight patient beds.
2. The arrangement of the suite allows for direct and constant visual supervision by nursing personnel.

Committee Reason: The revisions to Section 1014.2.3 were disapproved for coordination with the modification to the definition. This new definition, with the modification, clarifies the definition for “suite” by defining the supervision and arrangement of the rooms within a suite. This coordinates with the 2007 Supplement, Sections 1014.2.2 through 1014.2.6

Assembly Action:

None

E96-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1014.2.2.5 (IFC [B] 1014.2.2.5) Exit access through suites. Exit access from all other portions of a building not classifies as a suite in a Group I-2 occupancy, ~~including exit access from other suites,~~ shall not pass through a suite.

Committee Reason: The modification clarifies that it is acceptable to egress through a suite when coming from another suite. This is important for a defend-in-place scenario to allow for lift support facilities to be available in both locations – which is not an option in a corridor. This proposal, as modified, clarifies exiting from a suite. The definition for suite would include associated storage rooms and bathrooms, therefore, these spaces could also egress through the suite to a corridor or another suite.

Assembly Action:

None

E97-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The rearrangement of the text does not provide the clarification desired. Section 1024.1 should include Section 1013 in the references. The first proposed sentence in Section 1018.1 was confusing in relation to horizontal exits.

Assembly Action:

None

E98-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed new language for scissors stairways does not add clarity to the code.

Assembly Action:

None

E99-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based on the proponent's request.

Assembly Action: **None**

E100-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language adds confusion to the section – specifically as to how many doors are required and if one door could be served by a ladder or substituted for a ladder.

Assembly Action: **None**

E101-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal clarifies the intent and brings consistency to the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

E102-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent's concern is already addressed in Section 1025.12, Exception 6.

Assembly Action: **None**

E103-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels the code needs to be addressed comprehensively regarding open stairways in all occupancies as exits or exit access, and how travel distance should be measured along those stairways. There is confusion as to whether the definition for 'exit' would make a stairway no longer an exit if there is an exception for the exit enclosure. This concept should be referred to the Code Technologies Committee.

Section 1019 says each floor has to have access to two exits, not two exits directly from the floor, therefore open stairways can serve as part of a means of egress. A suggestion would be to move Section 1021.1 enclosure requirements to 1019 and apply it to stairways in general.

Assembly Action: **None**

E104-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: A definition should not have an exception. This should be referred to the Code Technologies Committee. See the committee action on E103-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

E105-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1002.1 (IFC [B] 1002.1) Definitions. The following words and terms shall, for the purposes of this chapter and as used elsewhere in this code, have the meanings shown herein.

ACCESSIBLE MEANS OF EGRESS. A continuous and unobstructed way of egress travel from any accessible point in a building or facility to ~~a place designated for assisted rescue~~ or a public way.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The modification to remove consideration of the change to the definition of accessible means of egress was done based on the proponent's request. Revisions to Section 1007.3 were approved for coordination with the 2007 Supplement where some open stairways provisions were relocated to Section 1016.1.

Assembly Action:

None

E106-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This should be referred to the Code Technologies Committee. See the committee action on E103-07/08. Exit access travel distance should not be measured within an exit. If open stairways are considered exits, this language is confusing.

Assembly Action:

None

E107-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

E108-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based on the proponent's request. This should be referred to the Code Technologies Committee. See the committee action on E103-07/08.

Assembly Action:

None

E109-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based on the proponent's request. This should be referred to the Code Technologies Committee. See the committee action on E103-07/08.

Assembly Action:

None

E110-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal would coordinate with the open exit and exit access stairways as provided for in the 2007 Supplement. This clarifies this issues and how to use these elements. A definition for vertical exit enclosure may also be helpful. This should be referred to the Code Technologies Committee. See the committee action on E103-07/08.

Assembly Action:

None

E111-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The additional language provides a good cross reference and clarification for Table 1016.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

E112-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The revision to the definition would use correct language for smoke and heat vents.

Assembly Action: **None**

E113-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Smoke and heat vents are necessary for the fire department to be able to fight the fire effectively in these types of facilities, so they should remain as a requirement in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

E114-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Fire fighter safety is a concern in these buildings. In this situation, the tenability in the building will diminish even with the sprinklers in operation, and the 400 feet in and 400 feet out in a building is a hazard for these responders. The correlative reference in the IFC should be struck for consistency.

Assembly Action: **None**

E115-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

E116-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The definition for 'areas of interrupted water supply' is part of FS17-07/08. This proposal is also related to G126-07/08. No technical justification was presented for this increase. The building code requirements rely on an adequate water supply for the sprinklers. If that is not available the redundancy should be in the water supply, not in the passive systems in the building. Areas where an adequate water supply is not available now are required to have tanks for the sprinkler system – would this requirement also mean these buildings would have to increase the corridor ratings? If the concern is for areas with high seismic activity, perhaps a better approach would be to require corridor ratings in buildings in high seismic areas rather than based on a possible interrupted water supply.

Assembly Action: **None**

E117-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal to increase the fire resistance rating to 1 hour for the corridors in Group E was disapproved. No technical justification was presented for this increase. Non-rated corridors are a sprinkler system incentive for schools where the fire area threshold is 20,000 square feet. The fire load in schools is minimal. The *International Fire Code* has requirements for monthly fire drills, so students and teachers are trained and practiced for emergency evacuation. The issue of having other incidences where lock downs need to occur in the schools would not be helped by rated corridors. If rated corridors are required, corridor continuity requirements would prohibit the open plans and common areas now in schools.

Assembly Action:

None

E118-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal to increase the fire resistance rating to 1 hour for the corridors in Group R was disapproved. No technical justification was presented for this increase. Sections 419, 708.3 and 711.3 allow for a dwelling unit separation of ½ hour, so exiting through a ½ fire resistance rated corridor would provide a consistent level of protection consistent with the continuity requirements.

Assembly Action:

None

E119-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal to increase the fire resistance rating to 1 hour for the corridors in Groups I-2 and I-4 was disapproved. No technical justification was presented for this increase. Section 410 requires smoke partitions in Group I-2 and smoke partitions do not have a fire resistance rating. This proposal is not coordinated with those provisions. The requirement to rate the corridors could dramatically affect the doors commonly used along with the standard operation of hospitals. Group I-2 facilities have trained staff for assistance in evacuation and are required to meet additional safety inspections that include the sprinkler system.

Assembly Action:

None

E120-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent has not provided technical justification to reduce the corridor ratings for Group I-3.

Assembly Action:

None

E121-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed language is a clarification that this corridor width is applicable to Group B and Group I facilities where gurney traffic occurs, not just Group I.

Assembly Action:

None

E122-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: An allowance for pressurization of rooms within certain hospital areas where the spreading of germs or contaminants is a concern is appropriate. This is incidental air for the space and will not be a safety hazard for the supply and return within the room.

Assembly Action:

None

E123-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The expansion of the corridor continuity requirements from rated corridors to all corridors is a major concern. If Exception 2 is warranted, no justification was provided as to why this should be limited to just Group B and not all Groups.

Assembly Action:

None

E124-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This should be referred to the Code Technologies Committee. See the committee action on E103-07/08. The language does not accomplish the intent stated in the reason. Once a certain level of protection is provided along a confined path, that level of protection should be maintained to the exit discharge.

Assembly Action:

None

E125-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal would require elevator hoistway protection where elevator lobbies are not required. The reference to Section 715.4.3 is not an appropriate reference for shaft openings.

Assembly Action:

None

E126-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1019.1 (IFC [B] 1019.1) (Supp) Exits from stories. All spaces within each story shall have access to the minimum number of approved independent exits as specified in Table 1019.1 based on the occupant load of the story. For the purposes of this chapter, occupied roofs shall be provided with exits as required for stories. The required number of exits from any story shall be maintained until arrival at grade or the public way.

Exceptions:

1. As modified by Section 403.15.
2. As modified by Section 1019.2.
3. Rooms and spaces within each story provided with and having access to a means of egress that complies with Exception 3 or 4 in Section 1016.1 shall not be required to be provided the minimum number of approved independent exits required by Table 1019 on each story.
4. In Groups R-2 and R-3 occupancies, one means of egress is permitted within and from individual dwelling units with a maximum occupant load of 20 where the dwelling unit is equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Sections 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2.
5. Within a story, rooms and spaces complying with Section 1015.1 with exits that discharge directly to the exterior at ~~grade level~~ the level of exit discharge, are permitted to have one exit.

Committee Reason: The modification is for coordination with the revision to level of exit discharge approved in the committee actions on E8-07/08 and E5-06/07. There are situations where rooms or spaces have independent exits directly to the outside of a building, similar to what is permitted in Section 1019.2, Exception 3. As long as these spaces meet provisions for spaces with one means of egress with access directly to the outside, there is an adequate level of safety provided.

Assembly Action: **None**

E127-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal adds consistency and clarifies the provisions for single exit buildings as provided in the 2007 Supplement.

Assembly Action: **None**

E128-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Adding note c to Table 1019.2 basically requires emergency escape and rescue openings. A more appropriate revision might be to eliminate the exception for sprinklered buildings in Section 1026 rather than doing that in a note to a table.

Assembly Action: **None**

E129-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed language will clarify a vague area of the code by indicating that the exit or exit passageway must connect to the outside.

Assembly Action: **None**

E130-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed language would clarify the intent of exit and exit discharge. This fills voids in the current text regarding the connection between the exit enclosure and exit passageway, and what happens where an pressurized stairway discharges to an exit passageway.

Assembly Action: **None**

E131-07/08 **Not Used**

E132-07/08

Errata: Replace the 1st paragraph of Section 1020.1.3 (IFC [B] 1020.1.3) as follows:

1020.1.3 (IFC [B] 1020.1.3) Ventilation. Equipment and ductwork for ~~exit enclosure~~ mechanical ventilation of ~~smokeproof enclosures and stairway pressurization~~ as permitted by Section 1020.1.2 shall comply with one of the following ~~items~~:

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would require both an F and T rating for a membrane penetration. There are no T ratings for wall membrane penetrations for pipes. It appears that the requirements for T-ratings in Section 1020.1.2, Exp. 1 and Section 1021.5, Exp. 1 may eliminate metallic items from passing through the enclosure protection. In Section 1020.1.2, the relocating of the language 'those serving the interior of the exit enclosure, including' puts this requirement in the scoping provisions of the section, thus the sprinkler system and standpipe could not penetrate the enclosure unless it serves only the stairway enclosure. This would be a huge issue in highrise buildings where the stand pipes are in the exit enclosures. This would also be a problem for fire department communications in the stairway.

Assembly Action: **None**

E133-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would prohibit transfer corridors. Appropriate exit signage within confusing exit enclosures could adequately address the proponent's issues. The situation addressed for underground exit paths seems exceptionally rare, but the proposed language has very broad implications.

Assembly Action: **None**

E134-07/08

Errata: Modify the proposal as follows.

1020.1.7 (IFC [B]1020.1.7) Smokeproof enclosures. In buildings required to comply with Section 403 or 405, each of the exit enclosures serving a story with a floor surface ~~that is~~ located more than 75 feet (22 860 mm) above the lowest level of fire department vehicle access or more than 30 feet (9144 mm) below the level of exit discharge serving such stories shall be a smokeproof enclosure or pressurized stairway in accordance with Section 909.20.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal offers specific language and references for separation requirements. This coordinates provisions that were started in the 2007 Supplement.

Assembly Action: **None**

E135-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The length of the transfer corridor is not the reason this configuration is unsafe. The requirement would result in a series of short transfer corridors rather than one longer transfer corridor – which would be worse. The proponent testified that the 50 feet length is based on dead end corridors lengths. This proposal is for all uses, and the 50 feet dead end is Group B only. The length of travel for a dead end is down and back, plus the dead ends are totally different functions. Therefore, justification to match the dead end provisions is not valid. E78-07/08 addresses signage in transfer corridors.

Assembly Action: **None**

E136-07/08

Errata: Replace the proposal with the following:

1022.1, 1022.4, (IFC [B] 1022.1, [B] 1022.4)

Proponent: Gregory R. Keith, Professional heuristic Development, representing The Boeing Company

Revise as follows:

1022.1 (IFC [B] 1022.1) Horizontal exits. Horizontal exits serving as an exit in a means of egress system shall comply with the requirements of this section. A horizontal exit shall not serve as the only exit from a portion of a building, and where two or more exits are required, not more than one-half of the total number of exits or total exit width shall be horizontal exits.

Exceptions:

1. Horizontal exits are permitted to comprise two-thirds of the required exits from any building or floor area for occupancies in Group I-2.
2. Horizontal exits are permitted to comprise 100 percent of the exits required for occupancies in Group I-3. At least 6 square feet (0.6 m2) of accessible space per occupant shall be provided on each side of the horizontal exit for the total number of people in adjoining compartments.

~~Every fire compartment for which credit is allowed in connection with a horizontal exit shall not be required to have a stairway or door leading directly outside, provided the adjoining fire compartments have stairways or doors leading directly outside and are so arranged that egress shall not require the occupants to return through the compartment from which egress originates.~~

~~The area into which a horizontal exit leads shall be provided with exits adequate to meet the occupant requirements of this chapter, but not including the added occupant capacity imposed by persons entering it through horizontal exits from other areas. At least one of its exits shall lead directly to the exterior or to an exit enclosure.~~

1022.4 (IFC [B] 1022.4) Capacity of refuge area. The refuge area of a horizontal exit shall be a space occupied by the same tenant or a public area and each such refuge area shall be adequate to accommodate the original occupant load of the refuge area plus the occupant load anticipated from the adjoining compartment. The anticipated occupant load from the adjoining compartment shall be based on the capacity of the horizontal exit doors entering the refuge area. The capacity of the refuge area shall be computed based on a net floor area allowance of 3 square feet (0.2787 m2) for each occupant to be accommodated therein.

Exception: The net floor area allowable per occupant shall be as follows for the indicated occupancies:

1. Six square feet (0.6 m2) per occupant for occupancies in Group I-3.
2. Fifteen square feet (1.4 m2) per occupant for ambulatory occupancies in Group I-2.
3. Thirty square feet (2.8 m2) per occupant for nonambulatory occupancies in Group I-2.

~~The refuge area into which a horizontal exit leads shall be provided with exits adequate to meet the occupant requirements of this chapter, but not including the added occupant load imposed by persons entering it through horizontal exits from other areas. At least one refuge area exit shall lead directly to the exterior or to an exit enclosure.~~

~~**Exception:** The adjoining compartment shall not be required to have a stairway or door leading directly outside, provided the refuge area into which a horizontal exit leads has stairways or doors leading directly outside and are so arranged that egress shall not require the occupants to return through the compartment from which egress originates.~~

Reason: This proposal intends to clarify horizontal exit provisions. First, the third paragraph of Section 1022.1 has been relocated to Section 1022.4. That provision deals with the design of the means of egress from the refuge area and is more appropriately located in the latter section. Secondly, the second paragraph of Section 1022.1 currently contains some confusing language referencing a fire compartment credit concept that is not recognized anywhere in Chapter 10. The paragraph has been rewritten in more contemporary language while maintaining the original technical intent. Additionally, based on IBC errata, the provision in question was originally intended to be an exception. Accordingly, it has been retained as an exception; however, it also been placed in context following the proposed second paragraph of Section 1022.4. Approval of this proposal will clarify the intent of the code and assist users in the proper determination of horizontal exit technical requirements.

Cost Impact: The code change proposal will not increase the cost of construction.

Analysis: An errata has been issued for Section 1022.1, Exception 2. In the 2000 IBC this section had two paragraphs under the exception. The 2003 IBC and 2006 IBC show the second paragraph of Exception 2 moved out as a main section paragraph. There was no code change proposal to relocate this paragraph, therefore, and errata has been issued for the 2003 and 2006 IBC to locate the paragraph starting "Every fire compartment..." as part of Exception 2.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal places the language in a better location to improve understanding of what is permitted for horizontal exits.

Assembly Action:

None

E137-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Stairs and ramps on the site of large recreational facilities are not part of the means of egress; therefore, the provisions in Chapter 10 are not always applicable.

Assembly Action:

None

E138-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: In a four exit building the proposed language would prohibit the option of one lobby, one vestibule and two exits to the exterior. The committee agreed that using the exceptions to exempt 100% of the exits of a building from going to the exterior was not the intent and requested the proponent to return with revised language.

Assembly Action: **None**

E139-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: In Section 1024.1, the term "sufficiently open" is too vague. The deletion of the language in Section 1024.3 could result in stairways within exit discharge not needing to be protected.

Assembly Action: **None**

E140-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed language clarifies that the exit signage is not enough in the lobby used for exit discharge. The exit door must be visible from the bottom of the exit stair.

Assembly Action: **None**

E141-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The inclusion of the term "not a building element" clarifies that bleachers and grandstands are not part of a floor system. Therefore, where ICC 300 *Bleachers, Grandstands and Folding and Telescopic Seating* should be used is also clarified.

Assembly Action: **None**

E142-07/08

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This appears to be a problem for just one certain type of window when used within a basement escape well. This is too universal a change to address this one issue. This change is a universal change that is inappropriate to deal with this single issue.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC B/E

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposed language could require a window well to be built larger than the current code language requires. The committee also felt that as the proposal was written it incorrectly assumes that the basement emergency egress window will always be in the open position.

Assembly Action: **None**

E143-07/08

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text only allowed for certain dimensions for the steps within the window well that did not allow for additional tread depth.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IRC B/E

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposed language was confusing and redundant as to application and purpose. Further, the committee voiced concern over the proposed step geometry and the reduction of tread depth to 6 inches without sufficient justification

Assembly Action:

None

E144-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The definitions are consistent with the referenced standards in Section 1027 in the 2007 Supplement. The definition is generic enough to allow for other technologies that were brought up during the floor testimony. Having it as a guide is helpful to users of the code.

Assembly Action:

None

E145-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

~~1027.1.6 (IFC [B] 1027.1.6) (Supp) Materials. Materials shall comply with Section 1027.16.1 or 1027.1.6.2~~

~~1027.1.6.1 (IFC [B] 1027.1.6.1) Self-luminous and photoluminescent.~~ Luminescent exit path markings shall be permitted to be made of any material, including paint, provided that an electrical charge is not required to maintain the required luminance. Such materials shall include, but not limited to, self-luminous materials and photoluminescent materials. Materials shall comply with either:

1. UL 1994, or
2. ASTM E 2072, except that the charging source shall be 1 foot candles (11 lux) of fluorescent illumination for 60 minutes, and the minimum luminance shall be 5 milicandelas per square meter after 90 minutes.

~~1027.1.6.2 (IFC [B] 1027.1.6.2) Externally powered. Externally powered exit path markings shall be listed in accordance with UL 1994.~~

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proponent requested the modification because 'externally powered' is not under the purview of UL 1994. The proposal was approved because it would allow a different performance based requirement for photoluminescent materials. There were some concerns expressed regarding UL 1994 and if it is going to provide the same level of photoluminescence in the same conditions, specifically to handrails in turnings and transitions.

Assembly Action:

None

E146-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal provides some good clarifications. The term “luminous” is more consistent with the standard. The proposal clarified the requirements for exit discharge through lobbies or vestibules. The addition of “solid” and “continuous” will ensure that these markings are usable. The exception for open parking garages is needed. The proposal differentiates between the means of egress path and the luminescent path.

Assembly Action:

None

E147-07/08

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard NFPA 170 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal would require photo luminescent markings in all corridors, not just in exits. With all obstructions being marked, the visual clutter may be a problem for occupants following the means of egress. There was no justification provided that the current requirements were not adequate. There is no testing that photoluminescent markings are going to provide additional levels of protection in general, and this proposal is just adding more. Section 1027.3.1 references only specific lines of a table in NFPA 170 – the requirements should be moved into the code. The labeling requirement in Section 1027.7 is a problem for enforcement – where and how often in a building. Low exit signage was previously disapproved in E80-07/08. The proponent developed new standards for graphics instead of following those in NFPA 170.

Assembly Action:

None

E148-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Section 1020.1.6 uses the term ‘stairway identification’ signs instead of ‘stairway floor number signs’ used in this proposal. The signage requirements should be in Section 1020, not in photoluminescent requirements.

Assembly Action:

None

E149-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is a new requirement in the code. New York has only had this in place for about 9 months. There is no technical justification provided that shows these provisions will not work and should be removed from the code. The maintenance issues are the building owner’s responsibility.

Assembly Action:

None

E150-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal, by using the term ‘entire work area’ instead of the current text for ‘portion of the work area’, is much more restrictive. The proposal confuses general exceptions and those specific to employee work areas. This would be inconsistent with ADA/ABA Accessibility Guidelines.

Assembly Action:

None

E151-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows.

1103.2.12 Day care facilities. Where a day care facility (Groups A-3, E, I-4 and R-3) is part of a ~~detached one- and two-family~~ dwelling unit, only the portion of the structure utilized for the day care facility is required to be accessible.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The modification was to withdraw the portion of the proposal dealing with day care facilities and retain the current code language based on the proponent's request. The new language for accessibility for live-work units adds clarity with specific references for this mixed occupancy space.

Assembly Action:

None

E152-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Requiring maneuvering clearances at 44 inch doors in hospital rooms would be a significant cost to hospitals, therefore this exception is appropriate. This was removed from ICC A117.1 2003 without consideration of these costs. The ADA/ABA Accessibility Guidelines do not require maneuvering clearances at either side of these doors.

Assembly Action:

None

E153-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The revised language clarifies that the 3,000 square foot area is the mezzanines, basements or upper stories and not the accessible ground floor level.

Assembly Action:

None

E154-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The revised language for the accessible route causes more confusion. The existing text more closely resembles the federal standards.

Assembly Action:

None

E155-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The intent of the current text is to address outpatient facilities in Group B, not Group I-1 and I-2 facilities. This is a big change in scope with no technical justification.

Assembly Action:

None

E156-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Van spaces are not required by the Fair Housing Act. The extra height for van spaces in private parking garages for Group R-2 and R-3 is an unnecessary expense. The extra height for van spaces was really intended for places of public accommodation under the ADAAG.

Assembly Action: **None**

E157-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The existing language in Section 1106.6, first sentence adequately addresses the proponent's concern. The additional proposed language adds confusion with non-defined terms such as 'vehicular traffic' and 'crosswalk.'

Assembly Action: **None**

E158-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The current language is adequate for accessible routes in housing developments. With the proposed elimination a concern would be that it could be misinterpreted that recreational facilities in a housing development were not required to be located on an accessible route.

Assembly Action: **None**

E159-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The additional language is editorial and adds clarity to the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

E160-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The additional language is editorial and adds clarity to the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

E161-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal provides more specific language by indicating Group R-1 units.

Assembly Action: **None**

E162-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Section 1107.7.2, while unclear, does address this issue for multi-story dwelling units with elevator service. The proposal does not address what happens when the unit is intended to meet the Type A dwelling unit scoping provisions. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) interprets Fair Housing units with private residence elevators to meet Fair Housing criteria on all levels. Type B unit requirements should be consistent with this interpretation. The proposal would only require Type B elements on levels accessed by the elevator.

Assembly Action:

None

E163-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies which service areas are being addressed by this requirement.

Assembly Action:

None

E164-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1108.2.3 Companion seats. At least one companion seat complying with ICC A117.1 shall be provided immediately adjacent to for each wheelchair space required by Section 1108.2.2.1 through 1108.2.2.3.

Committee Reason: The modification is so that the ICC A117.1 will contain all the technical criteria for the companion seat as it is related to the wheelchair space and that only scoping language will be in the IBC. Adding the language in this proposal will clarify where companion seating is required in assembly seating. Companion seating is not required adjacent to wheelchair spaces in team seating, jury boxes, witness boxes, etc.

Assembly Action:

None

E165-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Contrary to the proponent's reason statement, this will expand this requirement significantly. The proposal will expand the scope of the signage requirements from that related specifically to events and facilities to include any additional information, such as commercials.

Assembly Action:

None

E166-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal is editorial, however the addition of 'each' does clarify that all toilet rooms are required to be accessible.

Assembly Action:

None

E167-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The term 'fixtures' adequately addresses options. This could be interpreted to conflict with the exception to Section 1109.2.1.1 that allows a urinal within the room. This is also moving into a laundry list which should be avoided in code text when possible.

Assembly Action:

None

E168-07/08

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1109.2.3 Lavatories. Where lavatories are provided, at least 5 percent, but not less than one shall be accessible. Where the total lavatories provided in a toilet room or bathing facility is six or more, at least one lavatory with enhanced reach ranges in accordance with ICC A117.1, ~~Section 606.5~~, shall be provided in addition to the accessible lavatory.

Committee Reason: The modification is to delete the specific reference in ICC A117.1 because a specific reference is not done elsewhere in the IBC. The code does not currently have scoping for limited reach range lavatories. Providing this scoping would address the needs of Little People of America. The proposal will not require an additional fixture in the bathroom, just that one of the lavatories provided within large bathrooms will have limited reach range faucets.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IPC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is concern that the orientation of faucets in this manner will cause confusion as to how to operate the faucet for hot water since the code already requires that hot is to be on the left.

Assembly Action:

None

E169-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The ICC A117.1 is not completed at this time. The standard must be available per ICC policy. The committee does intend to have the 2008 standard available at the final action hearing.

Assembly Action:

None

E170-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal does not have an allowance for legs to support the beds. If a jurisdiction adopts Appendix E the code official would be required to regulate furniture. This would cause a problem with enforcement because furniture is typically placed after the certificate of occupancy.

Assembly Action:

None

E171-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The 2006 edition of BHMA standard is available. The codes should reference the latest edition of the standard.

Assembly Action:

None
