

---

## 2003/2004 INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE

### Means of Egress Code Development Committee

---

**David Stanford, CBO, Chair**

Assistant Building Official  
City of Richardson, TX

**David Wismer, P.E., CBO, Vice-Chair**

Director of Code Enforcement  
City of Philadelphia, PA

**Rick Beaty**

Chief, Grand Junction Fire Department  
Grand Junction, CO

**Brian Black**

Director, Building Codes & Standards  
Eastern Paralyzed Veterans Association  
Buffalo, NY

**Bruce Boulineau, CBO**

Chief Building Official  
City of Myrtle Beach, SC

**Kenneth Bush**

Fire Protection Engineer  
Office of State Fire Marshal  
Easton, MD

**William H. Chambless, Jr., CBO**

Director/Inspection and Fees  
City of Macon, GA

**Gordon Earhart, P.E., CSP**

Fire Protection Engineer  
UT-Battelle LLC  
Oak Ridge National Laboratory, TN

**Stephen D. Jones, CBO**

Construction Official  
Borough of Florham Park, NJ

**Joe Moore**

Building Official  
City of Fenton, MO

**Larry Perry, CBO, AIA**

Codes Consultant  
Building Owners & Managers Association Intl.  
Silver Spring, MD

**Emory Rodgers**

Regulatory Consultant  
Virginia Department of Housing &  
Community Development  
Fairfax, VA

**William Schock**

Building Official  
City of San Leandro, CA

**James B. Smith, P.E.**

Program Manager  
State of Wisconsin  
Madison, WI

**Steven L. Thomas**

President  
Colorado Code Consulting, LLC  
Aurora, CO

**Joseph H. Versteeg**

Principal  
Versteeg Associates  
Torrington, CT

**William Wheeler**

Fire Marshal  
City of Elmira, NY

**Steve Woodard**

Director, Planning & Codes  
City of Tullahoma, TN

**Staff Secretary:**

**Kim Paarlberg, RA**

Senior Technical Staff  
International Code Council



**INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE  
MEANS OF EGRESS  
HEARING RESULTS**

---

**E1-03/04**

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Modified**

**Modify proposal by adding revisions to the following additional sections:**

**408.3.6 Vertical Exit enclosures.** One of the required vertical exit enclosures in each building shall be permitted to have glazing installed in doors and interior walls at each landing level providing access to the enclosure, provided that the following conditions are met:

1. The vertical exit enclosure shall not serve more than four floor levels.
2. Vertical Exit doors shall not be less than 3/4-hour fire doors complying with Section 715.3.
3. through 6. (No change to current text)

**3410.6.6 Vertical openings.** Evaluate the fire-resistance rating of the vertical exit enclosures, hoistways, escalator openings and other shaft enclosures within the building, and openings between two or more floors. Table 3410.6.6(1) contains ... (remainder of text unchanged)

(The original proposal was approved as proposed)

**Committee Reason:** The proposed deletion would improve consistency in terminology.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

**E2-03/04**

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The proposal was disapproved because more information was needed to justify this change. Questions raised included the following: There needs to be more analysis for occupants per floor in high rise buildings. Data is needed to support 20 stories and 420 feet. Data is needed on evacuation processes in high rise buildings. The time lines are unrealistic for high rise buildings. The minimum door width required would conflict with Section 1008.1.1. Guidance is needed for how to calculate the time it takes to enter the stairway. The storage calculations in the supporting statement need justification.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

**E3-03/04**

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The proposed deletion would improve consistency in terminology.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

**E4-03/04**

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The proposed deletion would improve consistency in terminology.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

**E5-03/04**

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** This requirement should not be located in the administration section. If a door is utilized as an exit, it should be signed.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

**E6-03/04**

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The revised language will clarify that areas of refuge and horizontal exits are components of the accessible means of egress, not a termination point.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

**E7-03/04**

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The definition is open for interpretation. For example: Is a 'toe hold' with shoes or barefoot? Is the 'walking surface' the surface adjacent to the guard at the high side or the low side?

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

**E8-03/04**

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The proposed change eliminates a conflict with Section 1208.2.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E9-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The change clarifies what occupant load will be allowed when the actual load is less than required by the table.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E10-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** There is no limit on what would be considered 'equipment.' The occupant load for tennis courts, racquet ball courts, etc. would be too restrictive.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E11-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The decreased occupant load would result in less required width for corridors or exit doors.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E12-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** Adds clarity to those areas not covered by the fixed seating count. To determine the occupant load for the areas utilized for waiting, standing space and wheelchair space utilization of Table 1004.1.2 is appropriate. It is assumed that this will not be interpreted to pick up open space in circulation aisles.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E13-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposed change is too broad. While it is agreed that there are other emergencies that require evacuation of a building, there was no technical justification provided to substantiate the removal of the current option with sprinklers.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E14-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

**Modification:** Replace the proposal with the following:

**1006.3 Illumination emergency power.** The power supply for means of egress illumination shall normally be provided by the premise's electrical supply.

In the event of power supply failure, an emergency electrical system shall automatically illuminate the following areas:

1. ~~Aisles and unenclosed egress stairways~~ ~~Exit access corridors, passageways and aisles~~ in rooms and spaces which require two or more means of egress.
2. ~~Exit access~~ Corridors, and exit ~~enclosures~~ ~~stairways and exit passageways~~ located in buildings required to have two or more exits.
3. Exterior egress components at other than the level of exit discharge until exit discharge is accomplished for buildings required to have two or more exits.
4. Interior exit discharge elements, as permitted in Section 1023.1, in buildings required to have two or more exits.
5. The portion of the exterior exit discharge immediately adjacent to exit discharge doorways in buildings required to have two or more exits.

The emergency power system shall provide power for a duration of not less than 90 minutes and shall consist of storage batteries, unit equipment or an on-site generator. The installation of the emergency power system shall be in accordance with Section 2702.

**Committee Reason:** The terminology for components of the means of egress would be more consistent with language used elsewhere in the code.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E15-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** A concern would be if the sound generated from this system would be distinguishable from the general alarm bell. Another concern would be if this system is available from more than one manufacturer.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E16-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The reference is an editorial clean-up since a platform lift is permitted as part of an accessible means of egress in limited situations.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E17-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** Technically ramps are part of an accessible route and could be considered covered under Item 1, however, ramps are unusual in that they are covered in Chapter 10 rather than in Chapter 11.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E18-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The additional phrase in the revised exception would no longer permit an elevator accessed through a horizontal exit to be part of an accessible means of egress. In addition, this extends the scope of the smokeproof enclosure past the highrise buildings requirements without justification.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E19-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** Opening protectives for elevators that provide smoke protection are currently only available from a very limited number of manufacturers. The current language does not have a building height trigger. The additional requirement is not justified in low-rise buildings.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E20-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The revised language would coordinate this section with the terminology in Chapter 11.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E21-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The language proposed should address the specific problem identified by the proponent rather than a wholesale change. The proposed language only addresses a requirement for a side hinge without an exception for hardware or openability.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E22-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The exception for a side swinging door is appropriate for the space due to occupant familiarity and small occupant load in the space.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E23-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The change would limit this section to only magnetic locks. The current language allows a broader application. There should be provisions for the kill switch to be illuminated. The term "listed" is new text. Additional guidance as to the criteria for these product listings is needed. A question was if the use of a motion detector would be the appropriate way to activate the lock.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E24-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** Familiarity does not reduce the tripping hazard, whether visitors to or residents of the structure.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E25-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** This would coordinate requirements in the IRC and IBC.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E26-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The additional language adds clarity to where the exception is applicable.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E27-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** A question would be if the term 'release device' would be mistakenly interpreted to include locks. In addition, the first sentence suggests that handles and pulls are also 'release

devices' which would not be true. The term 'hardware' is universally understood.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E28-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The additional language would add clarity.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E29-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The additional language would not address where the signal would come from when an alarm system or sprinkler system is not provided in the building. The proposal does not address buildings between 4 and 8 stories. Most low rise buildings may not have a fire control system, therefore, the alternative of a switch at the main entrance to unlock the doors would result in negating the locks initial security purpose.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E30-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The terms 'special egress control devices' and 'specialized security measures' would be too ambiguous. Item 1 where staff are required to carry keys, does not defined as to which staff or how many staff must have keys. The term 'patients' would not cover all occupancies addressed. Item 9 does not specify requirements for the 'fail-safe' device. The text referencing the sprinkler system in Item 12 is already addressed elsewhere in the code.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E31-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Approved as modified**

**Modification:** Replace the proposal with the following:

**1008.1.9 Panic and fire exit hardware.** Where panic and fire exit hardware is installed, it shall comply with the following:

1. The actuating portion of the releasing device shall extend at least one-half of the door leaf width.
2. The A maximum unlatching force of shall not exceed 15 pounds (67 N).

Each door in a means of egress from an occupancy of Group A or E having an occupant load of 100 or more and shall not be provided with a latch or lock unless it is panic hardware or fire exit hardware.

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.

**Committee Reason:** The change to mandatory language in Item 2 is appropriate. In the published proposal, justification was not provided to lower the threshold for Group A panic hardware to 50 occupants.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E32-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Justification was not provided to lower the threshold for Group A panic hardware to 50 occupants.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E33-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The proposal resolves the conflict between Section 1008.1.8.3 Item 2 and 1008.1.9.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E34-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Modification:** The proposal was revised editorially as follows:

**1008.1.9 Panic and fire exit hardware.** Where panic and fire exit hardware is installed, it shall comply with the following:

1. The actuating portion of the releasing device shall extend at least one-half of the door leaf width.
2. A maximum unlatching force of 15 pounds (67 N).

Each door in a means of egress from an occupancy of Group A or E having an occupant load of 100 or more and shall not be provided with a latch or lock unless it is panic hardware or fire exit hardware.

Electrical rooms with equipment rated 1200 amperes or more and over 6 ft. (1.8 m) wide that contain overcurrent devices, switching devices, or control devices, with exit access doors must be equipped with panic hardware and doors must 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.

**Committee Reason:** The change is a coordination with the 2002 National Electrical Code. The location of the new paragraph should be changed editorially to make it obvious that balanced door requirements would also be applicable to electrical rooms.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E35-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

**Modification:** Replace the proposal with the following:

**1008.2.1 Stadiums.** Panic hardware is not required on gates surrounding stadiums where such gates are under constant immediate supervision while the public is present, and further provided that safe dispersal areas based on 3 square feet (0.28 m<sup>2</sup>) per occupant are located between the fence and enclosed space. Such required safe dispersal areas shall not be located less than 50 feet (15,240 mm) from the enclosed space. See Section ~~1017~~ 1023.6 for means of egress from safe dispersal areas.

**Committee Reason:** The correct reference to safe dispersal information should be provided.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E36-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** A concern is if this would be interpreted as an either/or choice rather than a requirement for both. Additionally, the question was raised if all turnstiles were electric.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E37-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The revision would make the language consistent with the referenced standard, ASME A18.1.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E38-03/04

### Item 1 (IBC)

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposed language is confusing. The interpretations would not result in the proponents intent. The measurement of the stairway should be the same as the foot experiences the stairway.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

### Item 2 (IRC)

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** Based on proponent's published reason.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E39-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposed language complicates the measurement for the treads. In addition, for a spiral stairway where the handrail was on the outside radius rather than the inside radius, the proposed language would not provide the correct location to measure the tread depth.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E40-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The proposal removes redundant language.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E41-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** Section 1009.8 was revised by the committee's action on Code Change E40-03/04. In addition, a requirement should not be in an exception.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E42-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** While a lot of information regarding falls on residential stairways was provided as supporting information, historically, a residential stairway is not a 7-3/4":10" stairway, but a stairway with a higher riser tread ratio. The hospital information on falls does not include information on the stairway tread and riser dimensions. Until information on falls based on the more recently required 7-3/4":10" stairway are available, the current requirement is a reasonable minimum standard.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E43-03/04

### Item 1 (IBC)

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** While a lot of information regarding falls on residential stairways was provided as supporting information, historically, a residential stairway is not a 7-3/4":10" stairway, but a stairway with a higher riser tread ratio. The hospital information on falls does not include information on the stairway tread and riser dimensions. Until information on falls based on the more recently required 7-3/4":10" stairway are available, the current requirement is a reasonable minimum standard.

**Assembly Action:** None

**Item 2 (IRC)**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposal was disapproved to be consistent with the Residential Committee's previous action on RB84-03/04.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

**E44-03/04**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The issue was addressed by the committee action on Code Change E40-03/04.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

**E45-03/04**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** This revision would make where open risers are permitted be consistent with where guard opening requirements are permitted to have 21" openings. These are areas where children are not typically present.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

**E46-03/04**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The deleted text is appropriate since it can be very difficult to enforce this criteria in areas with snow. The committee recommended proponents look at the Property Maintenance Code for a possible need for a coordinating code change.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

**E47-03/04**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The concern was addressed by the committee's action on Code Change E46-03/04.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

**E48-03/04**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The concern was addressed by the committee's action on Code Change E46-03/04.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

**E49-03/04**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** This deletion could be interpreted as resulting in no tread and riser requirements for circular stairways due to Exception 1 in Section 1009.3.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

**E50-03/04**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The additional language does not clarify anything. In addition, it does not permit a ladder for access to the roof.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

**E51-03/04**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

**Modification:** Replace the proposal with the following:

**1009.12.2 Protection at roof hatch openings.** Where the roof hatch opening providing the required access is located within 10 feet (3049 mm) of the roof edge, such roof access or roof edge shall be protected by guards installed in accordance with the provisions of Section 1012.

**1012.5 Mechanical equipment.** Guards shall be provided where appliances, equipment, fans, roof hatch openings or other components that required service are located within 10 feet (3049 mm) of a roof edge or open side of a walking surface and such edge or open side is located more than 30 inches (762 mm) above the floor, roof or grade below. The guard shall be constructed so as to prevent the passage of a 21 inch (533 mm) diameter sphere.

**1012.6 Roof access.** Guards shall be provided where the roof hatch opening is located within 10 feet (3048 mm) of a roof edge or open side of a walking surface and such edge or open sided is located more than 30 inches (762 mm) above the floor, roof or grade below. The guard shall be constructed so as to prevent the passage of a 21 inch (533 mm) diameter sphere.

**Committee Reason:** The proposal addressed a safety concern at roof hatch locations.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

**E52-03/04**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The proposal clarifies the difference between vehicular and pedestrian ramps.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E53-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

**Modify proposal as follows:**

**1010.6.3 Length.** The landing length shall be 60 inches (1525 mm) minimum.

**Exceptions:**

1. Landings in nonaccessible Group R-2 and R-3 individual dwelling units, as applicable in Section 101.2, are permitted to be 36 inches (914 mm) minimum.
2. Where the ramp is not a part of an accessible route, the length of the landing shall not be required to be more than 48 inches (1220 mm) in the direction of travel.

**Committee Reason:** The proposal would make landings for ramps that were not used as part of an accessible route consistent with the landing requirements for stairways. The modification is to clarify the direction of the specified dimension.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E54-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The proposal would make the IBC ramp requirements consistent with the technical standard, ICC/ANSI A117.1.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E55-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** If a door is utilized as an exit, it should be signed. This action would be consistent with the committee's action on Code Change E5-03/04.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E56-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The requirements for contrast in signage from ICC/ANSI A117.1 and general room lighting requirements in Chapter 12 are adequate for a separate tactile sign. Additional illumination is not required.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E57-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** This proposal raised many concerns including the following: There are no requirements for low level signage in the current text. There is no indication on which side of the wall these should be placed. There is no indication of what happens at an intersection. There are two incorrect statements in the proponent's reason statement. It is false that the "access out of public structures by physically challenged individuals has not been established by the code." In addition, the proponent talked about directing "physically challenged" persons to an exit, however, as written, these signs could direct these individuals to a non-accessible exit.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E58-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** No provisions were provided to determine when people are or are not in the building. There may be people in the building after hours when not all lights are on where they would still need to be able to identify the exits for emergencies. The proponent has not provided information that cycling of bulbs being turned on and off would increase bulb life over a continuous burn.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E59-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The proposed change would coordinate the language in the code with the UL924 standard.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E60-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the committee's action on Code Change E58-03/04.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E61-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** Since all Group R facilities are required to be sprinklered, the exception in the proposal would result in the floor-level exit signs never being required.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E62-03/04

### Item 1 (IBC)

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposed language requires these markings to all exits. In multi-exit buildings the possible configurations could result in confusion in requirements and enforcement. There is no indication of maintenance. There are too many concerns left open at this time.

**Assembly Action:** None

### Item 2 (IEBC)

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposed text change does not appear to add anything that would increase the safety of buildings. It would require more markings and indicators that may not have any effect on the safety of the building.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E63-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The justification only speaks about homes, however, the proposed text would be applicable to all building types. The definition for 'climbable guards' was disapproved by the committee in Code Change E7-03/04. The language is over restrictive and subject to a broad range of interpretations.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E64-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the committee's action on Code Change E63-03/04.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E65-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** Justification was not provided why guards should be lower in residential occupancies over other occupancies.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E66-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The current requirements allow for design flexibility. Toddlers are typically shorter than the 36" high level with

the 4" opening limitations. Recent climbing studies mentioned in the reason statement were not provided to the committee.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E67-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** This is a safety issue and is appropriate in Chapter 10.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E68-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** While this division could make the base paragraph clearer, there could be confusion on if the exceptions were applicable to the entire base paragraph or just item 4.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E69-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The committee approved the solution for this concern offered in Code Change E71-03/04. In addition, this proposal would permit all the means of egress to be through the stock room.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E70-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The committee approved the solution for this concern offered in Code Change E71-03/04.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E71-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

**Modify proposal as follows:**

**1013.2 Egress through intervening spaces.** Egress from a room or space shall not pass through adjoining or intervening rooms or areas, except where such adjoining rooms or areas are accessory to the area served; are not a high-hazard occupancy and provide a discernible path of egress travel to an exit. Egress shall not pass through kitchens, storage rooms, closets or spaces used for similar purposes. An exit access shall not pass through a room that can be locked to prevent egress. Means of egress from dwelling units or

sleeping areas shall not lead through other sleeping areas, toilet rooms or bathrooms.

**Exceptions:**

1. Means of egress are not prohibited through a kitchen area serving adjoining rooms constituting part of the same dwelling unit or sleeping unit.
2. Means of egress are not prohibited through adjoining or intervening rooms or spaces in a Group H occupancy when the adjoining or intervening rooms or spaces are the same or lesser hazard occupancy group.
3. Means of egress are not prohibited through stockrooms in Group M occupancies, when all of the following are met:
  - 3.1 The stock is of the same hazard classification as that found in the main retail area;
  - 3.2 Not more than 50 percent of the exit access is through the stockroom;
  - 3.3 The stockroom is no subject to locking from the egress side; and
  - 3.4 There is a ~~dedicated~~ demarcated minimum 44-inch wide aisle leading directly from the retail area to the exit without obstructions.

**Committee Reason:** The proposed language would permit a means of egress through a stock room at the back of a small store. The additional modification to Item 3.3 would permit the rear exit door to be locked from the outside for security purposes as long as it is readily open from the inside for means of egress. The door between the sales floor and stock room, since it is used for egress in both directions, may not be locked. The term 'demarcated' in item 3.4 will indicate some type of marking of the aisle will be required.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E72-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** While the idea would address the problems found in the new large facility one-stop shops, the proposed change is too broad. The term "same or similar" occupancy would not work for banks or restaurant areas within mercantile. As written it would permit an office tenant space to egress through another office tenant space which may have different operating hours. This could be a safety concern.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E73-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Substantiation was not provided that indicated a need for the smoke detectors in these types of occupancies.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E74-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The concept is good and is needed, however, the language needs some additional work. The definition for 'aisle'

should not include the defined term 'corridor.' The term 'trade fixture' needs to be clarified. Including the dimensions of the clothes on the racks would need to be included in the measurements to ensure adequate paths of travel between fixtures. It is not clear how one would differentiate between the aisle accessways and the aisles. Perhaps new terms should be developed for mercantile occupancies. The width of the aisle accessway should be measured between merchandise rather than fixtures and should be related to the occupant load for the area. The text should not reference the ADAAG - the IBC uses ICC/ANSI A117.1 for accessibility technical requirements.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E75-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** If the issue is egress balconies in atriums, Section 404 should be utilized in it's entirety. There are also other types of interior balconies. If the intent is only for atrium balconies, that language should be in the provision.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E76-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** It is not clear in the proposed text if the hazardous materials must be in excess of the exempt amounts or not. There was no justification that showed the additional exit would decrease the amount of injuries. If the danger is labs, the scope should include labs other than in just Group E.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E77-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** As written, the proposal would take away the 1/3 option for all other use groups. The proponents reason only addresses Group R-2.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E78-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The exception is not required if the change to the main text is approved. The exception is not proposed to be deleted. The change should be complete.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E79-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** A laundry list is not required. It would be more appropriate to locate this information in the definition, not under travel distances. In addition, the open exit stairway was not included in this list.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E80-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposal was part of a package with Code change E80, E87, E89 and E95 for a new approach to dealing with open exit stairways. Additional clarification of the issue is required.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E81-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** A lobby is not contained 'in' a corridor. They are two separate and distinct elements.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E82-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** A question was if the fire resistant walls would address smoke migration concerns. There is a huge variety in occupant load and hazards in all Group A, therefore, this may be too broad of a requirement. Justification for the increased rating was not provided.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E83-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** No substantiation was provided that a problem exists and needs to be addressed.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E84-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** No substantiation was provided that a problem exists and needs to be addressed.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E85-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** No substantiation was provided that a problem exists and needs to be addressed.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E86-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** This is a very broad brush approach. Most of the means of egress in Groups A and M are through largely open areas, not corridors. Doors and opening protectives are not required in this proposal. A concern would be what would happen when a corridor connected to an open exit stairway. Information was not provided on smoke in corridors in sprinklered buildings. Perhaps smoke protection should be required at different occupant thresholds. A better format might be a separate table for smoke partitions for corridors rather than including them in the fire-resistance table. Other concerns would be the adequate technical justification and the cost impact on the industry.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E87-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposal was part of a package with Code change E80, 87, 89 and 95 for a new approach to dealing with open exit stairways. Additional clarification of the issue is required. If there are corridors, corridor doors should be required at the top and bottom of open exit stairs.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E88-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** Section 1014 regulates exit access while Section 1018 regulates exits. There could be situations were both are applicable in the same space. The current text is appropriate.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E89-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The proposal was part of a package with Code change E80, 87, 89 and 95 for a new approach to dealing with open exit stairways. This is a clean-up for occupant load per floor.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E90-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The proposal increases consistency with the existing code language.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E91-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** A concern would be if a space above and below would result in a 3 story connection of spaces. In addition, the text would permit a basement storage area to be open to a office area. This would be an unjustified hazard.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E92-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** It would not be good code language to have an exception within an exception. The language in Code change E93-03/04 is preferred.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E93-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The proposed language would clarify that an open exit stairway is permitted within an individual sleeping unit.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E94-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Section 1019 deals with exits. Therefore, accessory stairways should not be addressed in this section.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E95-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** While the intent of the proposal is appropriate, the exceptions should be relocated to another location. The proposal was part of a package with Code change E80, 87, 89 and 95 for a new approach to dealing with open exit stairways. Additional clarification of the issue is required.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E96-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Modified**

**Modification:** Replace the proposal with the following:

~~1019.1.5~~ **1009.5.3 Enclosures under stairways.** The walls and soffits within enclosed usable spaces under enclosed and unenclosed stairways shall be protected by 1-hour fire-resistance-rated construction, or the fire-resistance rating of the stairway enclosure, whichever is greater. Access to the enclosed space shall not be directly from within the stair enclosure.

**Exception:** ~~Spaces under stairways serving and contained within a single residential dwelling unit in Group R-2 or R-3 as applicable in Section 101.2.~~ Spaces under stairways serving and contained within a single residential dwelling unit in Group R-2 or R-3 as applicable in Section 101.2 shall be permitted to be protected on the enclosed side with ½ inch (12.7 mm) gypsum board.

There shall be no enclosed usable space under exterior exit stairways unless the space is completely enclosed in 1-hour fire-resistance-rated construction. The open space under exterior stairways shall not be used for any purpose.

**Committee Reason:** The proposed change would coordinate with the IRC. The relocation from Section 1019 *Vertical exit enclosures* to Section 1009 *Stairways and handrails* is appropriate.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E97-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The proposal would be poor code language. There were no minimum structural properties specified for the concrete or masonry, so it is impossible to determine if another material would be equivalent. There was no justification for the threshold of 250 ft. height.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E98-03/04

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** No justification was provided for the revision from three to two stories.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## E99-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The elevator is not a normally occupied space, therefore it would not be permitted in exit passageways or vertical exit enclosures per the second paragraph in both Sections 1019.1.1 and 1020.4.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E100-03/04 Withdrawn by Proponent

---

## E101-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The justification provided was the recent nightclub disasters in Rhode Island and Chicago. Both locations had code violations. The Rhode Island facility had less than 300 occupants and the front door could have met width requirements for over 100% of the occupants.

To include all Group A would be too general. The occupant load would have to be increased significantly past 300 to get another door leaf. This would be extremely difficult to meet in very large occupancies such as football stadiums. Perhaps the additional width should be limited to Group A-2 nightclubs.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E102-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the committee's action to code change E101-03/04.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E103-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the committee's action to code change E101-03/04.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E104-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The term 'proportionately' would be applied inconsistently. All Group A would be too general. This would adversely effect large facilities without justification.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E105-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The change is a clarification. The term 'means of egress' is more appropriate.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E106-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** A ramp slope in assembly is 1:8 maximum. The more restrictive provisions for a ramp slope of 1:12 maximum would apply when also part of an accessible route. Therefore, the proposed language is not needed.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E107-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposal is disapproved for consistency on previous code committee actions related to sunrooms.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E108-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposed language would not be achievable on sloped sites in large portions of the country. In many cases, urban lots do not have 10 feet side yards. This may conflict with other provisions in the IBC that permit yards less than 10 feet in width. Fire fighting ground operations should not be in the building code.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E109-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The scope in Section 1101.1 and 1103.1 already covers this issue. In addition, the proposed language could expand the scope past the intent or purview of the building code.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E110-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The proposed language adds clarify. Site accessibility is specifically scoped elsewhere in Chapter 11, so this change will not include areas of a site not associated with a structure.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E111-03/04

Withdrawn by Proponent

---

## E112-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The term 'residential business' is not defined. This may be interpreted as a personal office space without employees or clients. Perhaps better language would be 'home occupations' or to have the exception deleted. Section 1103.2 already exempts single family homes.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E113-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The term 'accessible' should remain in the text to keep it clear that the intent is to connect accessible elements, not all elements.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E114-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The proposed deletion would remove redundant language. Levels are already addressed in Section 1104.4. There is no difference between the accessibility requirements for a 2<sup>nd</sup> floor versus a mezzanine.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E115-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposed Exception 4 is not an exception. The term 'focal point floor level' is not defined. Vertical access should be addressed in Section 1104.4.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E116-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** Expanding the scope to Accessible units, Type A units and Type B units meets the original intent of the provision.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E117-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** A basement is a story, and the proposed language treats it differently. The language regarding governmental building in Exception 1.4 does not pick up all regulations associated with federal funding. These requirements should either be left to federal law for stricter regulations or addressed as a group.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E118-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The increase to 60% for accessible entrances would be too difficult for two entrance buildings on sloped sites. The exception that tries to address this uses the term 'impracticable' and is not clear. The term 'infeasible' is used for platform lifts. The separation of dwelling and tenant space entrance requirements was helpful.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E119-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as modified

**Modification:** Replace the proposal with the following:

**1106.6 Location.** Accessible parking spaces shall be located on the shortest accessible route of travel from adjacent parking to an accessible building entrance. Accessible parking spaces shall be dispersed among the various types of parking facilities provided. In parking facilities that do not serve a particular building, accessible parking spaces, shall be located on the shortest route to an accessible pedestrian entrance to the parking facility. Where buildings have multiple accessible entrances with adjacent parking, accessible parking spaces shall be dispersed and located near the accessible entrance.

**Exceptions:**

1. In multilevel parking structures, van-accessible parking spaces are permitted on one level.
2. Parking spaces shall be permitted to be located in different parking facilities if substantially equivalent or greater accessibility is provided in terms of distance from an accessible entrance or entrances, parking fee, and user convenience.

**Committee Reason:** The new exception would provide better access for a persons with mobility impairments.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E120-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The proposal would add clarification for structures divided into separate buildings with fire walls and facilities connected together by bridges when elevators are not provided in all buildings.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E121-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

**Modification:** Replace the proposal with the following:

**1109.10 Assembly area seating.** Assembly areas with fixed seating in every occupancy shall comply with Section 1108.2 for accessible seating and assistive listening devices.

**Committee Reason:** The phrase 'in every occupancy' is confusing. The change would make the language consistent between Section 1108.2 and 1109.10.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E122-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The change is based on coordination with the 2003 edition of ICC/ANSI A117.1. Since this document is not yet finalized, this coordination is not appropriate at this time.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E123-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** While the change would be consistent with the original BCMC report, technical justification should be provided to change the triggers for vertical access in assembly with fixed seats on more than one level.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E124-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** A mezzanine is not a story.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E125-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** This section is talking about bars and counters. The reference to standing spaces complicates the issue and makes enforcement difficult.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E126-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The deletion is an appropriate editorial fix.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E127-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Modification:** The proposal was revised editorially as follows:

**1108.4.3.1 Cubicles and counters.** At least 5 percent, but no fewer than one, of cubicles shall be accessible on both the visitor and detainee sides. Where counters are provided, at least one shall be accessible on both the visitor and detainee sides.

**Exception:** This requirement shall not apply to the detainee side of cubicles or counters at noncontact visiting areas not serving Accessible unit holding cells.

**Committee Reason:** The additional language provides clarity. The word "unit" was added editorially so that it would be clearly understood that this exception was specific to sleeping units.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E128-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposed deletion of Exception 4 is based on child size information being available in the 2003 edition of ICC/ANSI A117.1. Since this document is not yet finalized, this coordination is not appropriate at this time.

While the 50% would be determinable with unisex toilet rooms, a concern would be which bathroom would be accessible when separate male and female bathrooms are provide. A modification was offered to make the 50% applicable only to toilet rooms in excess of the required fixtures. If the percentage is increased, it may be appropriate to apply the accessibility requirement to all clustered bathrooms.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E129-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposed deletion of Exception 4 is based on child size information being available in the 2003 edition of ICC/ANSI A117.1. Since this document is not yet finalized, this coordination is not appropriate at this time.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E130-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The scope of Chapter 11 is for accessibility for physical disabled persons. The reason for the proposal is to address a psychological disability. While there may be a time when we can address these types of disabilities in a building code context, we are not at that point at this time.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E131-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The scope of Chapter 11 is for accessibility for physical disabled persons. The reason for the proposal is to address a psychological disability. While there may be a time when we can address these types of disabilities in a building code context, we are not at that point at this time.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E132-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** While it would be appropriate to broaden this provision for some facilities with security check points similar to airports (e.g. courthouses), the possible interpretations of what would be considered a security check point in other occupancies is too broad.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E133-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The privacy issue addressed in Section 1109.2.1.7 is not in the ICC/ANSI A117.1.

While it could be argued that Section 1109.2.1.6 is redundant with the ICC/ANSI A117.1 requirement, the unisex bathroom in Section 1109.2.1 is intended for assisted usage. It could be interpreted that the requirements in the ICC/ANSI A117.1 were for single occupant usage bathrooms only.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E134-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The only time this would be applicable is when there are more women's fixtures required than men's fixtures. The 6 water closets and urinals provided in the room is a more appropriate way to judge when this should be applied.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E135-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposed deletion of Exception 2 is based on child size information being available the 2003 edition of ICC/ANSI A117.1. Since this document is not yet finalized, this coordination is not appropriate at this time.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E136-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The technical requirements for standing drinking fountains will be available the 2003 edition of ICC/ANSI A117.1. Since this document is not yet finalized, this coordination is not appropriate at this time.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E137-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The current limitations of the Limited Access/Limited Use (LULA) elevator are a combination of market driven decisions and inherent in the product itself. This was an intentional decision of the ASME A17.1 committee when developing the LULA requirements. It has not been demonstrated that this has been a problem or resulted in less accessibility.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E138-03/04

**Withdrawn by Proponent**

---

## E139-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The term 'dining terrace' would be open for interpretation. While it may be appropriate to extend this application to restaurants, without the information about the route and terrace being outdoors, the route to the exit may require travel back through the building from areas with a large occupant load. This may be hazardous in emergency situations.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E140-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

If E140 is approved, the title of the section will also be editorially revised as follows:

1109.8.3 Coat hooks and ~~fold~~ing shelves.

**Committee Reason:** The deletion is appropriate for consistency with proposed ADAAG. There does not seem to be any reason why this requirement should be limited to folding shelves in these limited locations.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E141-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposed language could be interpreted to allow 5% of the standing spaces which could have negative impact on accessibility. Exception #1 is needed because check writing areas at check out counters are currently being interpreted as work surfaces by the mercantile industry.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E142-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** Accessibility requirements should be driven by the number of check out aisles, not the square footage of the space.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E143-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** Stair provisions should comply with the criteria in Chapter 10 of the IBC. In addition, stairways 'along' something does not appear to have a lot of meaning.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E144-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** By proposing to combine the exceptions, the concern is that a signage requirement would extend to all bathrooms within a facility, thereby going much farther than originally intended.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E145-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** This would take an accessibility provision and apply it to a construction site. This could require a change in signage on a daily basis as the building is built.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E146-03/04

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** While the standard ICC/ANSI A117.1 is in its final stages, it is not yet complete.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## E147-03/04

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The update of these referenced standards are appropriate.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

## **E148-03/04**

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The proposed language is too broad to be consistently applied. A concern would be that if a townhouse development was built, this could be interpreted to require a percentage of Accessible units for equity purposes.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## **E149-03/04**

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The deletion would be appropriate since the text is already in Appendix B of the International Existing Building Code and available to anyone wishing to use it.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

