
2006/2007 INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE Means of Egress Code Development Committee

Bruce Boulineau - Chair

Director/Construction Services
City of Myrtle Beach
Myrtle Beach, SC

Cary Redman

Fire Marshall
Rep: National Association of Home Builders
Cherokee County
Canton, GA

Dave Frable – Vice Chair

Senior Fire Protection Engineer
U.S. General Services Administration-PBS
Geneva, IL

Jim W. Sealy

Architect
Jim Sealy Architect
Dallas, TX

Jason D. Averill

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

John Stovall

NSArchitects
Rep: National Association of Home Builders
Rockville, MD

Christopher W. Bryant

Principal
spg3 Architects
Philadelphia, PA

Andrew Stuffer

Building Official
Ventura City Fire Department
Ventura, CA

Jim Budzinski

Fire Chief
Tamarac Fire Rescue
Rep: International Association of Fire Chiefs
Tamarac, FL

Steve L. Thomas

President
Colorado Code Consulting LLC
Rep: City of Cherry Hills Village
Parker, CO

Kenneth Bush

Senior Fire Protection Engineer
Maryland State Fire Marshal's Office
Rep: National Association of State Fire Marshals
Easton, MD

Joseph H. Versteeg

Versteeg Associates
Torrington, CT

Edward A. Button

Assistant Fire Chief & Fire Marshal
Moscow Fire Department
Rep: National Association of Home Builders
Moscow, ID

Soy Williams, AIA

President
Soy Williams Consulting Inc.
Palmetto Bay, FL

William J. Lynn

Director of Building Department/Construction Official
Paramus Building Department
Paramus, NJ

Committee Secretary

Kimberly Paarlberg

Senior Staff Architect
International Code Council
Country Club Hills, IL

INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE
MEANS OF EGRESS COMMITTEE
HEARING RESULTS

E1-06/07

PART I — IBC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Stairs are inherently dangerous, therefore, asking for supplemental stairways to be exempt from Chapter 10 requirements is not proper.

Assembly Action: None

PART II — IFC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal does not achieve the proponent's goal of resolving the question of whether or not non-required egress components must comply with code requirements.

Assembly Action: None

E2-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The intent is well founded, however, locating emergency planning requirements in Chapter 10 is inappropriate. Emergency planning is not a construction issues. Emergency planning is the purview of the IFC and the maintenance part of these plans are enforced by the fire officials.

Assembly Action: None

E3-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is concern about the proposed added language 'accessible vertical and horizontal' because stairs enclosures are necessarily accessible. Elevators are not part of the general means of egress. The three distinct parts are redundant because the exit access, exit and exit discharge are part of the definition for 'means of egress'.

Assembly Action: None

E4-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is no difference between the proposed definitions for bleachers and grandstands. The term 'retracted or reduced' is confusing.

Assembly Action: None

E5-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

EXIT DISCHARGE, LEVEL OF. The lowest story at the point at which an exit terminates and an exit discharge begins.

Committee Reason: The revised language will clarify that the level of exit discharge is the story the occupants are egressing from rather than the floor they are walking on. The modification was made because the story could be the lowest, highest or any level of building.

Assembly Action: None

E6-06/07

PART I — IBC

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

FLIGHT. A continuous run of rectangular treads (fliers) or winders or combination thereof from one landing to another.

Committee Reason: The definition will clarify the difference between 'flight' and when a stairway moves from floor to floor. The term 'fliers' was dropped because it was confusing, not commonly used and not needed.

Assembly Action: None

PART II — IRC

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

FLIGHT. A continuous run of rectangular treads (fliers) or winders or combination thereof from one landing to another.

Committee Reason: The definition of Flight is a useful addition to Chapter 2 of the *International Residential Code*. The modification was passed by the Means of Egress committee and keeps the definitions consistent in the IBC and IRC.

Assembly Action: None

E7-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: While there is sometimes an inconsistency in where guards are required, it can be a judgement call at drop offs. This definition will increase the misapplication of guard requirements. The definition should not be tied to specific materials.

Assembly Action: None

E8-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Ramps are part of the means of egress, and it is logical to include them in the exceptions for the ceiling height provisions. This will coordinate the IBC requirements with ICC A117.1.

Assembly Action: None

E9-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The deletion of this language would make the code harder to use. This is the one spot where all the requirements for means of egress headroom comes together, so this section is needed.

Assembly Action: None

E10-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Electrical and mechanical rooms are not occupied spaces as defined by the code, therefore ceiling heights for means of egress are not required. The markings on the floor would be an enforcement problem. It was not clear if the area to be marked was the path for means of egress or the areas where the headroom was too low.

Assembly Action: None

E11-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal would add clarity on how to measure ramp width. The proposed language would increase coordination with the ICC A117.1 and new ADA/ABA Accessibility Guidelines.

Assembly Action: None

E12-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Access to elevator equipment is not a means of egress issue. It is more appropriate to keep this issue in the mechanical code.

Assembly Action: None

E13-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: In removing 'means of egress' from this section, the requirement might not get the attention it deserves in the egress chapter. Stating that the numbers for determining occupant loads for other purposes also use this table would be better located in other sections where applicable.

Assembly Action: None

E14-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal does not have a threshold limit for educational occupancies that would require posting. The proposed language would require posting in all classrooms, and that would be excessive.

Assembly Action: None

E15-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The required width can be larger than the capacity requirements, thus the proposed language could result in a significant increase for width. The corridor width would end up driving the width of the entire egress system.

Assembly Action: None

E16-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed language would provide consistency and clarity to the code for Group H and I-2 requirements.

Assembly Action: None

E17-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based on the testimony, if the hardware can be up to 10 inches from tip to tip, taking away the door and one handle, exclusion of the hardware could result in an additional protrusion of up to 11 inches into the path for means of egress. The 7 inches should include the hardware. In addition, when the door open 90 degrees, the 7 inches is the obstruction, while if it opens 180 degrees, there is credit given for the hardware so it is not a protrusion - this seems inconsistent.

Assembly Action: None

E18-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1005.2 Door encroachment. Doors, when fully opened, and handrails, shall not reduce the required means of egress width by more than 7 inches (178 mm). ~~Such door measurements shall include the thickness of the door and any hardware between the door and the adjacent wall surface.~~ Doors in any position shall not reduce the required width by more than one-half. Other nonstructural projections such as trim and similar decorative features are permitted to project into the required width 1.5 inches (38 mm) on each side.

Exception: The restrictions on a door swing shall not apply to doors within individual dwelling units and sleeping units of Group R-2 and dwelling units of Group R-3.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposed language would combine protrusion requirements in one section and would reduce redundancy. The sentence regarding measuring of the door and one-half of the hardware was deleted for consistency with the committee action on E17-06/07. Clear width or corridors should include hardware.

Assembly Action: **None**

E19-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language will result in an expansion of requirements for accessible means of egress by referencing all of the requirements in Chapter 10. For example, in taller buildings the requirement for separation could result in the elevator and stairway to be separated by 1/3 of the building diagonal.

Assembly Action: **None**

E20-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While it is appropriate to be concerned about the accessible means of egress providing two distinct exits, the separation requirements were developed for stair separation and should not be applied to elevator and stair separation without technical justification being provided.

Assembly Action: **None**

E21-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal would allow theaters to use common path of travel for stepped aisles as well as sloped floors. This is an improvement that was lacking in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

E22-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The current reference to vertical exit components, rather than general stairway provisions is more appropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

E23-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

1007.2 Continuity and components. Each required accessible means of egress shall be continuous to a public way and shall consist of one or more of the following components:

1. Accessible routes complying with Section 1104.
2. Interior exit stairways within vertical exit enclosures complying with Sections 1007.3 and 1020.
3. Exterior exit stairways complying with Sections 1007.3 and 1023.
4. Elevators complying with Section 1007.4.
5. Platform lifts complying with Section 1007.5.
6. Horizontal exits complying with Section 1022.
7. Ramps complying with Section 1010.
8. Areas of refuge complying with Section 1007.6

Exceptions:

1. Where the exit discharge is not accessible, an exterior area for assisted rescue must be provided in accordance with Section 1007.8.
2. Where the exit stairway is open to the exterior, the accessible means of egress shall include either an area of refuge in accordance with Section 1007.6 or an exterior area for assisted rescue in accordance with Section 1007.8.

1007.3 Exit stairways. In order to be considered part of an accessible means of egress, an exit stairway shall have a clear width of 48 inches (1219 mm) minimum between handrails and shall either incorporate an area of refuge within an enlarged floor-level landing or shall be accessed from either an area of refuge complying with Section 1007.6 or a horizontal exit.

Exceptions:

1. The area of refuge is not required at unenclosed interior exit stairways as permitted by Section 1020.1 in buildings or facilities that are equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1.
2. The clear width of 48 inches (1219 mm) between handrails is not required at exit stairways in buildings or facilities equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2.
3. The clear width of 48 inches (1219 mm) between handrails is not required for exit stairways accessed from a horizontal exit.
4. Areas of refuge are not required at exit stairways serving open parking garages.
5. ~~Where the exit stairway is open to the exterior, the accessible means of egress shall include either an area of refuge in accordance with Section 1007.6 or an exterior area for assisted rescue in accordance with Section 1007.8~~

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies the continuity for the accessible means of egress. The proponent asked for the modification to not relocate current Section 1007.2, Exception 2 to a new Section 1007.3, Exception 5. The proponent wished to bring this portion forward in a later proposal.

Staff note: The committee action to Sections 1007.2 and 1007.6.2 have removed the final direct reference to "vertical exit enclosures" in Chapter 10. The result is that the title of Section 1020 will be changed from "Vertical exit enclosures" to "Exit enclosures". Note that titles are editorial.

Assembly Action: **None**

E24-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved in favor of E25-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

E25-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The sprinkler exception for areas of refuge was deleted from Sections 1007.2 and 1007.3 as part of the final action hearings of the 04/05 cycle. No technical justification was provided to support the deletion of this option. There has been no loss of life in sprinklered high rise buildings. In addition, the deletion of the exceptions have resulted in conflicts with the elevator protection provisions and smoke barrier construction. There would be significant ramifications to current building construction.

Assembly Action: **None**

E26-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The term 'essentially' is not readily defined.

Assembly Action: **None**

E27-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

1007.4 Elevators. In order to be considered part of an accessible means of egress, an elevator shall comply with the emergency operation and signaling device requirements of Section 2.27 of ASME A17.1. Standby power shall be provided in accordance with Sections 2702 and 3003. The elevator shall be accessed from either an area of refuge complying with Section 1007.6 or a horizontal exit.

Exceptions:

1. Elevators are not required to be accessed from an area of refuge or horizontal exit in open parking garages.
2. Elevators not required to be located in a shaft in accordance with Section 707.2 are not required to be accessed from an area of refuge or horizontal exit.
3. ~~Elevators are not required to be accessed from an area of refuge or a horizontal exit where all portions of the means of egress are essentially open to the outside.~~

Committee Reason: The proposed exception 2 is a logical extension. If an elevator is not in a shaft, an area of refuge in front of it would not make sense. The modification to delete Exception 3 was for consistency with the committee action on E26-06/07. The term 'essentially' is not readily defined.

Assembly Action: **None**

E28-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

1007.7 Signage. At exits and elevators serving a required accessible space but not providing an approved accessible means of egress, signage shall be installed indicating the location of accessible means

~~of egress. At refuge areas created by horizontal exits or where areas of refuge are not required, provide signage indicating areas to wait for rescue assistance.~~

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The modification provided definable criteria for areas where smoke protected seating for all occupants is provided. It is logical that this is a viable alternative for areas of refuge for persons with mobility impairments. The modification removed the proposed revision to Section 1007.7. If an area of refuge is not required, then signage for that area of refuge does not make sense.

Assembly Action: **None**

E29-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Since Group R-2 occupancies are required to be sprinklered and separated, there is sufficient protection for the residents. There was a question if with the committee action on E25-06/07 that this exception may be redundant.

Assembly Action: **None**

E30-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: In this particular case, the use of sprinkler systems provided in accordance with NFPA 13R is reasonable and will provide the needed level of protection.

Assembly Action: **None**

E31-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was to delete the travel distance requirement for the area of refuge. The concern in the proponent's reason was partially due to the sprinkler exception for areas of refuge being deleted. Committee action on E25-06/07 has reinstated that exception. In an unsprinklered building, the time and travel distance to reach some level of protection is a concern, so the language regarding travel distance should remain in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

E32-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal will coordinate the requirements between the elevator lobby provisions and those for accessible means of egress.

Assembly Action: **None**

E33-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved in favor of the language in E32-06/07. The relationship between the elevator and where it would lay in relation to the horizontal exit is unclear.

Assembly Action: None

E34-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved in favor of the language in E32-06/07. The relationship between the elevator and where it would lay in relation to the horizontal exit is unclear. In addition, the text would require the use of Exceptions 3 and 6 instead of allowing it as an option.

Assembly Action: None

E35-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The level of protection offered by an open exit access stair is negligible, and what is needed is an actual exit enclosure.

Assembly Action: None

E36-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee action on E32-06/07 addressed the concerns for coordination between elevator lobbies and areas of refuge.

Assembly Action: None

E37-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Smoke control systems have a time frame of 20 minutes which must be considered for smoke intrusion for locations where the accessible means of egress may be effected. The language in the proposed exceptions may cause a conflict between the requirements in the base paragraph for protection from smoke and the exception for smoke barriers.

Assembly Action: None

E38-06/07

PART I — IBC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The language of the proposal does not clearly indicate whom the signage is to serve and is confusing. If the signage is on the outside, and the door locks behind the person, what is the purpose of telling them the location of other accessible means of egress if they cannot access them. At least a portion of the information is more appropriate on the inside of the building. The text should tell a user how to access the exterior area of rescue assistance - not send them somewhere else.

Assembly Action: None

PART II — IFC

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Including assisted rescue strategies and procedures in the required fire evacuation and safety planning provisions will provide a needed improvement in the life safety profile of buildings for all of their occupants.

Assembly Action: None

E39-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The revision to Section 1008.1.1 Exception 7 deletes the allowances for Group R-4 to use this exception. Deletion of the exception to Section 1008.1.6 allowing a 7.75 inch threshold would effectively eliminate the use of sliding glass doors. This goes beyond editorial as indicated in the reason

Assembly Action: None

E40-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The lower headroom height for door closers and stops will allow design flexibility without adversely effecting the means of egress.

Assembly Action: None

E41-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1008.1.2 Door swing. Egress doors shall be side-hinged swinging.

Exceptions:

1. ~~Private garages, office areas, factory and storage areas with an occupant load of 10 or less.~~
1. 9: In other than Group H Occupancies, manually operated horizontal sliding doors are permitted in a means of egress from spaces with an occupant load of 10 or less.
2. Group I-3 occupancies used as a place of detention.
3. Critical or intensive care patient rooms within suites of health care facilities.
4. Doors within or serving a single dwelling unit in Groups R-2 and R-3.

5. In other than Group H occupancies, revolving doors complying with Section 1008.1.3.1.
6. In other than Group H occupancies, horizontal sliding doors complying with Section 1008.1.3.3 are permitted in a means of egress.
7. Power-operated doors in accordance with Section 1008.1.3.2.
8. Doors serving a bathroom within an individual sleeping unit in Group R-1.

Committee Reason: The change allowing for a horizontal sliding door instead of a side swinging door in areas with small occupant loads would not decrease safety for the means of egress. The modification to delete Exception 1 was to eliminate redundant text with the new exception. The Assembly Action was due to the deletion of Exception 1 resulting in overhead doors not being permitted as an option for some of these small areas.

Assembly Action: **Approved as Submitted**

E42-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The code cannot mandate which side of corridor people will walk on. The proposed solution does not solve the problems brought up in the reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

E43-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The reorganization clarifies the operational force is applicable to all inside non-fire doors, including types other than side swinging doors.

Assembly Action: **None**

E44-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Revolving doors are a safety hazard along accessible routes without specifications for just how to make them accessible.

Assembly Action: **None**

E45-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval based on the committee's approval of E52-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

E46-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval based on the committee's approval of E52-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

E47-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

1008.1.8.3 Locks and latches. Locks and latches shall be permitted to prevent operation of doors where any of the following exists:

1. Places of detention or restraint.
2. In buildings in occupancy Group A having an occupant load of 300 or less, Groups B, F, M and S, and in places of religious worship, the main exterior door or doors are permitted to be equipped with key-operated locking devices from the egress side provided:
 - 2.1. The locking device is readily distinguishable as locked,
 - 2.2. A readily visible durable sign is posted on the egress side on or adjacent to the door stating: THIS DOOR TO REMAIN UNLOCKED WHEN BUILDING IS OCCUPIED. The sign shall be in letters 1 inch (25 mm) high on a contrasting background.
 - 2.3. The use of the key-operated locking device is revokable by the building official for due cause.
3. Where egress doors are used in pairs, approved automatic flush bolts shall be permitted to be used, provided that the door leaf having the automatic flush bolts has no doorknob or surface-mounted hardware.
4. Doors from individual dwelling or sleeping units of Group R occupancies having an occupant load of 10 or less are permitted to be equipped with a night latch, dead bolt or security chain, provided such devices are openable from the inside without the use of a key or tool.
5. Fire rated doors after the minimum elevated temperature has disabled the unlatching mechanism in accordance with listed fire door test procedures.

Committee Reason: The proposed language would codify application for doors currently used. A concern was expressed if the listing information would be sufficient to regulate this type of mechanism. The modification to the new item five is for consistency with the terminology for fire doors.

Assembly Action: **None**

E48-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved in favor of G83-06/07. Additional redundancy is needed for occupant safety in order to warrant the locking of the doors, not just keys. "All staff" could be extended from the janitor to the head nurse.

Assembly Action: **None**

E49-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This amendment takes the delayed egress lock systems that have been around for a number of years and have had no documented history of problems and copied over stairway re-entry requirements. Documentation was not provided to indicate a need for this type of release for delayed egress locks.

Assembly Action: None

E50-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The intent of the current language is for 15 lbs. or less to open the door. The proposal would not only revise the force requirements to 15 lbs. or greater, but does not specify any maximum.

Assembly Action: None

E51-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved in favor of G83-06/07. The provisions are scoped to just an I-2 occupancy. There may be other occupancies where this should be permitted.

Assembly Action: None

E52-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1008.1.8.7 Electromagnetically Locked Egress Doors. Doors in the means of egress that are not otherwise required to have panic hardware in buildings with an occupancy in Group A, B, E, M, R-1 or R-2 and doors to tenant spaces in Group A, B, E, M, R-1 or R-2 shall be permitted to be electromagnetically locked if equipped with listed hardware that incorporates a built-in switch, and meet ~~that meets~~ the requirements below:

1. The listed hardware affixed to the door leaf has an obvious method of operation that is readily operated under all lighting conditions.
2. The listed hardware is capable of being operated with one hand.
3. Operation of the listed hardware releases ~~interrupts power supply~~ to the electromagnetic lock and unlocks the door immediately.
4. Loss of power to the listed hardware automatically unlocks the door.

Committee Reason: The proposal resolves a huge misunderstanding in the code that all door locks are required to be mechanical. The modification to the base paragraph is to clarify that these locks will not conflict with panic hardware requirements. The modification to Item 2 clarifies that this type of lock is not a delayed egress lock or access control lock addressed elsewhere in the locking requirements.

Assembly Action: None

E53-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Approval of this proposal would result in a security issue for many building managers.

Assembly Action: None

E54-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Panic hardware should not be required along the entire route of means of egress for educational facilities. Other doors may not be used the same and/or occupants may disperse once they leave the assembly areas to use different exit doors. As written the proposal could result in a significant increase in the number of doors supplied with panic hardware in locations where it may not be necessary.

Assembly Action: None

E55-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: While a scoping section is needed for this section, the proposed language does not clarify if the stairway provisions should be applicable to all stairways, stairways that are part of the means of egress, or just stairways required to serve as part of the means of egress.

Assembly Action: None

E56-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Section 1009.1 is talking about stairway width and should stay limited to that item rather than expanding into projections. It is unclear how this proposal will effect landing sizes as required in Section 1009.4.

Assembly Action: None

E57-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: While the proposal would clarify that Accessible and Type A units should meet 7/11 stairway provisions, Type B units should not have to comply with the 7/11 stairway provisions. A concern was if Type A and Type B unit stairways were covered by the stairway provisions in ICC A117.1.

Assembly Action: None

E58-06/07

PART I — IBC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The term 'leading edge' is not confusing, therefore there is no need to replace it with the term 'nosing.' Technical justification was not provided for the need to revise the profile measurements.

Assembly Action: None

PART II — IRC

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This new language includes the newly defined term "nosing". Having a nosing on a stair tread is important to the safety of a stair, especially with an eleven inch tread application.

Assembly Action: None

E59-06/07

PART I — IBC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is a good start in the right direction for a consistent way to measure stairways. A concern is where exactly the walk line will be measured. As the proposal is currently written, it is not possible to measure to the guard until the guard is installed. The term 'guard in-fill' is too open for interpretation. In the last sentence of proposed 1009.4, the term 'minimum' that is proposed to be deleted is more understandable than the proposed term 'usable'.

Assembly Action: None

PART II — IRC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The words "usable" and "walkline" are undefined terms. If this proposed language was approved the IRC would become more restrictive than the IBC. In addition, a monumental type stair would be required to have multiple hand rails.

Assembly Action: None

E60-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This requirement is overly broad to be required at all stairways. A stripe on every step would be confusing for a user when moving down the stair. There is no measurement for contrast, therefore this requirement would be unenforceable. Substantiation was not provided for the limit for a 2 inch stripe. This would increase the cost of construction.

Assembly Action: None

E61-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed language does not clarify when openings are permitted in stairways.

Assembly Action: None

E62-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There was no justification for this change. The current code is clear for spiral stairways and alternating tread stairways.

Assembly Action: None

E63-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Areas that are not open to the public in F, H and S occupancies should not be required to have solid risers on stairway.

Assembly Action: None

E64-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proponent has provided clarifying language for adequate stairway landings when dealing with both doors opening onto landing and when wheelchair spaces are located on the landing.

Assembly Action: None

E65-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1009.5.1 Stairway walking surface. The walking surface of treads and landings of a stairway shall not be sloped steeper than one unit vertical in 48 units horizontal (2-percent slope) in any direction. Stairway treads and landings shall have a solid surface. Finish floor surfaces shall be securely attached.

Exceptions:

1. Openings in stair walking surfaces shall be a size that does not permit the passage of ½ inch (13 mm) diameter sphere. Elongated opening shall be placed so that the long dimension is perpendicular to the dominant direction of travel.
2. In Group F, H and S occupancies, other than areas of parking structures accessible to the public, openings in treads and landings shall not be prohibited provided a sphere with a diameter of 1.125 inches (29 mm) cannot pass through the opening.

Committee Reason: The allowances for grill or grate type stairways, especially in outdoor areas in climates subject to snow accumulation, is necessary for a safe means of egress. A modification was made to delete the word 'dominant' in Exception 1 because the word was redundant.

Assembly Action: **None**

E66-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: 'Slip resistance' is not measurable. A concern would be how to measure this on stairways with multiple materials on the treads. The term more commonly used is 'exterior' versus 'outdoor'.

Assembly Action: **None**

E67-06/07

PART I — IBC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed language clarifies where to measure the width of a spiral stairway.

Assembly Action:

PART II — IRC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The new language for spiral stairways helps to add clarity to this code section and it helps to keep the area at and below the guardrail clear.

Assembly Action: **None**

E68-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Section 505.5 specifically states that equipment platforms are not required to have means of egress stairways, therefore this proposal could be interpreted as conflicting with that section.

Assembly Action: **None**

E69-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal clarifies handrail requirements in aisles serving seating areas. Perhaps a public comment could be brought forward to clean up "not required where permitted" and put the exceptions in better code language.

Assembly Action: **None**

E70-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal would coordinate the IBC and IRC requirements for stairways in Group R-2 and R-3 with three of fewer risers. The hazard does not increase for this situation between single family homes and within a townhouse or apartment.

Assembly Action: **None**

E71-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The definition of occupied space already covers this concern, therefore, stair access to a roof with elevator equipment is not required.

Assembly Action: **None**

E72-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There was no technical justification for such a large jump in lighting requirements in stairways. The language is unenforceable. The term 'occupancy sensing' is unclear. This will be a substantial cost increase for buildings.

Assembly Action: **None**

E73-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The description of how standards are referenced in the code is addressed in Section 102.4. This action would be consistent with E81-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

E74-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

1010.5.1Width. The minimum width of a means of egress ramp shall not be less than that required for corridors by Section 1017.2. The clear width of a ramp between handrails, if provided, or other permissible projections shall be 36 inches (914 mm) minimum.

Committee Reason: The proposal will clarify that the clear width for an ramp is all the way down from the handrails to the ground. The term "if provided" was added back in as a modification to allow for ramps with a rise of less than 6 inches not having handrails.

Assembly Action: **None**

E75-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed language clarifies that the ramps in Accessible, Type A and Type B units cannot use the exceptions.

Assembly Action: None

E76-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed language for 'wet' conditions is too vague and open to opinion. A question would be if just the possibility of tracking water into an area would constitute a wet condition.

Assembly Action: None

E77-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed text clarifies the code and reduces a potential tripping hazard along access to the seats.

Assembly Action: None

E78-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed 2 inch minimum high curb would conflict with the requirements in ICC A117.1 and the new ADA/ABA Accessibility Guidelines which require a 4 inch minimum high curb.

Assembly Action: None

E79-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Walls and rails are types of barrier. While the current language may be considered redundant, it does provide additional guidance and does not conflict with ICC A117.1.

Assembly Action: None

E80-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The inclusion for all occupancies and all exit access doors in the proposal is over burdensome. Technical date must be provided to show the effectiveness of this type of egress lighting. There would be significant costs to install this system throughout.

Concerns were expressed about a maintenance schedule, the level of illumination or color, and if a photo luminescent product would be considered equivalent.

Assembly Action: None

E81-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The description of how standards are referenced in the code is addressed in Section 102.4. This action would be consistent with E73-06/07.

Assembly Action: None

E82-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: UL 924 is an appropriate standard for illumination of exit signage. The standard has been revised to meet ICC criteria.

Assembly Action: None

E83-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Indicating the three types of exit signage permitted is a good clarification for the code, UL 924 is an appropriate standard for illumination of exit signage. The standard has been revised to meet ICC criteria.

Assembly Action: None

E84-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee agreed the intent for egress guidance had merit, but believed that there were other products that could address the exiting issues raised. Several proponents had similar proposals. The committee asked the proponents to work together to resolve issues brought up during the discussions. The proposal should be technology neutral - not just for photoluminescent materials. The markings should delineate the exit path in the enclosed exit stairway. An additional concern about E84-06/07 was that there was no explanation of the limitation to Groups B, E, M and R-1. Of special concern was no inclusion of Groups A and I. This proposal also extended the requirements outside the exit stairway by the wording in proposed Section 1011.6.

Assembly Action: None

E85-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The provisions are too broad in scope. These markings would be required in any size Group B. It is unclear how markings would be revised and maintained in a large Group A occupancy with multiple uses or functions. The room that the code change hearings were being heard was used as an example of this type of use.

Assembly Action: **None**

E86-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: It is reasonable on alternating tread devices to allow for a lower handrail for safety reasons.

Assembly Action: **None**

E87-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The in depth study that was performed has proven that these Type II handrails should be allowed. The technical criteria in Type II handrails provide the 'equivalent graspability' previously permitted in the code. A concern was expressed about a potential conflict with ICC A117.1 and new ADA/ABA Accessibility Guideline requirements for no tight grasping, twisting and pinching. While the study did include a range of ages, it is not clear if any of the study participants were persons with disabilities.

Assembly Action: **Disapproved**

E88-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal is limited to handrails along stairways within individual dwelling units in Group R-2 and R-3. Approval will allow for coordination with the IRC. The studies have proved that these handrails proposed as Type II would result in handrails which provide equivalent graspability to what is currently permitted in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

E89-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

1012.4 Continuity. Handrail-gripping surfaces shall be continuous, without interruption by newel posts or other obstructions.

Exceptions:

1. Handrails within dwelling units are permitted to be interrupted by a newel post at a turn or stair landing.
2. Within a dwelling unit, the use of a volute, turnout starting easing or starting newel is allowed over the lowest tread.
3. Handrail brackets or balusters attached to the bottom surface of the handrail that do not project horizontally beyond the

sides of the handrail within 1.5 inches (38 mm) of the bottom of the handrail shall not be considered obstructions. For each 0.5 inch (12.7 mm) of additional handrail perimeter dimension above 4 inches (102 mm), the vertical clearance dimension of 1.5 inches (38 mm) shall be permitted to be reduced by 0.125 inch (3 mm).

Committee Reason: The proposal will provide clarification for different stair configurations. The modification would allow for landings at L or U shaped stairways to have newel posts at the corners.

Assembly Action: **None**

E90-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Handrails located along areas other than ramps and stairways are used differently. The new exception is useful for rails that serve as walking aids along hallways. The change would also coordinate with ICC A117.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

E91-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal addresses a safety hazard commonly found in the field. This proposal will also coordinate with ICC A117.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

E92-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The straight extension of the handrail into the landing at the top or bottom of the stairway could be an egress hazard. There should be an exception for these extensions where handrails are continuous and in Group A aisle situations. In the exception, while the Accessible and Type A units should be excluded, Type B units should be permitted to use the exception.

Assembly Action: **None**

E93-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The unique configuration of alternating tread devices makes an exception for the handrail extensions reasonable.

Assembly Action: **None**

E94-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The redundancy is needed to clarify the minimum clear width is needed for accessible routes along ramps.

Assembly Action: **None**

E95-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Double handrails are needed to allow for two way travel on a stairway. This proposal would eliminate that design option.

Assembly Action: None

E96-06/07

PART I — IBC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Repeatedly throughout the testimony the phrase “work in progress” was used. This is a work in progress and is not ready to go into the code. Measuring a guard height from a seat board is too restrictive. At what point would you stop with items adjacent to guards (e.g. storage boxes, planters, moveable furniture). There may be some legal implications with this requirement that would not be consistent with the intent of the CTC. Section 1013.2 Exceptions 1 and 2 are redundant. There is a double negative in Section 1013.2, Exception 2.

Assembly Action: None

PART II — IRC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed language would increase the scope of this section to include any walking surface greater than 30 inches above the floor or grade. This was would be over restrictive and would also cause an issue with seat boards.

Assembly Action: None

E97-06/07

PART I — IBC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal is a good idea and is needed for sloped sites. However, the measurement is confusing. This should be incorporated in the guard recommendations from CTC.

Assembly Action: None

PART II — IRC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The new proposed language reference to “the deepest point” is confusing. This could cause even more issues with drainage areas.

Assembly Action: None

E98-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: In one of the legacy codes “seatboard” was the top row of a bleacher, not a bench. In the current text, this is not clear, so this is an issue that needs to be addressed. However, deletion of the term with only a reference to the ICC 300 standard would not address the similar safety issue found in other tiered seating arrangements.

Assembly Action: None

E99-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The locations of where alternating tread devices are permitted is limited, therefore a lower guard height is appropriate.

Assembly Action: None

E100-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The locations of where alternating tread devices are permitted is limited, therefore a large guard opening is appropriate. This would be consistent with the committee action on E99-06/07.

Assembly Action: None

E101-06/07

PART I — IBC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This issue should be deferred to the Code Technologies Committee for a comprehensive submittal along with E102-06/07.

Assembly Action: None

PART II — IRC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposed change to limit the straight non-flexible elements greater than 4 inches in length in guards that are within 45 degrees of horizontal is too restrictive.

Assembly Action: None

E102-06/07

PART I — IBC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This issue should be deferred to the Code Technologies Committee for a comprehensive submittal along with E101-06/07.

Assembly Action: None

PART II — IRC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Not enough research has been conducted and insufficient technical data has been cited to support this proposed change.

Assembly Action: **None**

E103-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal as written would prohibit the use of the storage area by requiring a continuous wall.

Assembly Action: **None**

E104-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal will provide consistency in the code for the use of the term 'exit access'.

Assembly Action: **None**

E105-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal provides a logical order for the separation of different types of suites found in hospitals and will help clarify requirements for means of egress.

Assembly Action: **None**

E106-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal addresses a common question regarding separation of areas within hospitals. This is a good clarification.

Assembly Action: **None**

E107-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal does not increase the overall travel distance, but increases the common path of travel only. The trade off is appropriate for a NFPA 13R system. The trade off will provide incentive for providing sprinkler systems and will provide adequate protection for the areas addressed in this change as far as the common path of travel. The proposals for E107 and E108 are the same.

Assembly Action: **None**

E108-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal does not increase the overall travel distance, but increases the common path of travel only. The trade off is appropriate for a NFPA 13R system. The trade off will provide incentive for providing sprinkler systems and will provide adequate protection for the areas addressed in this change as far as the common path of travel. The proposals for E107 and E108 are the same.

Assembly Action: **None**

E109-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no common path of travel requirements in single exit spaces. The change is not needed.

Assembly Action: **None**

E110-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal provides necessary direction for the different requirements for the width of aisles and aisle accessways.

Assembly Action: **None**

E111-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

aisle. An unenclosed exit access component that defines and provides a path of egress travel ~~to a corridor or to an exit.~~

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposal will provide a more easily understood format for the requirements for aisles and egress balconies.

A modification was made to the definition for 'aisles' to delete the words "to a corridor or to and exit." Since an aisle could extend to an exit access door or intervening room the text would be too restrictive. In addition, requirements should not be in a definition.

Assembly Action: **None**

E112-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: A requirement to measure exit access travel distance should be in Section 1016. This proposal was disapproved based on the committee actions in E122-06/07 and E123-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

E113-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

1019.1 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, except as modified in Section 1015.1 or 1019.2. 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.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposal will address floors with smaller occupant loads than the level above or below, separating exits from spaces and exits from stories. The language will also clear up a reference circle.

The modification was to leave in the term 'approved independent' in Section 1019.1. This is important text to remain for the means of egress system.

Assembly Action: **None**

E114-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Errata: Table 1015.1, note c should be underlined as proposed new text.

Committee Reason: The proposal is a significant change by deleting the idea of common path of travel in the code. Common path of travel is used along a path, not always just in a room. It is needed in large spaces. The term 'travel distance' in the proposal could be confused with general travel distance requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

E115-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

1015.1 Exit or exit access doorways required. Two exits or exit access doorways from any space shall be provided where one of the following conditions exists:

1. The occupant load of the space exceeds the values in Table 1015.1.

Exception: 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 ~~46~~ 20 where the dwelling unit is equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2.

2. The common path of egress travel exceeds the limitations of Section 1014.3.
3. Where required by Sections 1015.3, 1015.4 and 1015.5.

Exception: Group I-2 occupancies shall comply with Section 1014.2.2.

1019.1 Minimum number of exits. All rooms and spaces within each story shall be provided with and have access to the minimum number of approved independent exits required by Table 1019.1 based on the occupant load of the story, except as modified in Section 1015.1 or 1019.2. 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, basement or individual space shall be maintained until arrival at grade or the public way.

Exception: 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 ~~46~~ 20 where the dwelling unit is equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2.

Committee Reason: This proposal specifically addressed allowances for a single exit access door from an individual dwelling unit. This is a common problem resulting from dwelling units getting larger without an increase in actual occupant load. A concern was expressed on how this propose would affect Group R-2 dormitories or congregate residences.

A modification was made to also allow a NFPA 13R systems, commonly used in Group R occupancies, for this allowance for one means of egress.

A second modification was made to increase the occupant load to 20 so that this provision would cover a dwelling unit up to 4,000 square feet in area. A concern was expressed about this number possibly leading to confusion with 16 occupants being used to determine congregate residences that could use Group R-3 requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

E116-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved in favor of the committee action on E115-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

E117-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved in favor of the committee action on E115-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

E118-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved in favor of E115-06/07. This proposal would include congregate residences in spaces with one means of egress. Most of the testimony given on this issue was for problems with larger single family dwelling units.

Assembly Action: **None**

E119-06/07

Errata: Two values in the table were incorrect. The Maximum Occupant Load for A, B, E, M, F and U should be 49. The Maximum Occupant Load for Group S should be 29. These values were not part of the proposed revisions.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: In Group R-3, a congregate residence is limited to 16. A choice of 15 occupants as stated in the proposal, or as discussed as a possible modification to coordinate with E115-06/07, 20 occupants would be confusing. Testimony included information that jurisdictions are deleting the Group R sprinkler requirements, therefore, a concern was that the table does not have a tie to allowing these increased occupant loads only with sprinkler systems.

Assembly Action: **None**

E120-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The current text is clear that it is the building or the area served that you are looking at and that is how you determine the remoteness requirements. If you have a strip mall and you have a single tenant space, that is the area served and you need to provide the remoteness of the exit access doorways for that area. The idea of 'building' is important when dealing with a structure separated by fire walls.

Assembly Action: **None**

E121-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language is confusing. The term 'interlocked similar to' is unclear. It is not clear if a single or double wall between stairs should be required to maintain appropriate continuity of the exits.

Assembly Action: **None**

E122-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

1016.1 Travel distance limitations. Exits shall be so located on each story such that the maximum length of exit access travel, measured from the most remote point within a story to the entrance to an exit along the natural and unobstructed path of egress travel, shall not exceed the distances given in Table 1016.1.

Where the path of exit access includes unenclosed stairways or ramps within the exit access the distance of travel on such means of egress components shall also be included in the travel distance measurement. The measurement along stairways shall be made on a plane parallel and tangent to the stair tread nosings in the center of the stairway.

Exceptions:

1. Travel distance in open parking garages is permitted to be measured to the closest riser of open stairs.
2. In outdoor facilities with open exit access components and open exterior stairs or ramps, travel distance is permitted to be measured to the closest riser of a stair or the closest slope of the ramp.

3. In other than occupancy Groups H and I, the exit access travel distance to a maximum of 50 percent of the exits is permitted to be measured from the most remote point within a building to an exit ~~discharge~~ using unenclosed stairways or ramps when connecting a maximum of 2 stories. The two connected stories shall be provided with at least two means of egress. Such interconnected stories shall not be open to other stories. The measurement along stairways shall be made on a plane parallel and tangent to the stair tread nosings in the center of the stairway.
4. In other than occupancy Groups H and I, exit access travel distance is permitted to be measured from the most remote point within a building to an exit ~~discharge~~ using unenclosed stairways or ramps in the first and second stories in buildings equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1. The first and second stories shall be provided with at least two means of egress. Such interconnected stories shall not be open to other stories. The measurement along stairways shall be made on a plane parallel and tangent to the stair tread nosings in the center of the stairway.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposal moves exit access requirements out of the current exit requirements in Section 1020.1 and into the correct location, Section 1016.1. This clarifies the limits for the open stairways that are part of the means of egress and their use in the building. The modification deleted the term 'discharge' from Section 1016.1 in Exceptions 3 and 4. Travel down the open exit access stairways could lead to an enclosed exit stairway, and not always directly to the door to the outside (i.e. exit discharge).

Assembly Action: **None**

E123-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved in favor of the alternative proposed in E122-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

E124-06/07

Withdrawn by Proponent

E125-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee had several concerns with the requirements in the proposal. Is analysis always needed? Would code officials have the knowledge needed to adequately review and confirm the computer analysis? Will egress modelling be effective? Would it be used in a big box mercantile? This may be more appropriate as an alternative method. It is not clear that this replaces the smoke and heat vents required in Section 1016.2. As currently worded, smoke and heat vents would still be required.

Assembly Action: **None**

E126-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The existing definition of corridor in Chapter 10 is sufficient.

Assembly Action: **None**

E127-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Justification was not provided to substantiate the need for this substantial change for corridor rating for all the uses listed. A modification was offered concentrating on Groups I-2 and I-4. Hospitals have good fire records and Group I-2 have requirements or smoke barriers in Section 407.3. NFPA was cited as requiring a 1/2 hour rated corridor in hospitals, however, NFPA only has this requirement for non-sprinklered hospitals.

Assembly Action: None

E128-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Proper justification was not provided for this substantial change for all the occupancies listed. If the concern is mostly for residential occupancies, as expressed in the testimony, the change should only address corridors in that occupancy. The substantiation stated that corridors are structural - that is not typically the case. There is an incorrect reference in the reason to NFPA insinuating that they require 1 hour rated corridors in sprinklered building.

Assembly Action: None

E129-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Justification for rating the corridors in Group E was not provided. At this time there is no loss data in Group E occupancies. In addition, there are mandatory drills on a regular basis. This proposal would require rated corridors even in schools with doors directly to the outside from each classroom. The proposal would prohibit open plan design.

Assembly Action: None

E130-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that a 50 foot dead end corridor would allow for safe egress and increase design options. It was noted that a NFPA 13 system was required for this increase even for Group R occupancies.

Assembly Action: None

E131-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved in favor of the language in E130-06/07.

Assembly Action: None

E132-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There was no justification for the increase for the fire resistance to all corridors. There was no indication of what the hazard would be for going through the elevator lobby. This proposal would conflict with Section 707.14 that allows options to not provide separated lobbies.

Assembly Action: None

E133-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There was no indication of a hazard associated with the elevator lobby. The building code already allows the elevator lobby to be used as an area of refuge. The proposal would prohibit stairways egressing off the lobby.

Assembly Action: None

E134-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The alternating tread device provides the same level of safety as the a ladder, which is already permitted by the code as a second exit from helistops.

Assembly Action: None

E135-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is an exit access issue, not an exit issue, therefore this proposed text is in the wrong section. The term "immediate" is not achievable. The proponent requested disapproval in order to address issues brought up during the testimony.

Assembly Action: None

E136-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

**TABLE 1019.2
STORIES WITH ONE EXIT**

(No change to content of table)

- For the required number of exits for parking structures, see Section 1019.1.1.
- For the required number of exits for air traffic control towers, see Section 412.1.
- ~~Emergency escape and rescue openings as provided in accordance with Section 1026.~~ Buildings classified as Group R-2 equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2 and provided with emergency escape and rescue openings in accordance with Section 1026.

- d. Group B, F and S occupancies in buildings equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 shall have a maximum travel distance of 100 feet.
- e. Day care occupancies shall have a maximum occupant load of 10.

~~1019.3 Egress from multi-story dwelling units. Only one exit is required from individual multi-story dwelling units located in buildings of any height provided the dwelling unit meets all of the following requirements:~~

- ~~1. The individual dwelling unit occupies not more than three stories; and~~
- ~~2. The exit from the dwelling unit is located at the level of exit discharge or is located to provide immediate access to not less than two approved independent exits from the story; and~~
- ~~3. The dwelling unit complies with Section 1015.1 as a space with one means of egress.~~

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies the intent of the code. The charging statement in 1019.1 states that every story has two exits. The proposal carries on with that and references stories again versus the entire building. The proposal will allow for small 2nd floors or basements that meet the travel distance over a much larger 1st floor to have single exits. Note c from the original text will be maintained. It is necessary to provide information that for a single exit to be permitted, both a sprinkler system and emergency escape window are necessary for adequate safety. A modification was offered by the proponent for the deletion of proposed section 1019.3 since it was already addressed by committee action on E115-06/07 and E135-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

E137-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal, by eliminating the option of horizontal transfers in the exit enclosure, places severe limitations on building design. Horizontal movement may be necessary for adequate dispersion of exits in buildings with setbacks or to move around equipment floors. The proposed text uses the term 'corridor' instead of 'exit passageway'. The NIST report did mention delays at transfer floors, but most evacuation drills had not include actual travel down the stairways. This concern could have been partially addressed by fire drills/training.

Assembly Action: **None**

E138-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal will promote consistency between the floor rating requirements and the vertical enclosure ratings. A concern was expressed regarding the lack or substantiation for this change.

Assembly Action: **None**

E139-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the reason was given as coordination with ICC A117.1 and floor number signs are not required by ICC A117.1. The IBC should not reference specific sections of the ICC A117.1 standard.

Assembly Action: **None**

E140-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal adds necessary clarification and standardization to the code regarding stairway floor signage requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

E141-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Stairway identification signage technology should not be limited to photo luminescence.

Assembly Action: **None**

E142-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The occurrences of emergency power failures does not justify this additional requirement. The technology should not be limited to photo luminescence. A reference to the UL 1994 standard, instead of ASTM E2072, would allow other options.

Assembly Action: **None**

E143-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal did not specify where these markings should be applied. Most highrise buildings pressurize stairs, so with no smokeproof enclosure, there would be no requirements. Since the intent of this was for highrise buildings, the intent of the proposal is not met. The product provided for this evacuation assistance must be tied to the evacuation time for the building. Photo luminescence may not provide lighting for a sufficient time.

Assembly Action: **None**

E144-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While the committee agreed with the concept, the proposal was disapproved because the language was confusing as to application and purpose.

Assembly Action: **None**

E145-06/07

Errata: The paragraph following Section 1022.4, Exception 3 should have been underlined as new proposed text.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The concept of not returning through the compartment is very important for horizontal exits. Without this language the argument could be made that someone would have to move back through the same compartment to exit the building and that would be detrimental to safety.

Assembly Action: None

E146-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent has identified a missing item in the code that needs to be addressed, however, the reference to Section 716 jumps over limitations in fire walls and fire barriers. This language would better located in Chapter 7.

Assembly Action: None

E147-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: While the committee agreed that ramps should be permitted as part of the means of egress from Group I-2 facilities at some level, with the current deletion, the second sentence of the section would then allow a Group I-2 to have an exit ramp of any height.

Assembly Action: None

E148-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There are several fundamental problems with the proposal as written. It proposes exceptions for exit width, but does not say how much. It does not reference anything about exit numbers or locations. There is a reference to a life safety evaluation using an Assembly occupancy chapter, which does not relate to others uses. The requirement for protecting the shaft from the sprinkler system is unclear. The wording is not sufficient to be put in the code at this time.

Assembly Action: None

E149-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal to move the exceptions from exit discharge to exits does not improve the code. The current location is clear.

Assembly Action: None

E150-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies that horizontal exits can exit into another building rather than directly to the exterior.

Assembly Action: None

E151-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal does not provide technical justification for the requirements. There are undefined terms that could cause interpretation problems (e.g. shielding).

Assembly Action: None

E152-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal provides equivalent levels of egress safety for educational occupancies that may have assembly areas (e.g. cafeterias, libraries).

Assembly Action: None

E153-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The language should not be deleted. A separation is required for waiting areas in order to keep them from creeping into the path for means of egress.

Assembly Action: None

E154-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: These lobby spaces need to be defined so that they do not adversely impact the means of egress. The proposed language would remove that definition.

Assembly Action: None

E155-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: While the committee agreed with the intent of the proposal, there can be a great diversity in what might be considered a press box. A definition for press boxes is needed in order to define where this special means of egress would be permitted. It should be clarified if the occupant load would be determined for each room in a press box or the whole level. Press boxes are addressed in IBC 903, 1025 and 1104.

Assembly Action: None

E156-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There was not any technical justification provided for the change. There is a difference between assembly seating covered in the IBC and bleacher seating covered by ICC 300.

Assembly Action: None

E157-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposals was disapproved because it will allow unlimited length dead end aisles.

Assembly Action: None

E158-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Seats with folding tablets are a common condition that occurs in many higher education lecture halls. The proposal provides specific criteria to maintain the aisle accessways where tablets are used.

Assembly Action: None

E159-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The exception would result in a potential tripping hazard with potential non-uniformity in treads. The proposal would also limit design options when the seating row spacing is more than 36 inches.

Assembly Action: None

E160-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal will coordinate with the ICC 300 and should be addressed in that standard.

Assembly Action: None

E161-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this change in favor of the more specific reference proposed in E160-06/07.

Assembly Action: None

E162-06/07

PART I — IBC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponents mentioned a new ASTM standard being developed to address emergency escape ladders. This standard, when completed should be brought forward as part of this proposal. The charging text is for all windows, not just bedroom windows. Group R under the IBC is required to be sprinklered throughout. This was not taken into consideration with the fire death statistics stated in the supporting reason.

Assembly Action: None

PART II — IRC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There currently is no recognized standard that addresses emergency escape ladders. The language does not address the length of the ladder and how close to the ground the ladder must terminate. There was some concern voiced over the attractive nuisance such a device may create.

Assembly Action: None

E163-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because although the development of the 2006 edition is complete, the standard is not yet printed and generally available.

Assembly Action: None

E164-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The latest editions of BMHA A156.10 and NFPA 101 were approved for inclusion in the referenced standards.

Assembly Action: None

E165-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal language will help small business employee areas. This is also consistent with the new ADA/ABA Accessibility Guidelines for employee work areas. The language for court rooms is addressed in E183-06/07.

Assembly Action: None

E166-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language is inappropriately located in the general exception section. Businesses, which would include sales offices, are already covered adequately in the main part of the chapter. Parking and permanent bathrooms may not be provided during construction. The proposed language indicates that they would be required.

Assembly Action: **None**

E167-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Home occupations is a vague term that is not defined. A concern would be when a home office could be interpreted as requiring accessibility. The proposal refers to a definition in a local zoning ordinance which may not exist within the jurisdiction. This proposal also requires accessible bathrooms. Chapter 11 historically has required accessible bathrooms only when bathrooms are provided. If the live-work situation truly contains a business or mercantile occupancy, the provisions are already addressed in Chapter 11. Perhaps this proposal should be coordinated with the live-work proposal from G92-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

E168-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal will coordinate with the technical requirements for fuel dispensing devices in ICC A117.1-2003. Specific sections of a standard should not be referenced in the building code.

Assembly Action: **None**

E169-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal clarifies the limits of the exception in Section 1104.3. The proposed language in Section 1108.2.4 coordinates the location of the designated aisle seats with the new ADA/ABA Accessibility Guidelines.

Assembly Action: **None**

E170-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

1104.4 Multilevel buildings and facilities. At least one accessible route shall connect each accessible level, including mezzanines, in multilevel buildings and facilities.

Exceptions:

1. An accessible route is not required to stories and mezzanines above and below accessible levels that have an aggregate area of not more than 3,000 square feet (278.7 m²). This exception shall not apply to:
 - 1.1. Multiple tenant facilities of Group M occupancies containing five or more tenant spaces;
 - 1.2. Levels containing offices of health care providers (Group B or I); or 1.3. Passenger transportation facilities and airports (Group A-3 or B).
2. Levels that do not contain accessible elements or other spaces required by Section 1107 or 1108 are not required to be served by an accessible route from an accessible level.
3. In air traffic control towers, an accessible route is not required to serve the cab and the floor immediately below the cab.
4. Where a two-story building or facility has one story with an occupant load of five or fewer persons that does not contain public use space, that story shall not be required to be connected by an accessible route to the story above or below.
5. ~~The Vertical portion of the accessible route~~ access to elevated employee work stations within a courtroom is not required at the time of initial construction, provided a ramp, lift or elevator complying with ICC A117.1 can be installed without requiring reconfiguration or extension of the courtroom or extension of the electrical system.

Committee Reason: The IBC should include provisions for accessibility into courtrooms that are consistent with the new ADA/ABA Accessibility Guidelines. The modification to Exception 5 would be more consistent with the terminology found in the Guidelines. The proposed language in Exception 5 regarding the route has implications that are not appropriate for this section.

Assembly Action: **None**

E171-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There was no justification provided for the numbers in the proposed exception. These numbers are not used anywhere else in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

E172-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Tying the number of accessible parking spaces to the Accessible and Type A units may be too restrictive when parking is limited.

Assembly Action: **None**

E173-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies that the numbers for parking spaces are not absolutes, but minimums. Clarifies the extent of the parking for rehabilitation facilities and is consistent with the new ADA/ABA Accessibility Guidelines.

Assembly Action: **None**

E174-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal for valet parking at mechanical parking garages makes sense for the user and is consistent with the new ADA/ABA Guidelines.

Assembly Action: None

E175-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The Universal Design Unit technical criteria should be in ICC A117.1 before the IBC would scope this type of unit. The Universal Design Unit technical criteria should be reviewed by Housing and Urban Development in order to maintain 'safe harbor' for the codes. An additional type of unit would add confusion.

Assembly Action: None

E176-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify table heading as follows:

TABLE 1107.6.1.1
ACCESSIBLE DWELLING AND SLEEPING UNITS

TOTAL NUMBER OF UNITS PROVIDED	MINIMUM REQUIRED NUMBER OF ACCESSIBLE UNITS WITHOUT ROLL-IN SHOWERS	MINIMUM REQUIRED NUMBER OF ACCESSIBLE UNITS ASSOCIATED WITH ROLL-IN SHOWERS	TOTAL NUMBER OF REQUIRED ACCESSIBLE UNITS

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: Adding the column would clarify that some Accessible Units should be provided with bathtubs or transfer showers to allow consumers increased options. A concern would be if the text in Section 1107.6.1.1 should be revised to clarify the options. This proposal is consistent with the new ADA/ABA Accessibility Guidelines. The title of the third column should be revised for consistency with the other titles.

Assembly Action: None

E177-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: A multi-story exemption would not be consistent with the original intent for Type A Units. The original intent of the Type A Units was to provide a higher level of access for persons with disabilities. This would include access to all floor levels if a designer decided to construct multi-story units within their Group R-2 facility.

Assembly Action: None

E178-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The requirements are already addressed. The proposed language does not improve the code.

Assembly Action: None

E179-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The code is coordinated with the current edition of ICC A117.1 already.

Assembly Action: None

E180-06/07

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The IBC contains broader scoping requirements for dispersion for seating (e.g. levels, boxes). The ICC A117.1 does not contain these same dispersion requirements.

Assembly Action: None

E181-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed language focuses on the surfaces rather than the seating and therefore clarifies the code.

Assembly Action: None

E182-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies that the accessible dining surfaces should be located on levels that have an accessible route to them. Dining areas can have non-accessible mezzanines.

Assembly Action: None

E183-06/07

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1108.4.1.1 **Jury box.** A wheelchair space complying with ICC A117.1 shall be provided within the jury box.

Exception: ~~An~~ Adjacent companion seating is not required.

1108.4.1.4 Employee work stations. The judges' bench, clerks' station, bailiffs' station, deputy clerk's station, and court reporter's station shall be located on an accessible route. The vertical ~~portion of the accessible route~~ access to elevated employee work stations within a courtroom is not required at the time of initial construction, provided a ramp, lift or elevator complying with ICC A117.1 can be installed without requiring reconfiguration or extension of the courtroom or extension of the electrical system.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: This proposal would be consistent with the change made to employee work stations in E165-06/07. The new provisions indicate the level of accessibility required in courtrooms. The modification is for consistency with the modification made to similar language in E170-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

E184-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The requirements are too restrictive and addresses items that are not typically covered within the building code. The term 'paraphernalia shelf' is too vague.

Assembly Action: **None**

E185-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The change in the language from 'Unisex' to 'Family or assisted use' will clarify the intent of these bathrooms (required in large mercantile and assembly facilities) is to serve anyone that needs assistance and is traveling with an opposite sex attendant. It is recommended that there should be a public comment to address the travel distance concerns between the 500' travel distance in Section 1109.2.1.5 and the 'same area' language in Section 3409.8.9.

Assembly Action: **None**

E186-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed exceptions are not required. The employee work area sinks would already be exempted under Section 1103.2.3 *Employee work areas*.

Assembly Action: **None**

E187-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal deletes redundant language in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

E188-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed language would clarify that accessible tables and counters should be located in areas with an accessible route. This would be consistent with E182-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

E189-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Deletion of this requirement would not be consistent with the language in current ADAAG. The interpretation provided in the Access Board's Regulatory Assessment is not clear for all areas. The proposed language in E190-06/07 is preferable.

Assembly Action: **None**

E190-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The addition of Type A units into the list for accessible windows would be consistent with ICC A117.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

E191-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal is an attempt to regulate furniture and would be virtually impossible to enforce.

Assembly Action: **None**
