

ERRATA #1 – Posted April 23, 2008

Replace PP603.5-2, #80 as shown on pages 64 to 66 of the Ballot Comments from January 2008 Meeting in the Agenda Book for the April 2008 Meeting, dated April 2008, with the following:

PP603.5-2

#80

603.5

Proponent: Curt Wiehle, Minnesota Building Codes and Standards, representing Minnesota Building Code Standards

Add new text as follows:

603.5 Diaper Changing Tables. At least one diaper changing table shall comply with Section 902. Folding tables shall be permitted to have the latching mechanism located 54 inches (1370 mm) maximum above the floor provided a clear floor space complying with Section 305 is positioned for a parallel approach to the changing table when in the folded position.

Reason: It is appropriate to provide accessibility criteria for diaper changing tables. Due to the folding nature of most tables and considering the mounting height required to comply with Section 902, latching mechanisms may unavoidably be beyond the established reach range. It is therefore necessary to provide an exception to the reach range height.

July 2006 - Committee action: Disapproved

Committee reason: As currently written the first part of this proposal creates a scoping issue which is more appropriately addressed in a separate document and not within the standard. Committee did not see a reason to allow the higher 54 inch height for the latching mechanism when the general 48 inch reach range should be sufficient. The proposal does not address the need for a clear floor space when the table is folded down into the usable position. The current text only assures the clear floor space when the higher latching height is used and when the table is in the stored position.

Ballot Results:

44 Number eligible to vote
37 Affirmative (Uphold the Committee Recommendation)
2 Negative (Disagree with the Committee Recommendation)
0 Abstain (from Voting)
5 Not Returned

Marsha Mazz, representing U.S. Access Board

Affirmative with comment:

As written, the Standard coordinates with ADA/ABA as revised. The proposal would not coordinate.

John Paul Scott, representing IAAPA

Negative with comment:

The committee could have conducted a proposed modification on this proposal, and fixed it as it did elsewhere. Don't through the baby out with the bath water!

Many baby changing appliances do not come with 48" reach range to controls, but can easily be retrofitted with a nylon strap handle and a self-tapping screw gun.

603.5 Diaper Changing Tables, Counters or Appliances. When provided a minimum of one diaper changing table, counter or appliance per toilet or bathing room shall comply with 603.5. The table's, counter's or appliances top surface or fall protection curb, which ever is higher, shall be 34 inches maximum above the finish floor. A forward approached, clear floor area complying with Section 305, and knee and toe clearance shall be provided complying with Section 306 shall be provided.

Operating parts on diaper changing appliances, and on soap and towel dispensers, or vending machines specifically located for use at the diaper changing area, shall comply with Section 309. Diaper changing appliances shall not be located in the wheelchair accessible toilet compartment.

Hope Reed, representing NMGCD

Negative with comment:

Baby changing tables need to be covered in ANSI just as we cover paper towel & soap dispensers. See new proposal below:

603.5 Diaper Changing Tables. Where provided diaper changing tables shall comply with Section 309 and 902.

Allan Fraser, representing NFPA

Affirmative with comment:

I strenuously object to the "Committee Reason" text. While I'm sure that staff has made a good faith effort to capture committee comments, I believe that what's written is often misleading as to the committee's position both for members and for the general public who will be reading and commenting on them later.

The printed "Committee reasons" are not, in fact, the committee's reasons. They are staff's interpretation of comments made by individual committee members and have not been seen by committee members until now, a full three months after the meeting. The committee can only act or take a position by a vote of the committee. None of the "committee reason" text was voted by the committee and it is therefore inappropriate to portray it as the committee's reasons. The committee reasons should be developed and voted on by the committee at the meeting concurrently with the vote on the proposal. I disagree with staff's interpretation of the "committee reason" on many of the proposals.

January 2008 - Committee action: Approved as modified

Modification: Replace the original proposal with the following proposal.

Proposal as modified and approved:

603.5 Diaper Changing Tables. Diaper changing tables shall comply with Section 309 and 902.

Committee reason: Baby changing tables are work surfaces and need to be covered in ANSI just as we cover paper towel & soap dispensers.

Ballot Results:

44 Number eligible to vote

35 Affirmative (Uphold the Committee Recommendation)

1 Negative (Disagree with the Committee Recommendation)

0 Abstain (from Voting)

8 Not Returned

Allan Fraser, representing NFPA**Negative with comment.**

The purpose of committee members submitting comments with their vote on letter ballots is so that those comments can be re-circulated to all members and then to allow any committee member the opportunity to change their vote(s) prior to a final tally if they are persuaded by another member's arguments. It is not the proper process to make additional changes in text or to modify committee actions. Such further changes by the committee, either initiated by public comment or by the committee itself are to be done after the public review in the second phase of the process. Therefore, virtually all of the actions taken by the committee during the meeting Jan. 28- Feb. 1, 2008 were inappropriate and inconsistent with the A117 ASC procedures and the ANSI essential requirements.

In addition, the limiting of public comments to only the underlined or struckout portions of the draft text inappropriately precludes individuals from commenting on the public proposals that were not accepted since they do not show in the draft. I believe that this violates not only the letter, but the spirit of both the A117 ASC procedures and the ANSI essential requirements for an open consensus process.

The committee voted twice on this proposal with different results. Text resulting from each vote has not been included in the public record nor have the committees vote tallies on both votes been included in the public record. The individual committee member's reasons for negative or abstaining votes have not been included as part of the public record nor have comments attached to affirmative votes.

The public review document was published with text created at the Jan. 28-Feb. 1, 2008 meeting before such changes had been properly balloted. This compromises the process.

The draft on which public comment is being requested is incomplete without providing the public with the information noted above and is flawed by not providing proper public review time after committee balloting.