

CTC Meeting #26
April 8 - 9, 2013
IBC Coordination with ADAAG

The following 2013 Group B changes have been compiled for the above noted CTC Area of Study. Code changes with an (*) indicate CTC sponsored code changes. These changes are intended to serve as the agenda for the CTC in order to establish CTC positions, if any, for the upcoming 2013 Group B Committee Action Hearings.

EB17-13	EB43-13*	RB142-13
EB18-13*	EB50-13	RB177-13*
EB19-13*	EB60-13*	RB178-13
EB20-13*	F171-13*	RB179-13
EB21-13*	F172-13*	SP26-13
EB22-13	F234-13	SP44-13
EB42-13*	RB141-13	

EB17 – 13

705.1, 905.1, 905.4 (NEW), 905.4.1 (NEW), 1005.2 (NEW), 1105 (NEW)

Proponent: Gene Boecker, Code Consultants, Inc., representing self

705.1 General. A *facility* that is altered shall comply with the applicable provisions in Sections 705.1.1 through 705.1.14, and Chapter 11 of the *International Building Code* unless it is *technically infeasible*. Where compliance with this section is *technically infeasible*, the alteration shall provide access to the maximum extent that is technically feasible. A *facility* that is constructed or altered to be accessible shall be maintained accessible during occupancy. A facility shall not be altered such that the existing accessible means of egress is reduced.

Exceptions:

1. The altered element or space is not required to be on an accessible route unless required by Section 705.2.
2. Accessible means of egress required by Chapter 10 of the *International Building Code* are not required to be ~~added~~ provided in existing buildings undergoing less than a level 3 alteration.
3. Type B dwelling or sleeping units required by Section 1107 of the *International Building Code* are not required to be provided in existing *facilities* undergoing less than a Level 3 *alteration*.
4. The alteration to Type A individually owned dwelling units within a Group R-2 occupancy shall meet the provisions for Type B dwelling units.

905.1 General. The means of egress shall comply with the requirements of Section 805 except as specifically required in Sections 905.2 ~~and 905.3~~ through 905.4.

905.4 Accessible means of egress. Not less than one accessible means of egress shall be provided in accordance with Section 905.4.1 and Section 1007 of the International Building Code in alterations affecting an area containing a primary function and in additions.

Exceptions:

1. Level 1 and Level 2 alterations.
2. Historic buildings.
3. Accessible means of egress is not required to exceed 20 percent of the costs of the alterations including any costs associated with compliance for Section 410.7. Where the

costs to provide accessibility cannot accommodate compliance with both this Section and Section 410.7, Section 410.7 shall take precedence.

4. Alterations limited solely to windows, hardware, operating controls, electrical outlets and signs.
5. Alterations limited solely to mechanical systems, electrical systems, installation or alteration of fire protection systems and abatement of hazardous materials.
6. Alterations undertaken for the primary purpose of increasing the accessibility of a facility.
7. Altered areas limited to Type B dwelling and sleeping units

905.4.1 Means of egress through an existing building. Where the accessible means of egress from an portion of a building being alteration or addition requires occupants to egress through portions of existing building, compliance with Section 1007 of the *International Building Code* is required through the existing building, unless technically infeasible. Where compliance with this provision is technically infeasible, the accessible means of egress through the existing building shall provide access to the maximum extent technically feasible.

1005.2 Accessible means of egress. Where a change of occupancy includes a Level 3 Alteration to an area containing a primary function, at least one accessible means of egress shall be provided in compliance with Section 905.

SECTION 1105 **MEANS OF EGRESS**

1105.1 General. The means of egress shall comply with the requirements of Section 905.4.1 and Chapter 10 of the *International Building Code*.

Reason: During last code change cycle, a proposal similar to this was presented. The committee felt it was too confusing and that it did not address the concept of disproportionate cost effectively. This proposal seeks to address those issues more clearly. Where possible the language was changed to be uniform among the various codes and sections.

Common sense should dictate that where major alterations occur consideration for at least one accessible means of egress should be provided. Additionally, the simple idea that an accessible means of egress should be intentionally denied to a segment of the population does not seem appropriate. As the codes now stand, a building can be completely gutted with only the facades remaining and no accessible means of egress must be provided.

It is important to remember that the new construction requirements in the IBC only require a maximum of two accessible means of egress as noted in Section 1007.1 (assuming travel distance compliance is accommodated).

With the deletion of Chapter 34 from the IBC it is incumbent on the IEBC to address these issues.

705.1: A change was made to the second exception to indicate that means of egress requirements for existing building are not required for lesser alterations, similar to exception #3.

905.1: A change is made to address the added section.

905.4: A new section is added to specifically address accessible means of egress. Rather than the blanket statement in Section 1007.1 of the building code, this section will address the scope and extent of work necessary to address accessible means of egress for existing buildings. It directs the code user to Section 1007 for the technical requirements when an accessible means of egress is necessary as well as clearly delineate that when an alteration occurs affecting an area containing a primary function, an accessible means of egress must be provided. The threshold is limited to alterations affecting a primary function because that threshold relates to the importance of changes to an area and is understood due to its relationship with the Federal accessibility regulations for the past 20 years. The intent is to provide at least one accessible means of egress.

905.4, exception #1: Alterations with some magnitude should address accessible means of egress; if the alteration is relatively small then there is reason to limit the requirement. Even if the accessible means of egress would not be a disproportionate cost (exception #2), in small alterations the area required to create the accessible means of egress may be disproportionate to the space allowed for the alteration. If so, it may "steal" too much space from an otherwise small area and would not be appropriate.

905.4, exception #2: The exception makes it clear that an accessible means of egress is not required for alterations to historic buildings. To do so, may alter the historic character. While an accessible means of egress should be provided wherever possible, the exception recognizes that in historic buildings the ability to make the necessary changes to comply may be detrimental to the historic integrity.

905.4, exception #3: Existing buildings come in all shapes and sizes and the work proposed for creating an accessible means of egress can be a small part or major portion of the effort. This exception identifies that and uses the same 20% rule for the accessible route relative to the primary use area. The exception also clarifies that where funds cannot provide the accessible route and an accessible means of egress, it is more important to provide the accessible route. This maintains consistency with the Federal requirements for alterations affecting an area containing a primary function.

905.4, exceptions #4, #5, #6, #7: These are the same as exceptions #2, #3, #4 and #5 in Section 705.2 for alterations affecting an area containing a primary function. These are included here for consistency.

905.4.1: If an addition is designed such that the means of egress must enter the existing building then the general rule is that the egress design in the existing building must meet the requirements for egress as it passes through the existing building. This is simply the continuation of the means of egress from the addition for egress width, panic hardware (as applicable) and similar concerns. The same should be true for the design of the accessible means of egress. If one of the accessible egress paths leads through the existing building, it too needs to meet/continue the level of protection as designed in the addition. The limitation to this is that if the effort to make the existing means of egress accessible is "technically infeasible" then work should be done to what is possible. One example of this may be making sure that the slopes along the egress path in the existing building's corridor are proper even if the width cannot be altered to allow the proper maneuverability approach to the exit door.

1005.2: A change of occupancy by itself is not sufficient to trigger the requirement for an accessible means of egress. However, if a change in occupancy also includes a Level 3 Alteration, then it should be subject to the same requirements as any other Level 3 Alteration. This provision is added as a clarification to that effect.

1105.1: Chapter 11 (Additions) does not address means of egress specifically. A reference to compliance with the means of egress provisions in Chapter 10 of the IBC is included. This is similar to the first sentence in Section 402.1 which requires additions to comply with the requirements of the IBC for new construction but more specific as is done for the "non-prescriptive" methods. The added language is inserted before the accessibility section to make it consistent with its placement in other chapters.

The codes identify the minimums necessary for life safety. These proposed changes provide the disabled community with similar levels of life safety to the general public and still sets reasonable thresholds based on the extent of work for the project. With the adoption of the new 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design, it is clear that the IBC will set the standard for accessible means of egress. This organization has a responsibility to act in the best interests of the general public in all its diversity. Where major changes are proposed to an existing building due to a large alteration or an addition, it should be the desire of the ICC to incorporate appropriate accessible means of egress where possible.

Cost Impact: The code change proposal will increase the cost of construction in many situations but may have no effect in others.

Cost Impact Discussion: It is not easy to address what costs could be affecting this due to the myriad possible configurations for a building. A building that is a single story at grade may have no additional cost. Because an accessible entrance would be required, it would function as the accessible means of egress. Hence, a single story building with a total internal renovation may be unaffected cost-wise by this proposal.

The main costs are those involving an elevator of adequate size on emergency standby power and a two-way communications system. If the elevator is too small, the costs to alter that would be disproportionate and it would not be required according to IEBC Section 905.4, exception #3.

At the opposite end of the spectrum could be a nine story high-rise building that is being gutted on five floors. It would be required to have an accessible route to the upper floors. The IFC would require the emergency power for fire fighter operation so that cost for that part of the accessible means of egress is covered. In that situation only the two-way communication systems costs would apply.

Buildings without elevators would likely similarly fall into the category of disproportionate costs since the addition of an elevator can be costly. Moreover, the accessible means of egress is tied into alterations that affect an area containing a primary function. This already has accessibility requirements for access such as toilet room and accessible route renovations. If the costs to add an elevator are within the 20 percent cap but the cost to add emergency standby power would be beyond the 20 percent, the exceptions in IEBC Section 905.4, exception #3 make it clear that the costs for access take precedence over the costs for egress and that combined they are not required to exceed the 20 percent figure.

In many cases the 20 percent cap will be met by the required access features and there may be no funds remaining for an accessible egress. The important thing is that we should recognize the need to provide a means of egress for all of the occupants within the building to the greatest extent possible. No definitive numbers can be provided because the variations are so many. This discussion attempts to address only the possibilities.

EB18 – 13

705.1.6

Proponent: Carl Baldassarra, P.E., Chair, ICC Code Technology Committee

Delete without substitution as follows:

~~**705.1.6 Performance areas.** Where it is *technically infeasible* to alter performance areas to be on an accessible route, at least one of each type of performance area shall be made accessible.~~

Reason: The exception for performance area does not make a lot of sense because there are typically not multiple performance areas of the same type. If access to the stage or pit is technically infeasible, how would you do even one? A correlative proposal was also been proposed and approved for IBC 3411.8.6 and IEBC 410.8.6.

The ICC Board established the ICC Code Technology Committee (CTC) as the venue to discuss contemporary code issues in a committee setting which provides the necessary time and flexibility to allow for full participation and input by any interested party. The code issues are assigned to the CTC by the ICC Board as "areas of study". Information on the CTC, including: meeting agendas; minutes; reports; resource documents; presentations; and all other materials developed in conjunction with the CTC effort can be downloaded from the following website: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/CTC/Pages/default.aspx>. Since its inception in April/2005, the CTC has held twenty five meetings - all open to the public.

CTC Meeting #26 – IBC Coordination with ADAAG

April 8-9, 2012

Page 3 of 15

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

EB19 – 13

705.1.8, 806.3

Proponent: Carl Baldassarra, P.E., Chair, ICC Code Technology Committee

Revise as follows:

705.1.8 Accessible dwelling or sleeping units. Where Group I-1, I-2, I-3, R-1, R-2 or R-4 dwelling or sleeping units are being altered, the requirements of Section 1107 of the *International Building Code* for Accessible units and ~~Chapter 9 of the *International Building Code* for visible alarms~~ apply only to the quantity of the spaces being altered.

Revise as follows:

806.3 Accessible dwelling units and sleeping units. Where Group I-1, I-2, I-3, R-1, R-2 or R-4 dwelling or sleeping units are being added, the requirements of Section 1107 of the *International Building Code* for Accessible units and ~~Chapter 9 of the *International Building Code* for visible alarms~~ apply only to the quantity of spaces being added.

Reason: Alarms are required to be altered only when the system is being altered. The language in IEBC should be deleted to be consistent with this revision previously made to IBC 3411.8.7. (ADA 223.1.1 & 224.1.1)

IBC 3411.8.7 (IEBC [B] 410.8.7) Accessible dwelling or sleeping units. Where Group I-1, I-2, I-3, R-1, R-2 or R-4 *dwelling or sleeping units* are being altered or added, the requirements of Section 1107 for *Accessible* units apply only to the quantity of spaces being altered or added.

The ICC Board established the ICC Code Technology Committee (CTC) as the venue to discuss contemporary code issues in a committee setting which provides the necessary time and flexibility to allow for full participation and input by any interested party. The code issues are assigned to the CTC by the ICC Board as "areas of study". Information on the CTC, including: meeting agendas; minutes; reports; resource documents; presentations; and all other materials developed in conjunction with the CTC effort can be downloaded from the following website: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/CTC/Pages/default.aspx>. Since its inception in April/2005, the CTC has held twenty five meetings - all open to the public.

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

EB20 – 13

705.1.10

Proponent: Carl Baldassarra, P.E., Chair, ICC Code Technology Committee

Revise as follows:

705.1.10 Toilet rooms. Where it is *technically infeasible* to alter existing toilet and bathing rooms to be *accessible*, an *accessible* family or assisted-use toilet or bathing room constructed in accordance with Section 1109.2.1 of the *International Building Code* is permitted. The family or assisted-use toilet or bathing room shall be located on the same floor and in the same area as the existing toilet or bathing rooms. At the inaccessible toilet and bathing rooms, directional signs indicating the location of the nearest family or assisted-use toilet room or bathing room shall be provided. These directional signs shall include the International Symbol of Accessibility and sign characters shall meet the visual character requirements in accordance with ICC A117.1.

Reason: This proposal will coordinate with ADA 216.8. The intent of this proposal is to add directional signage requirements for family/assisted-use bathrooms when the existing bathrooms are not fully accessible. The same proposal was made and approved for IBC Section 3411.8.11/IEBC 410.8.11.

The ICC Board established the ICC Code Technology Committee (CTC) as the venue to discuss contemporary code issues in a committee setting which provides the necessary time and flexibility to allow for full participation and input by any interested party.

CTC Meeting #26 – IBC Coordination with ADAAG

April 8-9, 2012

Page 4 of 15

The code issues are assigned to the CTC by the ICC Board as “areas of study”. Information on the CTC, including: meeting agendas; minutes; reports; resource documents; presentations; and all other materials developed in conjunction with the CTC effort can be downloaded from the following website: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/CTC/Pages/default.aspx>. Since its inception in April/2005, the CTC has held twenty five meetings - all open to the public.

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

EB21 – 13

705.1, 705.1.15 (NEW)

Proponent: Carl Baldassarra, P.E., Chair, ICC Code Technology Committee
(cbaldassarra@rjagroup.com)

Revise as follows:

705.1 General. A *facility* that is altered shall comply with the applicable provisions in Sections 705.1.1 through ~~705.1.14~~ 705.1.15, and Chapter 11 of the *International Building Code* unless it is *technically infeasible*. Where compliance with this section is *technically infeasible*, the alteration shall provide access to the maximum extent that is technically feasible.

A *facility* that is constructed or altered to be accessible shall be maintained accessible during occupancy.

Exceptions:

1. The altered element or space is not required to be on an accessible route unless required by Section 705.2.
2. Accessible means of egress required by Chapter 10 of the *International Building Code* are not required to be provided in existing *facilities*.
3. Type B dwelling or sleeping units required by Section 1107 of the *International Building Code* are not required to be provided in existing *facilities* undergoing less than a Level 3 *alteration*.
4. The alteration to Type A individually owned dwelling units within a Group R-2 occupancy shall meet the provisions for Type B dwelling units.

705.1.15 Amusement rides. Where the structural or operational characteristics of an amusement ride are altered to the extent that the amusement ride's performance differs from that specified by the manufacturer or the original design, the amusement ride shall comply with requirements for new construction in the International Building Code, Section 1110.4.7.

Reason: The accessibility requirements for new construction for Amusement rides have been proposed to the IBC as part of a coordination effort with the 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design and 2009 ICC A117.1 Chapter 11, Recreation. The overall intent is to provide access to recreational facilities so that persons with mobility impairments can participate to the best of their ability. The requirements are not intended to change any essential aspects of that recreational activity.

The intent of this public comment is to match the provisions for existing amusement rides proposed and approved for IBC Chapter 34 and IEBC Chapter 4. This way the provisions for existing buildings will be consistent between Chapter 4 and 7 of the IEBC. Technical criteria can be found in the 2009 edition of the ICC A117.1, Section 1102 and includes accessible routes, load and unload areas, wheelchair spaces on rides, seats for transfer, and transfer devices.

The ICC Board established the ICC Code Technology Committee (CTC) as the venue to discuss contemporary code issues in a committee setting which provides the necessary time and flexibility to allow for full participation and input by any interested party. The code issues are assigned to the CTC by the ICC Board as “areas of study”. Information on the CTC, including: meeting agendas; minutes; reports; resource documents; presentations; and all other materials developed in conjunction with the CTC effort can be downloaded from the following website: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/CTC/Pages/default.aspx>. Since its inception in April/2005, the CTC has held twenty five meetings - all open to the public.

Cost Impact: This code change proposal will not increase the cost of construction. This will be required by the 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design.

EB22 – 13

705.2

Proponent: Hope Reed, New Mexico Governor's Commission on Disability (hope.reed@state.nm.us)

Revise as follows:

705.2 Alterations affecting an area containing a primary function. Where an *alteration* affects the accessibility to a, or contains an area of, *primary function*, the route to the *primary function* area shall be accessible. The accessible route to the *primary function* area shall include toilet facilities ~~or~~ and drinking fountains serving the area of *primary function*.

Exceptions:

1. The costs of providing the accessible route are not required to exceed 20 percent of the costs of the alterations affecting the area of *primary function*.

(Portions of text not shown remain unchanged)

Reason: See this same change for IEBC 410.7 and IBC 3411.7

Modify one word to comply with **2010 ADA Standards** section 35.151(b)(4) Path of travel, and comply with **2010 ADA**

Standards section 36.403(a)(1) Path of travel.

People with disabilities need bathroom renovations and drinking fountain renovations along the "Path of Travel." When there is a choice, the easier solution is to change just the drinking fountains and look no further. The restroom renovations can be ignored. This does not benefit people with disabilities.

Those old restrooms need to be fixed and when full accessibility is not possible, some attempt at accessibility will provide a benefit to many. Widening the restroom door, installing a raised toilet, installing grab bars, and removing toilet partitions can be easy access renovations to comply with the intent of **2010 ADA**. Restroom and drinking fountain renovations need to be considered on an equal basis to comply with IEBC 705.1 where it states, "*alterations shall provide access to the maximum extent that is technically feasible.*"

Cost Impact: The cost will not exceed 20% of the cost for the alteration as stated in IEBC 705.2 Exception 1. Renovations should include equal consideration of both restroom renovations and drinking fountain renovations.

The IEBC needs to help building code officials bring alteration projects closer to the 20% dollar amount. Restroom and drinking fountain renovations need to be considered on an equal basis to comply with IEBC 705.1 where it states, "*alterations shall provide access to the maximum extent that is technically feasible.*"

EB42 – 13

806.2

Proponent: Carl Baldassarra, P.E., Chair, ICC Code Technology Committee
(cbaldassarra@rjagroup.com)

Revise as follows:

806.2 Stairs and escalators in existing buildings. In *alterations* where an escalator or stair is added where none existed previously, an accessible route shall be provided in accordance with ~~Sections~~ Section 1104.4 ~~and~~ 1104.5 of the *International Building Code*.

Reason: The intent of this provisions is that the accessible route will be permitted to be provided in the same area as the new construction, and is not require it to be located elsewhere in the building. A reference to Section 1104.5 could require the accessible route to be provided in another part of the building is the new stairway was not on a general circulation route. A correlative change has been proposed and approved for IBC Section 3411.8.4/IEBC 410.8.4.

The ICC Board established the ICC Code Technology Committee (CTC) as the venue to discuss contemporary code issues in a committee setting which provides the necessary time and flexibility to allow for full participation and input by any interested party. The code issues are assigned to the CTC by the ICC Board as "areas of study". Information on the CTC, including: meeting agendas; minutes; reports; resource documents; presentations; and all other materials developed in conjunction with the CTC effort can be downloaded from the following website: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/CTC/Pages/default.aspx>. Since its inception in April/2005, the CTC has held twenty five meetings - all open to the public.

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

EB43 – 13

806.3, 806.4, 806.5, 906.2

Proponent: Carl Baldassarra, P.E., Chair, ICC Code Technology Committee

Revise as follows:

806.3 1105.2 Accessible dwelling units and sleeping units. Where Group I-1, I-2, I-3, R-1, R-2 or R-4 dwelling or sleeping units are being added, the requirements of Section 1107 of the *International Building Code* for accessible units and Chapter 9 of the *International Building Code* for visible alarms apply only to the quantity of spaces being added.

806.4 1105.3 Type A dwelling or sleeping units. Where more than 20 Group R-2 dwelling or sleeping units are being added, the requirements of Section 1107 of the *International Building Code* for Type A units and Chapter 9 of the *International Building Code* for visible alarms apply only to the quantity of the spaces being added.

806.5 1105.4 Type B dwelling or sleeping units. Where four or more Group I-1, I-2, R-1, R-2, R-3 or R-4 dwelling or sleeping units are being added, the requirements of Section 1107 of the *International Building Code* for Type B units and Chapter 9 of the *International Building Code* for visible alarms apply only to the quantity of the spaces being added.

906.2 Type B dwelling or sleeping units. Where four or more Group I-1, I-2, R-1, R-2, R-3 or R-4 dwelling or sleeping units are being altered ~~or added~~, the requirements of Section 1107 of the *International Building Code* for Type B units and Chapter 9 of the *International Building Code* for visible alarms apply only to the quantity of the spaces being altered ~~or added~~.

Reason: The intent of this change is to clarify when Accessible, Type A and Type B units are required in alterations and additions.

Units being added within an existing structure are considered an alteration; therefore, Accessible and Type A units that are added as part of a renovation are adequately addressed in Section 705.1.8 and 705.1.9, and the language in 806.3 and 806.4 is not needed.

Additions adjacent to or above a building must comply with new construction. Therefore, Section 806.3, 806.4 and 806.5 should be relocated to Section 1105. This clarifies that just the addition is considered for the number of units, not the addition plus the number of existing units. Section 705.1.14, Extent of application, would allow for a situation where Accessible and Type A units were provided in sufficient numbers, including the addition, in the existing building.

Type B units are currently required in existing building undergoing a Level 3 alteration, with or without a change of occupancy. This requirement will remain the same (see Section 705.1, Exception 3, Section 906.2 and the exception to Section 1012.8).

For reference these are the related sections with revisions included.

Level I Alterations

705.1 General. A *facility* that is altered shall comply with the applicable provisions in Sections 705.1.1 through 705.1.14, and Chapter 11 of the *International Building Code* unless it is *technically infeasible*. Where compliance with this section is *technically infeasible*, the alteration shall provide access to the maximum extent that is technically feasible. A *facility* that is constructed or altered to be accessible shall be maintained accessible during occupancy.

Exceptions:

1. The altered element or space is not required to be on an accessible route unless required by Section 705.2.
2. Accessible means of egress required by Chapter 10 of the *International Building Code* are not required to be provided in existing *facilities*.
3. Type B dwelling or sleeping units required by Section 1107 of the *International Building Code* are not required to be provided in existing *facilities* undergoing less than a Level 3 *alteration*.
4. The alteration to Type A individually owned dwelling units within a Group R-2 occupancy shall meet the provisions for Type B dwelling units.

705.1.8 Accessible dwelling or sleeping units. Where Group I-1, I-2, I-3, R-1, R-2 or R-4 dwelling or sleeping units are being altered, the requirements of Section 1107 of the *International Building Code* for accessible units and Chapter 9 of the *International Building Code* for visible alarms apply only to the quantity of the spaces being altered.

705.1.9 Type A dwelling or sleeping units. Where more than 20 Group R-2 dwelling or sleeping units are being altered, the requirements of Section 1107 of the *International Building Code* for Type A units and Chapter 9 of the *International Building Code* for visible alarms apply only to the quantity of the spaces being altered.

Level II Alterations

806.1 General. A building, *facility*, or element that is altered shall comply with this section and Section 705.

Level III Alterations

906.1 General. A building, *facility* or element that is altered shall comply with this section and Sections 705 and 806.

906.2 Type B dwelling or sleeping units. Where four or more Group I-1, I-2, R-1, R-2, R-3 or R-4 dwelling or sleeping units are being altered ~~or added~~, the requirements of Section 1107 of the *International Building Code* for Type B units and Chapter 9 of the *International Building Code* for visible alarms apply only to the quantity of the spaces being altered ~~or added~~.

Change of Occupancy

1006.1 General. Accessibility in portions of buildings undergoing a *change of occupancy* classification shall comply with Section 1012.8.

1012.8 Accessibility. *Existing buildings* that undergo a change of group or occupancy classification shall comply with this section.

Exception: Type B dwelling or sleeping units required by Section 1107 of the *International Building Code* are not required to be provided in existing buildings and facilities undergoing a *change of occupancy* in conjunction with less than a Level 3 *alteration*.

Additions

1105.1 Minimum requirements. Accessibility provisions for new construction shall apply to additions. An addition that affects the accessibility to, or contains an area of, *primary function* shall comply with the requirements of Sections 705, 806 and 906, as applicable.

1105.2 806.3 Accessible dwelling units and sleeping units. Where Group I-1, I-2, I-3, R-1, R-2 or R-4 dwelling or sleeping units are being added, the requirements of Section 1107 of the *International Building Code* for accessible units and Chapter 9 of the *International Building Code* for visible alarms apply only to the quantity of spaces being added.

1105.3 806.4 Type A dwelling or sleeping units. Where more than 20 Group R-2 dwelling or sleeping units are being added, the requirements of Section 1107 of the *International Building Code* for Type A units and Chapter 9 of the *International Building Code* for visible alarms apply only to the quantity of the spaces being added.

1105.4 806.5 Type B dwelling or sleeping units. Where four or more Group I-1, I-2, R-1, R-2, R-3 or R-4 dwelling or sleeping units are being added, the requirements of Section 1107 of the *International Building Code* for Type B units and Chapter 9 of the *International Building Code* for visible alarms apply only to the quantity of the spaces being added.

The ICC Board established the ICC Code Technology Committee (CTC) as the venue to discuss contemporary code issues in a committee setting which provides the necessary time and flexibility to allow for full participation and input by any interested party. The code issues are assigned to the CTC by the ICC Board as "areas of study". Information on the CTC, including: meeting agendas; minutes; reports; resource documents; presentations; and all other materials developed in conjunction with the CTC effort can be downloaded from the following website: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/CTC/Pages/default.aspx>. Since its inception in April/2005, the CTC has held twenty five meetings - all open to the public.

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

EB50 – 13

906.2

Proponent: Ron Nickson, National Multi Housing Council (NMHC) (rnickson@nhmc.org), Steve Orlowski, National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) (sorlowski@nahb.org)

Revise as follows:

906.2 Type B dwelling or sleeping units. Where four or more Group I-1, I-2, R-1, R-2, R-3 or R-4 dwelling or sleeping units are being altered or added, the requirements of Section 1107 of the *International Building Code* for Type B units and Chapter 9 of the *International Building Code* for visible alarms apply only to the quantity of the spaces being altered or added.

Exception: Group I-1, I-2, R-2, R-3 and R-4 dwelling or sleeping units where the first certificate of occupancy was issued before March 15, 1991 are not required to provide Type B dwelling or sleeping units.

Reason: The purpose of this code change is to revise the provisions of the existing building code to be in line with the provisions of FHA, which state “*The design requirements apply to buildings built for first occupancy after March 13, 1991, which fall under the definition of “covered multifamily dwellings.”*” Too often existing building owners who submit plans to alter an existing residential building which was built before the FHA guidelines went into effect are told that they must comply with the accessible requirements for new buildings. This exception brings the IEBC in line with federal guidelines.

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

EB60 – 13

1204.1.1

Proponent: Carl Baldassarra, P.E., Chair, ICC Code Technology Committee

Revise as follows:

1204.1.1 Site arrival points. At least one ~~main entrance shall be accessible~~ route from a site arrival point to an accessible entrance shall be provided.

Reason: For historical buildings, the requirement for the accessible routes from the site arrival point to the accessible entrance should read the same in IBC and IEBC. The current text in IEBC 1204.1.1 does not address where the route should be provided. The IBC text is as follows:

IBC 3411.9.1 (IEBC [B] 410.9.1) Site arrival points. At least one *accessible* route from a site arrival point to an *accessible* entrance shall be provided.

The ICC Board established the ICC Code Technology Committee (CTC) as the venue to discuss contemporary code issues in a committee setting which provides the necessary time and flexibility to allow for full participation and input by any interested party. The code issues are assigned to the CTC by the ICC Board as “areas of study”. Information on the CTC, including: meeting agendas; minutes; reports; resource documents; presentations; and all other materials developed in conjunction with the CTC effort can be downloaded from the following website: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/CTC/Pages/default.aspx>. Since its inception in April/2005, the CTC has held twenty five meetings - all open to the public.

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

F171 – 13

202, 907.5.2.3.1 (IBC [F] 907.5.2.3.1). 907.5.2.3.2 (IBC [F] 907.5.2.3.2)

Proponent: Carl Baldassarra, P.E., FSFPE, Chair, ICC Code Technology Committee
(cbaldassarra@RJAGroup.com)

Revise as follows:

IFC 907.5.2.3.1 (IBC [F] 907.5.2.3.1) Public use areas and common use areas. Visible alarm notification appliances shall be provided in *public use areas* and *common use areas*.

~~IFC 907.5.2.3.2 (IBC [F] 907.5.2.3.2) Employee work areas.~~ **Exception: Where *employee work areas* have audible alarm coverage, the notification appliance circuits serving the *employee work areas* shall be initially designed with a minimum of 20-percent spare capacity to account for the potential of adding visible notification appliances in the future to accommodate hearing impaired employee(s).**

Add new definitions as follows:

SECTION 202 GENERAL DEFINITIONS

[B] COMMON USE. Interior or exterior *circulation paths*, rooms, spaces or elements that are not for public use and are made available for the shared use of two or more people.

[B] PUBLIC-USE AREAS. Interior or exterior rooms or spaces that are made available to the general public.

[B] EMPLOYEE WORK AREA. All or any portion of a space used only by employees and only for work. *Corridors*, toilet rooms, kitchenettes and break rooms are not employee work areas.

Reason: The intent of this proposal is to use defined terms for public use and common use to avoid confusion for where visible alarms are required. The definitions are copied from IBC. This requirement would be consistent with ADA 215.2.

The ICC Board established the ICC Code Technology Committee (CTC) as the venue to discuss contemporary code issues in a committee setting which provides the necessary time and flexibility to allow for full participation and input by any interested party. The code issues are assigned to the CTC by the ICC Board as "areas of study". Information on the CTC, including: meeting agendas; minutes; reports; resource documents; presentations; and all other materials developed in conjunction with the CTC effort can be downloaded from the following website: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/CTC/Pages/default.aspx>. Since its inception in April/2005, the CTC has held twenty five meetings - all open to the public.

Cost Impact: None – This will be required by the 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design.

F172 – 13

907.5.2.3.3 (IBC [F] 907.5.2.3.3)

Proponent: Carl Baldassarra, P.E., FSFPE, Chair, ICC Code Technology Committee
(cbaldassarra@RJAGroup.com)

Revise as follows:

907.5.2.3.3 (IBC [F] 907.5.2.3.3) Groups I-1 and R-1. Group I-1 and R-1 *dwelling units or sleeping units* in accordance with Table 907.5.2.3.3 shall be provided with a visible alarm notification ~~appliance~~ throughout the unit, activated by both the in-room smoke alarm and the building fire alarm system.

Reason: The revised language will clarify that within hotel rooms and assisted living units that visible alarms must provide full coverage.

The ICC Board established the ICC Code Technology Committee (CTC) as the venue to discuss contemporary code issues in a committee setting which provides the necessary time and flexibility to allow for full participation and input by any interested party. The code issues are assigned to the CTC by the ICC Board as "areas of study". Information on the CTC, including: meeting agendas; minutes; reports; resource documents; presentations; and all other materials developed in conjunction with the CTC effort can be downloaded from the following website: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/CTC/Pages/default.aspx>. Since its inception in April/2005, the CTC has held twenty five meetings - all open to the public.

Cost Impact: None

F234 – 13

1104.8

Proponent: John Woestman, Kellen Company, representing Builders Hardware Manufacturers Association (BHMA) (jwoestman@kellencompany.com)

Revise as follows:

1104.8 Opening force for doors. The opening force for interior side-swinging doors without closers shall not exceed a 5 pound (22 N) force. These forces do not apply to the force required to retract latch bolts or disengage other devices that hold the door in a closed position. For other side-swinging, sliding and

folding doors, the door latch shall release when subjected to a force of not more than 15 pounds (66 N). The door shall be set in motion when subjected to a force not exceeding 30 pounds (133 N). The door shall swing to a full-open position when subjected to a force of not more than 50 pounds (222 N). Forces shall be applied to the latch side.

Reason: Revisions approved in the 2012 ICC code development cycle for the 2015 IBC should be coordinated in this section of the IFC. The proposed revisions to this section of the IFC is consistent with the revisions to section 1008.1.3 of the 2015 IBC and section 1008.1.3 of the 2015 IFC, resulting from code change proposal E62-12 which was approved "as modified" in 2012.

Cost Impact: None

RB141 – 13

R311.8.1

Proponent: Rick Davidson, City of Maple Grove Association of Minnesota Building Officials
(rdavidson@maplegrovern.gov)

Revise as follows:

R311.8.1 Maximum slope. Ramps serving the egress door required by section R311.2 shall have a maximum slope of 1 unit vertical in 12 units horizontal (8.3-percent slope). All other ramps shall have a maximum slope of 1 unit vertical to 8 units horizontal (12.5-percent slope).

Exception: Where it is technically infeasible to comply because of site constraints, ramps may have a maximum slope of one unit vertical in eight horizontal (12.5-percent slope).

Reason: When ramp slope requirements were changed a few years back, the reason stated was to enable persons with disabilities to stay in their homes. However, the scope of the proposal included all ramps, even those that could not be used by persons with disabilities. For example, dwelling additions to older homes sometimes have new basements at a deeper level and the owner wishes to make the transition by ramp. A 1:12 slope can sometimes be difficult to achieve and absorbs much more space than need be. Media rooms are often designed to have sloping floors with ramps serving the seating and again the 1:12 slope is problematic. This proposal gives some relief for those situations where accessibility may not be an issue. This also is consistent with section 1010.3 of the IBC which allows a 1:8 slope for pedestrian ramps not used as a means of egress.

IBC SECTION 1010 RAMPS

1010.3 Slope. *Ramps* used as part of a *means of egress* shall have a running slope not steeper than one unit vertical in 12 units horizontal (8-percent slope). The slope of other pedestrian *ramps* shall not be steeper than one unit vertical in eight units horizontal (12.5-percent slope).

Cost Impact: None

RB142 – 13

R311.8.1, R311.8.2

Proponent: Glenn Mathewson, MCP., representing self (GlennMathewson@nadra.org)

Revise as follows:

R311.8.1 Maximum slope. Ramps shall have a maximum slope of 1 unit vertical in 12 units horizontal (8.3-percent slope).

Exception: Where it is technically infeasible to comply because of site constraints, ramps shall ~~may~~ have a maximum slope of ~~one~~ 1 unit vertical in ~~eight~~ 8 units horizontal (12.5-percent slope).

R311.8.2 Landings required. There shall be a floor or landing at the top and bottom of each ramp, where doors open onto ramps, and where ramps change directions. The width of the landing

perpendicular to the ramp slope shall be not less than the width of the ramp. The depth of the landing in the direction of the ramp slope shall be not less than 36-inches. A minimum 3-foot-by-3-foot (914 mm by 914 mm) landing shall be provided:

1. ~~At the top and bottoms of ramps.~~
2. ~~Where doors open onto ramps.~~
3. ~~Where ramps change directions.~~

Reason: It is inconsistent to present slope in one section using numerical symbols, and then in the exception use textual language. It appears to be more common in the IRC to use numerical symbols, thus the choice to modify the exception.

-Use of the word "may" is inappropriate when referring to a maximum value. "Shall" is clearer that the maximum value is the undisputable limit.

All other landings in the IRC (doors/stairs) reference the width of the feature they serve, as this is sensible. Currently ramp provisions refer to a specific geometric width, and would not properly and safely accommodate a ramp that was wider than the minimum 36 inches. Likely...landings are already built to the width of the ramps they serve.

-The use of a list of landing locations is not consistent with other similar IRC sections. The proposed language is more similar to that used to describe landings on stairs...a very similar feature.

RB177 – 13

R320.1, R320.1.1 (New)

Proponent: Carl Baldassarra, P.E., FSFPE, Chair, ICC Code Technology Committee
(cbaldassarra@rjagroup.com)

Revise as follows:

R320.1 Scope. Where there are four or more *dwelling units* ~~or sleeping units~~ in a single structure, the provisions of Chapter 11 of the *International Building Code* for Group R-3 shall apply.

R320.1.1 Guest rooms. A dwelling with guestrooms shall comply with the provisions of Chapter 11 of the *International Building Code* for Group R-3. For the purpose of applying the requirements of IBC chapter 11, *guestrooms* shall be considered *sleeping units*.

Exception: Lodging houses.

Reason: Residential and institutional occupancies with 6 or more residents are within the scope of the IBC only and cannot be constructed under the IRC. This is based on both the scope of the IRC and IBC. Scoping provisions of the IRC and IBC, and code provisions within the IBC permit some residential and institutional occupancies with 5 or fewer occupants to be constructed in accordance with the IRC as an alternative to compliance with the IBC. The IBC occupancies that allow use of the IRC for five or fewer guests are: Group R-3 lodging houses (see G40-13), lodging houses are also in the scope of the IRC in section 101.2 #2; section 308.3.1 for Group I-1 and 308.4.1 for Group I-2.

Per the 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design and the IBC 1103.2.11 owner occupied lodging houses with 5 or fewer guests are not required to be accessible. So compliance with the IRC works for this condition without causing any conflicts with the IBC. If the lodging house is not owner occupied or accommodates more than 5 guests the building is outside of the scope of the IRC and accessibility is addressed since the building will be constructed per the IBC.

The issue addressed by this code change is how to handle 2012 IBC Sections 308.3.1 for I-1 and 308.4.1 for I-2. These sections classify the building as Group R-3 or allow use of the IRC for these institutional uses that have 5 or fewer care recipients. If it is classified as Group R-3 then IBC section 1107.6.3 provides requirements for accessibility of the building. Clearly the intent of Section 1107.6.3 is that if you have 4 or 5 care recipients the "sleeping units" must be Type B (subject to Section 1107.7 exceptions). The problem is that IRC structures by scope and definition do not have sleeping units:

R101.2 Scope. The provisions of the *International Residential Code for One- and Two-family Dwellings* shall apply to the construction, *alteration*, movement, enlargement, replacement, repair, equipment, use and occupancy, location, removal and demolition of detached one- and two-family dwellings and townhouses not more than three stories above *grade plane* in height with a separate means of egress and their *accessory structures*.

DWELLING. Any building that contains one or two *dwelling units* used, intended, or designed to be built, used, rented, leased, let or hired out to be occupied, or that are occupied for living purposes.

Adding the IBC definition of sleeping units to the IRC does not work because IBC sleeping units are not part of a dwelling unit. The current IBC definition of sleeping units states that "Such rooms and spaces that are also part of a dwelling unit are not sleeping

units". Having a building constructed under the IRC that is not a dwelling unit, but a building with multiple sleeping units, is outside of the scope of the IRC.

Any of the Group I uses for 5 and under that are built to the IRC should have the same accessibility requirements as a Group R-3 constructed building. The IRC does not have sleeping units. Under the IRC such facilities are a dwelling unit with guest rooms. While the IRC contains a definition for guestroom, it is not clear on how the guestrooms should be counted for accessibility. Since the resident rooms are not sleeping units but guest rooms the current Section R320.1 does not require accessibility per Chapter 11 of the IBC for any IRC structures that have multiple guest rooms in one dwelling unit. The solution proposed here is to delete sleeping units from Section R320.1 to remove the confusion about the scope of sleeping units in the IRC and to add new Section R320.1.1 to address guestrooms. The statement that guestrooms shall be considered sleeping units for the purpose of applying IBC Chapter 11 is necessary because we cannot change the IBC language until the 2018 cycle. We plan to propose a more coordinated change for both the IBC and IRC to address this issue in the 2018 cycle. The exception for lodging houses is to maintain the exemption from accessibility requirements for lodging houses consistent with IBC Section 1103.2.11.

The ICC Board established the ICC Code Technology Committee (CTC) as the venue to discuss contemporary code issues in a committee setting which provides the necessary time and flexibility to allow for full participation and input by any interested party. The code issues are assigned to the CTC by the ICC Board as "areas of study". Information on the CTC, including: meeting agendas; minutes; reports; resource documents; presentations; and all other materials developed in conjunction with the CTC effort can be downloaded from the following website: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/CTC/Pages/default.aspx>. Since its inception in April/2005, the CTC has held twenty five meetings - all open to the public.

Cost Impact: None

RB178 – 13

R320.1

Proponent: Steve Orłowski, representing National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) (sorlowski@nahb.org)

Add new text as follows:

R320.1 Scope. Where there are four or more *dwelling* units or sleeping units in a single structure, the provisions of Chapter 11 of the *International Building Code* for Group R-3 shall apply.

Exception: Owner-occupied lodging houses with five or fewer guestrooms or sleeping units constructed in accordance with the *International Residential Code* are not required to be accessible.

Reason: Based on the action taken during the Group A Hearings, Lodging houses are now referenced in the IBC. It was noted during the hearings, that lodging houses with five or fewer guest rooms or sleeping units are not required to be accessible under the 2010 ADA Guidelines. This proposal simply clarifies that lodging houses are not subject to the provisions of Chapter 11 of the IBC if they contain five or fewer guest rooms or sleeping units.

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

RB179– 13

R320.2 (New)

Proponent: Dominic Marinelli, representing United Spinal Association (dmarinelli@accessibility-services.com)

Revise as follows:

R320.2 Type C units. Dwelling units and townhouses shall be provided with the accessible features for Type C units in accordance with the applicable portions of Chapter 10 of ICC A117.1. Type C units are permitted to be designed and constructed as accessible units, Type A units or Type B units.

Exception: An exterior circulation path is not required where site constraints beyond the control of the owner prevent its installation.

Reason: As the Type C dwelling unit technical criteria are now included in the 2009 ANSI A117.1 Standard (Section 1005) we would like to insert A117.1 as a reference standard in the IRC to make it clear for jurisdictions that wish to adopt Section 1005 of ANSI A117.1 through legislative scoping amendments to the IRC, that A117.1 is indeed a reference standard applicable for the IRC. The scoping in R320.2 will trigger compliance with Type C unit criteria, while the exception permits a reduction in Type C criteria based on site impracticality or other restrictions outside the owner's control.

Type C units are representative of the term also known as "Visitability". Visitability is a growing trend nationwide that refers to single-family or owner-occupied housing designed in such a way that it can be lived in or visited by people who have trouble with steps or who use wheelchairs or walkers. The visitability criteria are intended to ensure that in new construction, certain basic accessible features are included at the time of construction, including a unit entrance located on a circulation path complying with Type C criteria, an accessible circulation path that connects the entrance of the unit with one toilet or bathroom, one habitable space with an area 70 square feet minimum, and if a food preparation area is provided on the entrance level, the circulation path shall connect to the food preparation area. There are also features for the bathroom that include reinforcements for grab bars and clearances similar to those required by the Fair Housing Act at the toilet room or bathroom on the entrance level of the unit. Doors along the unit interior circulation path shall have a clear width of 31 ¾ inches – the same as required by FHA.

As stated on Concrete Change's website by Eleanor Smith, a leading advocate for visitability, "First, the spirit of Visitability is as important as the list of features. That spirit says it's not just unwise, but unacceptable that new homes continue to be built with gross barriers — given the how easy it is to build basic access in the great majority of new homes, and given the harsh effects major barriers have on so many people's lives. These easily-avoided barriers cause daily drudgery; unsafe living conditions; social isolation; and forced institutionalization. Visitability is a movement to change home construction practices so that virtually all new homes — not merely those custom-built for occupants who currently have disabilities — offer a few specific features making the home easier for mobility-impaired people to live in and visit. Several people have asked for a more detailed definition, noting that the list of required features has not been identical in all Visitability-type legislation, handouts and other materials."

The inclusion of the Type C criteria in the A117.1 standard was the culmination of a task group that worked to take the various visitability ordinances in place throughout the country and incorporate visitability criteria into A117.1, which designers and builders were familiar with, so that when Visitability was presented to them, they could look to a familiar "standard" to understand what "Visitability" means in terms of design and construction.

Cost Impact: Indicate whether or not this proposal will impact construction costs.

SP26– 13

305.4

Proponent: Jennifer Hatfield, J. Hatfield & Associates, PL, representing the Association of Pool & Spa Professionals (jhatfield@apsp.org)

Revise as follows:

305.4 Structure wall as a barrier. Where a wall of a dwelling or structure serves as part of the *barrier*, and where any doors and or operable windows in the wall have with a sill heights of less than 48 inches (1219 mm) above the indoor floor that and where any of those doors or windows provide direct access to the aquatic vessel through the wall, shall be equipped with one or more of the following shall be required:

1. The doors and operable windows having a sill height of less than 48 inches (1219 mm) above the indoor floor shall have an alarm that produces an audible warning when the door, or window or their screens or window, is are opened. The alarm shall be *listed* and *labeled* as a water hazard entrance alarm in accordance with UL 2017. In dwellings or structures not required to be Accessible units, Type A units or Type B units, alarm the deactivation switches shall be located 54 inches (1372 mm) or more above the threshold of the door. In dwellings or structures required to be Accessible units, Type A units or Type B units, alarm the deactivation switches shall be located not greater than 54 inches (1372 mm) and not less than 48 inches (1219 mm) above the threshold of the door.
2. A safety cover that is *listed* and *labeled* in accordance with ASTM F 1346 is provided for the aquatic vessel.
3. An *approved* means of protection, such as self-closing doors with self-latching devices is provided. Such means of protection shall provide that the a degree of protection afforded that is not less than the protection afforded by Items 1 or 2.

Reason: How the charging paragraph originally was written, it did not make sense that doors and windows would be equipped with a safety cover, the proposed language clarifies what was the original intention

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

SP44 – 13

323.2.1

Proponent: Jennifer Hatfield, J. Hatfield & Associates, PL, representing the Association of Pool & Spa Professionals (jhatfield@apsp.org)

Revise as follows:

323.2.1 Height. Handrails shall be between 34 inches (864mm) and 38 inches (965 mm) above the ramp or step surface as measured at the nosing of the step or finished surface of the slope.

Exception: The requirements of this section shall not apply to *residential aquatic vessels*.

Reason: What is the justification for this height range requirement applying to both public and residential installations? The 34"-38" height is already a requirement for stair and ramp rails in the ADA Standards for Accessible Design for public facilities. Many of rails do not meet the height requirements. The handrail height requirement should be removed from the general requirements section and placed into the public swimming pools section or exempt out the residential vessels, as proposed here. For inground residential swimming pools, the range for the rail height can be broader, or not specified.

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