



ICC (ASC A117) CONSENSUS COMMITTEE ON ACCESSIBLE AND USABLE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

A117.1 Committee Minutes #36 Thursday, July 13, 2023 12-4 Eastern

Chair: Ken Schoonover

Vice-chair: Gina Hilberry

Secretariat: Karl Aittaniemi; kaittaniemi@iccsafe; 888-422-7233, Ext. 4205

Please send requests for accommodations to Karl at least 5 business days before the call.

1) Welcome and Introductions

- 1) Call to order the meeting was called to order at 12:00 Eastern
- 2) Meeting attendance:

Committee members:

Doug Anderson, AHLA Principal
Tara Barthelmess, NCDOI & OSFM, Principal
Karen Braitmayer, DREDF, Principal
Kevin Brinkman, NEII, Principal
Dan Buuck, NAHB, Principal
John Catlett, JD Catlett Consulting for BOMA, Principal
Paula Cino, National Multifamily Housing Council, Principal
Bill Conner, ASTC, alternate
David W Cooper, SMA Principal
Dan Dain, AIA, Principal
Glenn Dea, International Sign Association, Principal
Brad Gaskins, NACS, Principal
Alan Gettelman, Individual Member
Jenifer Gilliland, WABO Principal
John S. Gonzalez, ICC (Alternate)
Greg Guarnaccia, Illuminating Engineering Society (Principal)
Jennifer Hatfield, PHTA, Alternate
Glenn Hedman, RESNA, Alternate
Gina Hilberry, UCP, Principal, Vice-Chair served as chair for this call
Robert Kelly Montgomery County, Principal
Matt Lescher, NATO, Principal
George Lim SEG, Alternate
Allison Lourash, LPA Principal
, ASPE American Society of Plumbing Engineers, Principal
Simon Majarian, SEG, Alternate
Carolyn Majowka, VBCOA, Alternate
Marsha Mazz, United Spinal Association, Principal
Michele Mihelic, AIA, Alternate
Susan Morgan, ASID, Alternate
Jeffrey Munsterteiger, NAHB, Alternate
Eunice Noell-Waggoner, IES, Alternate

Kimberly Paarlberg, ICC, Principal
Barbara Padilla, AHLA Alternate
Rex Pace, HUD, Principal
Jake Pauls, Individual member
Lucy Pereira, International Sign Association, Alternate
Hope Reed, NMGCD Alternate
Richard Roberts, NEMA, Principal
Ed Roether, Individual member
Kurt Roeper Builders Hardware Manufacturers Assoc , Alternate
Nathan Roether, United Spinal, Alternate
Stan Ross NM
Leslie Shankman-Cohn ASID (Principal)
Pat Sheehan, ACB, Principal
Koni Sims, ACB, Alternate
Ed Steinfeld, RESNA, Principal
Kyle Thompson, PMI (Principal)
Michael Tierney, BHMA, Principal
Norman Wang, Building Codes Administration, Maryland Dept of Labor, Principal
Richard Williams, WABO Alternate
R Duane Wilson, ASTC, Principal
Scott Windley US Access Board Principal

Interested parties:

Karen Gridley, MN Dept. Labor & Industry, Construction Codes Division
Thomas Hirsch, FAIA HIRSCH GROUP ARCHITECTURE
Laurel W. Wright, NCDOT/OSFM, Ret.
Thomas B Zuzik Jr Railingcodes.com, representing NOMMA.org

B. Logistics

- 1) Minutes for 6-22-2023; agenda for 7-13-2023 were approved
- 2) Work groups
 - Reach over a counter - 3rd presentation April 27, 2023; meetings TBD
 - 06-13 meetings TBD
 - Adult changing Meeting June 27, 2023
 - Assisted toileting and bathing March 24, 2022 presentation meeting TBD
 - Scoping April 7, 2022 presentation meetings TBD
 - Accessible bathing April 21, 2022 presentation meeting TBD
 - Accessible Communication Features for the Built Environment meeting every other Wednesday, 1-3 Eastern;
 - o special thanks to Eunice Noell-Waggoner
 - Walking and Wheeled Surfaces meeting TBD
 - Terminology meeting April 17, June 12, 26, July 10, 17, 24, 2023
 - Membership committee letter for non-participation in development.
 - Editorial collecting names for volunteers, email Karl and Kim

C. Administrative items

The revised proposals are available at - [A117.1 Public proposals 2-8-2022](#)

Information on the meetings and development of the 2023 edition of the standard will be posted at [A117.1 webpage](#)

Ballots for proposals heard through July 28, 2022 were sent to the committee.

Deadline for the ballot was **Sept. 6, 2022.**

Ballots for proposals heard through January 19, 2023 were sent to the committee.

Deadline for the ballot was **March 6, 2023.**

Ballots for proposals heard through May 11, 2023 and public comment agenda were sent to the committee. Deadline for the ballot was **July 31, 2023.**

Revised meeting dates

- July 27, August 10, 24 are current summer dates
- Revised dates are: Sept. 14, 28, Oct. 12, 26, Nov. 9 (not the 23rd since this is Thanksgiving), Dec. 7 and 21.
- Kim/Karl to send out revised meeting invitations

D. ICC A117.1 development prot

- o Whether scoping is necessary in the Standard given the successful treatment of scoping in the IBC.
- o That this committee is the only forum in which people with disabilities have a significant voice and a vote. Advocates generally do not have the resources to participate in the ICC Code Development Process. The industry reps that participate in the IBC Chapter 11 process are largely the same who are members of or participate in this process.

Adoption ordinance

Errata for title of ordinance.

This is a sample adoption ordinance. Scoping is addressed in the new appendix.

Effective date, if not at time of adoption?

Item A201.1 –

Issue e tes to a building code.

- o While under ADA you can submit a complaint on a building that has not been built yet, this should be deleted here.
- o Newly designed is addressed during the review process so it should stay.

New construction and existing building scoping is addressed later in the appendix. This could be more generic. It may be sufficient to just say constructio

Is this intended to be enforced by the building department? A code official cannot address operational concerns addressed in civil rights laws.

Look at IBC Section 102.2 Other laws. While this is in the sample ordinance in Item 10, this may be needed in the text.

previously constructed items such as signs.

Tabled to continue discussion at the next meeting.

5-25-2023 Meeting

General concerns –

Why do we need to do this if we have a scoping document?

Could an appendix be just elements that exceeded the IBC and IEBC?

If a jurisdiction adopts this separately from the building codes, who will be the person enforcing or making interpretations on these requirements.

Is the intent to say comply if provided for everything in the standard, or just what was in the current scoping document?

A201.1 –

Should the exceptions for the entire standard be located under this section example A203.1. Dan Buuck to submit modification.

It was requested that a comparison matrix should be provided to the committee for reasoning.

The chair for the working group, Gina Hilberry, stated that the committee started with a matrix, but it was split up and not recombined during the work group development process. There were multiple iterations.

The document does pull criteria from the 2010 ADA Standard, IBC and NFPA 101/5000 as well as new items in the standard.

A201.2 –

Assisted use is not used in the assisted living provisions. Some additional definitions from IBC are needed to clearly state what assisted living and nursing homes are quantified.

Exceptions are included in the definitions (e.g. transient lodging). These should be moved to

Some of the definitions include what something is not, vs. what it is (e.g. transient lodging).

Additions an occupied roof is not an addition floor area. Why is a mezzanine not included.

Occupant load uses means of egress which is not defined in the standard.

Some definitions include technical requirements (e.g. limited access spaces, machinery space) these need to be removed.

Alterations are the exceptions for controls, or just the items hidden in the wall?

Alterations is this only for jurisdictions that do not use IBC or as a replacement for IBC Chapter 11? Definitions should correlate with the I-codes as much as possible to reduce conflicts.

Alterations - This is a substantial expansion. Is this trying to get the exceptions for improvements to the route into the definition.

The codes may change the definitions how would we keep up so that we don't create conflicts.

There are too many laundry lists.

Definitions are a description of terminology they should not contain requirements.

An alteration would be different for each element (e.g. elevators).

Alteration this appears to be trying to match A204.7 why not address it there instead. Defined term not used in text.

Mezzanines this is primarily IBC definitions with the height intended to make it not a raised platform

Maybe we should come back to the definitions when we are dealing with the topic.

Entrance

- different types of entrances should be grouped in definitions
- this should include ingress requirements why not steps included?
- Is this not address by the three types public, service, restricted
- This appears to be describing the accessible route into the building that

would cause confusion with entrance

Change of occupancy is treated the same as an alteration, so this definition should be removed and A204.5 can be revised same as IEBC.

Change of occupancy what happens if this changes in the IEBC over time.

Employee work area is important to the scoping should it be included in Appendix A? The work group responded that if it was in Section 107.5, it did not need to be repeated.

Historic Buildings IEBC has moved this definition forward. This needs to be updated. However, this will be a continuing issue with liability and cost concerns.

Limited access space the exception is in A202.2.3 General exception, not in a definition. Delete

Machinery space - the exception should be in A202.2.4 General exception, not in a definition. Delete

Public use areas

- elements is confusing. How is this used in the text. Gene said this came from the 2010 standard.
- Is exterior room accessed from the outside or is it open to the outside air?

Facility is a term that is not person centered. However, this is needed for a group of buildings that operate together as one facility or several tenants/facilities in the same facility reference in the IBC A17.1.

A202.2.3 General exceptions

Why are some of the other exceptions in the IBC not in this list places or religious worship, day care facilities?

Why does the exceptions exempt the elements from accessibility and the route. The route provisions say connect accessible elements so this is redundant. It could be implied that everything other non-accessible element does not have to be on a route. Marsha explained that the route is a separate requirement, so these spaces needed to be exempt from both.

A202.2.3 – Limited Access delete definition in favor of text here.

A202.2.4 Machinery spaces - delete definition in favor of text here.

A202.2.5 Single occupant structures change to match IBC toll booths. Better

Tf1 0 0 1 276.29 513.07 Tmdd

The chair indicated that discussion will proceed in sequence from beginning to end rather than jumping around in the proposal and instructed the meeting participants to prepare for the next meeting by looking ahead and being prepared to discuss the next block(s) of subject matter. It would be preferable (not required, just preferable) to wait to submit modifications until after a block of text has been discussed and develop and submit modifications to that text at the following meeting. Provide modifications to staff using the modification [form](#) posted on ICC A117.1 webpage under Administration.

The chair requested that the agenda identify blocks of portions of the proposal in sections to limit the scope of discussion by topic.

06-22-2023:

No comment on A202.2.8 through A202.2.11

A202.2 Exceptions - There are some exceptions located in the uses they may need to be located either at the front of the use, or have a reference in the exceptions so they are not missed.

A202.3.2.1 and A202.3.2.2 Site arrival points Exception clarify where the route requirement is for housing

A202.3.2.3 Why level instead of story in the first sentence? How would this stop changes less than a story height with no route to them? This should cover occupied roofs.

Exception 1 uses stories instead of levels so may be confusing with main text; need a 1.5 to not allow for 4 or more dwelling units on a story.

Exception 2 how are basements addressed? Is this covered in a 2 story building.

A202.3.2.4 Dw

Exception 4 why is this needed this is employees areas that are within a dining or drinking area, like the area behind a bar or in front of a check out stations/table bussing station.

A202.3.2.8 Performance areas. –

The last sentence for raised platforms is limited to banquet rooms? Need to address the platform platforms more generally?

What about a platform that is brought in as furniture for events?

What about when a platform is not a performance area like a head table at a wedding?

A202.3.2.9 Employee Work Areas. none

A202.3.2.10 Walkways adjoining construction and demolition sites. –

Location confusing. Mov

A202.7.1.1 Public entrances. Questions on to what is a public entrance, especially if the entrances are secured or indicated as limited (e.g. key pad or marked employee only). Would this exceed FHA by requiring 60% for access to the building? Think two entrance building that leads to individual dwellings on the hallway.

A202.7.1.2 Parking garage entrances. none

A202.7.1.3 Entrances from tunnels or elevated walkways. none

A202.7.1.4 Transportation Facilities. none

A202.7.1.5 Tenant spaces, dwelling units and sleeping units. none

A202.7.1.6 Restricted Entrances.

This needs to be more carefully separated from public entrances. The language repeats itself. See Access Board/DOJ guidance. Much more limited that people think.

A202.7.2 Doors, Doorways and Gates none

A202.7.2.1 General.

Is using providing user passage expanding the scope instead of on an accessible route to comply? This would pick up

