



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

A117.1 Committee Minutes #34 Thursday, June 8, 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:

- Julius Ballanco, ASPE, Alternate
- Tara Barthelmess, NCDOI & OSFM, Principal
- Gene Boecker, NATO alternate
- Kevin Brinkman, NEII, Principal
- John Catlett, BOMA International, Principal
- Paula Cino, National Multifamily Housing Council, Principal
- David Cooper, SMA, Principal
- Glenn Dea, International Sign Association, Principal
- Brad Gaskins, NACS Principal
- Alan Gettelman, Individual Member
- John S. Gonzalez – ICC (Alternate)
- Greg Guarnaccia, Illuminating Engineering Society (Principal)
- Glenn Hedman, RESNA, Alternate
- Gina Hilberry, UCP Principal, Vice-Chair (Chair for this meeting)
- Robert Kelly Montgomery County Principal
- Matt Lescher, NATO, Principal
- George Lim SEG, Alternate
- Simon Majarian, SEG, Alternate
- Carolyn Majowka, VBCOA, Alternate
- Marsha Mazz, United Spinal Assoc., Principal
- Sean McNamara, Target Corp, Alternate
- Susan Morgan, ASID, Alternate
- Jeffrey Munsterteiger, NAHB, Alternate
- Eunice Noell-Waggoner, IES, Alternate
- Kimberly Paarlberg, ICC Principal
- Rex Pace, HUD, Principal
- Barbara Padilla, AHLA Alternate

- Jake Pauls, Individual Member
- Lucy Pereira, International Sign Association, Alternate
- Kenny Peskin, Int'l Sign Association, Alternate
- Hope Reed, NMGCD Alternate
- Ed Roether, Individual member
- Arlene Romoff, HLAA proxy for Sharon Toji
- Jessica Schrader, SEGD, Principal
- Pat SheBehan, ACB, Principal
- Koni Sims, ACB, Alternate
- Kyle Thompson, PMI (Principal)
- Michael Tierney, BHMA Principle
- Norman C. Wang, AIA Maryland Dept of Labor, Building Codes Administration, Principal
- Richard Williams, WABO Alternate
- R Duane Wilson, ASTC, Principal
- Scott Windley US Access Board Principal

Interested parties:

- Maggie Calkins, SAGE and IDEAS Institute.
- Amy Carpenter, SFCS Architects
- Ron Crouch, AIA, Moseley Architects [Richmond VA HQ's]
- Jim Kendzel, MPH, American Supply Association
- Larry M Schneider AIA
- Laurel W, Wright, NCOSFM Ret,
- Thomas Zuzik Jr Railingcodes.com representing NOMMA.org

B. Logistics

- 1) Minutes for 5-25-2023; agenda for 6-8-2023 were approved
- 2) Work groups –
 - Reach over a counter - 3rd presentation April 27, 2023; meetings TBD
 - 06-13 – meetings TBD
 - Adult changing – 2nd presentation May 19, 2022 – meetings TBD
 - 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;
 - special thanks to Eunice Noell-Waggoner
 - Walking and Wheeled Surfaces – meeting TBD
 - Terminology – meeting April 17, 2023, June 12, 26, 2023 –
 - Marsha Mazz appointed as new chair; Dennis Hall has resigned from the task group.
 - Membership committee – letter for non-participation in development.

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.**
- The next ballot and public comment will be out soon. Deadline is anticipated to be July 31, 2023.

D. ICC A117.1 development procedures –

E. Review of Proposals:

The following proposals were discussed during the call. See the report for any official committee reasons and final actions. Any items remaining on the agenda will roll to the next agenda -

Appendix

5-11-2023 Meeting

A-01 – The following are discussion points during the meeting –

Discussion of Appendix –

- That the overall goal is to harmonize as much as possible with existing scoping (IBC, ADA Standards, etc.) and not increase existing scoping.
- That the Committee structure may need to be adjusted to achieve efficiency and adequacy of representation by interested parties.
- That the IBC is not the only user of the Standard. Scoping is necessary for the Standard to be adopted by entities that do not use the building codes – such as universities or other non-governmental agencies.
- That this would be duplicative of existing scoping in the IBC and in some state codes and cause confusion for architects, builders, code officials who prefer one set of rules and more work for jurisdictions in their adoption process.
- That it is not known how this would affect HUD’s review for ‘safe harbor’?
- That the proposal may not cover all of the IBC scoping.
- That the proposal would not be adequate solely as a substitute for IBC Chapter 11 because of the interrelationship of accessibility provisions in the other I-Codes.
- Maintenance –
 - That there could be a problem with coordination between A117, IBC and ADA over time given the different timing of their revision cycles.
 - That this would substantially increase the work load of the committee and the people who participate in all forums.
 - Whether scoping is necessary in the Standard given the successful treatment of scoping in the IBC.

- 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 with ‘newly designed’ when it relates to a building code.
 - While under ADA you can submit a complaint on a building that has not been built yet, this should be deleted here.
 - 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 “New construction and alterations”.
- 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.
- Should ‘elements’ be included to address 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 doors
- Clusters – if this is for bathrooms (also sauna and steam rooms), there could be back to back items that are accessed from different tenants. This should be addressed in the exception and the definition removed – or come up with a different approach.
- 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?
- Primary function area.
 - Locker rooms and bathrooms should be considered primary function spaces.
 - It is important to look at how this is used in context – this is only a break for improvements to the route, not to providing accessibility in the space.
- Restricted entrance – is there a way to make the definition consistent with the Access Board guidance
- Story –
 - IBC says to the top of the roof rafters, not the top of the roof. This fix could be here to reduce potential conflict with no change to accessibility requirements
 - The last sentence is about a mezzanine, so it should not be under the definition for story
 - It must be clear the changes in levels are not a story
- Technically infeasible – additional clarification would be helpful
- Transient lodging –
 - ‘guestrooms’ are a type of sleeping unit – better to use the defined terms
 - 2nd sentence is a list of what this is not
 - The exception should be in the general exceptions
- We need to define Accessible and Type C units if the intent is to scope those types of units – as a requirement or as a where provided
- Work area equipment – 2nd sentence is requirement, 3rd sentence is what this is not included.

A202 Accessibility Required

A202.1 –

- Should ‘structure’ be added? That could result in including retaining walls, fences, etc.
- ‘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 is defined in the ICC A117.1.

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 understanding and compliance.

Start next meeting with A202.2.8 and any proposed modifications.

6-08-2023 Meeting

Reviewed 14 modifications to Definitions.

Modification 1 Addition

Mod to add back in gross AM 19-4-0

AM 24-3-1

Modification 2 Alteration

Original modification 5-19-2

Replacement 21-3-1

Modification 3 – Assisted use - Tabled till related package for assisted living

Modification 4 – Change in occupancy – AM 24-0-1

Modification 5 – Cluster – replacement AM 29-0-1

Modification 6 – Entrance – AM 12-11-3

Modification 7 – Limited Access Spaces – AM 24-2-3

Modification 8 – Machinery spaces, A202.2.4 – replacement 20-2-3

Modification 9 – split proposal

Mezzanine – AM 22-2-3

Story – AM 14-9-4

Modification 10 – Public Use Areas – AM 26-0-3

Modification 11 – Social service center establishment – AM 23-0-3

Modification 12 – Transient lodging – AM 24-1-3

Modification 13 – Accessible unit – AM 24-1-3

Modification 14 – Type C unit –

Chair ruled A203.9.17 should be proposed with Residential requirements

Definition AM 18-0-2

Start next meeting with A202.2.8.

- 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.

F) New business:

G) Future meetings:

- 1) Calls will be every other Thursday, from Noon to 4:00 pm Eastern.
The meeting dates for 2022 are:
March 10, 24; April 7, 21; May 5, 19; June 2, 16, 30; July 14, 28; August 11, 25; Sept. 8, 22; Oct. 6, 20; Nov. 3, 17; Dec. 1, 15, 2022.
Meeting dates for 2023 are:
Jan. 5 and 19, Feb. 2 and 16, March 2, 16 and 30, April 13 and 27, May 11 and 25, June 8 and 22, July 13, 27, August 10, 24, Sept. 7, 21, Oct. 5, 19, Nov. 2, 16 and 30, Dec. 14, 2023.
- 2) Information on the meetings and development of the 2023 edition of the standard will be posted at [ICC A117.1 webpage](#)
- 3) Any questions contact Karl Aittaniemi; kaittaniemi@iccsafe; 888-422-7233, Ext. 4205

H) Adjourn – Meeting was adjourned at 4:05.